

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

11th August 2016

| <u>UPRN</u> | <u>APPLICATION NO.</u> | <u>DATE VALID</u> |
|-------------------------|--|-------------------|
| | 16/P1149 | 22/04/2016 |
| Address/Site | 153 – 161 The Broadway, Wimbledon, SW19 1NE | |
| Ward | Abbey | |
| Proposal: | Demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a 9 storey 176 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) and ground floor restaurant (use Class A3) facility and car parking and associated landscaping and access (2 residential dwellings shown at rear for indicative purposes only and are subject of separate application) | |
| Drawing Nos | 3642/P100, P104 F (proposed site plan); P105 G, P106 D, P107 D(proposed floor plans); P108 G,(proposed elevations), P109 D (contextual street elevations), P110 C (proposed sections), P111 B (Proposed roof plan)& P113 B (proposed Broadway elevation) | |
| Contact Officer: | Stuart Adams (0208 545 3147) | |

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission subject to conditions and S106 agreement relating to contribution towards CPZ review

CHECKLIST INFORMATION.

Heads of agreement: - N/A

Is a screening opinion required: No

Is an Environmental Statement required: No

Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been submitted – No

Press notice – Yes

Site notice – Yes

Design Review Panel consulted – Yes

Number of neighbours consulted – 608

External consultations – No.

PTAL score – 6a
CPZ – 4F

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee in light of the number of objections received and at the request of Councillor Neep.

2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The application site comprises a four storey building dating from the 1960's situated on the south side of The Broadway. The ground floor of the building has been vacant since June 2014 (Henry J Beans Bar and Grill) and three office floors above have been vacant since 2008 (job centre). There is a car parking and servicing area at the rear of the site, accessed from Griffiths Road.
- 2.2 There is a mixture of architectural styles in the vicinity of the application site and the surrounding area is mixed commercial in character. Immediately adjacent to the application site is the distinctive curved glazed frontage of the 6 storey CIPD office building. To the east is Highlands House, a 1960's multi-level commercial building with Majestic wine warehouse at ground floor and 6 floors of office space above. Opposite the application site is a recent seven storey mixed used development with residential on the upper floors.
- 2.3 The application site is located within the designated Wimbledon Town Centre in the adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014). It is not within a conservation area. Controlled Parking Zones operate in the Broadway and surrounding streets . The site has excellent public transport links and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6b.

3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a 9 storey 176 bedroom hotel (Use Class C1) and ground floor restaurant (Use Class A3) facility and car parking and associated landscaping and access (2 residential dwellings shown at rear for indicative purposes only and are subject of separate application).
- 3.2 The proposed building would adopt a modern design approach with a palette of materials that includes buff brick, stone, coloured metal cladding and glazing. At ground floor level, the building would accommodate the hotel lobby, reception, bar, restaurant, service access leading from the

front to the rear, 2 guest bedrooms and back of house facilities. At first, second and third floor levels would be 24 guest bedrooms, at fourth floor 23 bedrooms, fifth 22 bedrooms, sixth & seventh 20 bedrooms and eight 17 bedrooms.

- 3.3 There would be four disabled car parking bays, 13 cycle spaces and an operational vehicle bay provided for at the rear of the site which would be accessed via the existing Griffiths Road access. The servicing for the hotel for linen, food and drink deliveries and refuse would be on street outside the hotel, subject to existing loading restrictions which exclude loading in peak hours.

- 3.4 Amended Plans
Since the original submission the plans have been amended to incorporate the following changes –

Ground floor alterations

Minor amendments have been made to the ground floor plant room area at the rear of the proposed hotel. A new sub-station is located within the hotel plant room, with emergency access retained as existing from Griffiths Road. The substation access gate is re-positioned to aid vehicular tracking.

The overall plant space has been rationalised and this has enabled the proposal at ground floor to be moved an additional 2.6m away from the boundary with the dwellings on Griffith Road. The proposed ground floor is now within the footprint of the original permitted scheme at the southern boundary. The former substation housing will be retained and used as general storage.

Car Parking

The disabled parking has been increased from 2 to 4 bays within the rear yard accessed from Griffiths Road and a contractor's service vehicle parking bay has been added.

Materials Palette

The cladding to the rear elevation has been substantially reduced, with the elements closest to Griffiths Road replaced with buff brick. The surround and returns of the Broadway facade have been amended to brick with stone at ground floor level and additional details about materials have been provided.

- 3.5 An application for outline planning permission, LBM ref 16/P2330, has been submitted concurrently for erection of two dwellings at the rear of site. Details have been indicatively shown on the plans for the proposed

hotel. The outline application is recommended for approval under delegated powers subject to a parking permit free legal agreement.

4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 16/P2330 - Outline application (access only) for erection of two x dwellings at the rear of site – Pending decision

4.2 **11/P3437** - Change of use (from Class B1) office to (Class C1) hotel involving the demolition of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors of the existing building and the erection of eight new floors to form a 149 bedroom hotel above existing ground floor bar use – **REFUSED** by Planning Applications Committee on 30th April 2013 for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed development would be of insufficient design quality for this prominent town centre location and would by reason of its design, height and siting have an unsatisfactory relationship with the adjoining building at 143-151 The Broadway (known as CIPD House) and would be contrary to retained UDP Policies BE.16 (Urban Design) and BE.22 (Design of New Development) and Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS14 (Design).
- 2) The bulk, massing and site coverage would result in an unneighbourly form of development that would be visually intrusive to occupiers of neighbouring properties contrary to retained UDP Policy BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise).

4.2.1 This application was subsequently **ALLOWED on appeal (Ref: APP/T5720/A/13/2201609)** on the 27th February 2014. The planning permission is still extant until 27th February 2017. The Inspector considered the two main issues to be the effect on the character and appearance of the adjoining buildings in the Broadway and on the street scene and the impact on the living conditions of occupiers of the properties to the south in terms of visual impact, daylight and sunlight. The Inspector's conclusions on the 2 issues were as follows:

- 1) The scheme would respect and blend in appropriately with adjacent buildings and would make a positive contribution to the street scene and the townscape in general
- 2) The proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby properties due to its visual impact or loss of daylight and sunlight.

The Inspector's decision notice is attached as an Appendix to the report.

- 4.3 11/P1167 - Change of use (from Class B1) office to (Class C1) hotel involving the demolition of the 1st 2nd and 3rd floors of the existing building and the erection of a new seven storey hotel with 155 rooms, external fire escape and reduction of parking provision from 22 spaces to 18 – Refused under delegated powers on 03/08/2011 for the following reasons:
- 1) The proposed development would be of insufficient design quality for this prominent town centre location and would by reason of its design, height and siting have an unsatisfactory relationship with the adjoining building at 143-151 The Broadway (known as CIPD House) and would be contrary to retained UDP policies BE.16 (Urban Design) and BE.22 (Design of New Development) and Adopted Core Strategy policy CS14 (Design).
 - 2) The bulk, massing and site coverage of the proposed rear extension would result in an unneighbourly form of development that would be visually intrusive to occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in Griffith's Road contrary to retained UDP policy BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise).
 - 3) The proposed hotel fails to take a suitably comprehensive approach to the development of this important town centre site and compromises the future redevelopment of the adjacent designated development site 4WTC on the adopted UDP Proposals Map and is contrary to Policies CS6(e) - Wimbledon Town Centre, CS7- Centres and CS14(iii) of the adopted Core Strategy (July 2011) and the principles of good planning.
- 4.4 06/P2912 - In April 2007 planning permission was granted by the Planning Application Committee for the recladding of the existing building and the erection of an additional four floors of office accommodation. The application was subject to a S.106 Agreement that was not completed.
- 4.5 00/P1800 - In September 2001 planning permission was granted for the change of use of the ground floor of the property from A1 (retail use) to A3 (café/bar use). The permission was subject to a S.106 Agreement
- 4.6 96/P0219 - In May 1998 planning permission was granted (subject to S.106 Agreement) by the Planning Applications Committee for the erection of an additional two floors office accommodation above the existing building and the erection of a part single part, two, three and four storey rear extension to provide a total of 2768m² of B1 (office) floorspace and 782m² of A3 (café/bar) floorspace. This permission was not implemented.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1 The application has been advertised by major site notice procedure and letters of notification to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 In response to the consultation (original plans), 92 letters of objection were received (including ones from the Wimbledon E Hillside Residents Association, South Wimbledon Community Association, Cllr Neep, Cllr Chirico & Love Wimbledon). 3 letters of support were also received.
- 5.3 The main issues raised in objection were as follows:

Height/Design/Materials

- Height of building would be out of proportion to the existing buildings in that area, higher rise buildings don't enhance the street scene, lack of cohesive planning for town as a whole – needs to be a proper planning strategy for Wimbledon that maintains its attractiveness
- Appearance will detract from the Broadway, will further de-value Wimbledon brand, not in keeping of the surrounding area. Materials are cheap and ugly, virtually all metal cladding. Lazy, corporate design that does not acknowledge or complement surrounding streetscape and building styles. Metal cladding will not age well, a design using bricks would integrate better into the surrounding area. Set poor precedent. Visually intrusive form of development
- Overdevelopment of the site (previous approval of a 149 hotel was too much), unacceptably high density
- Whatever height is permitted no mobile phone masts, air conditioning equipment or their plant and machinery should be permitted on the roof so as to protect the skyline of Wimbledon

Parking/Servicing

- The proposed single vehicle layby at the front of the building is ridiculously inadequate. Inappropriate to have delivery and waste disposal vehicles using the same place as hotel guests being dropped off by taxi. Easy to imagine queues of vehicles blocking The Broadway waiting to get into the layby.
- The development would adversely affect highway safety or inconvenience road users, including buses, especially with guests pulling in to load/unload and lorries and vans arriving with deliveries, which are to be by the front entrance of the building. This stretch of the Broadway is often backed up, with heavy traffic and many buses, especially in the morning. It is the main route through the centre of the town. With the prospect of an super-enlarged YMCA building almost opposite, and imminent plans to redevelop for Crossrail 2, highway safety has to be a consideration.

- Increased traffic and increase risk of road injuries
- Inadequate parking. Additional parking should be included. Instead of two residential units at rear this should be car parking. If approved, surrounding residential streets should become resident only with no parking for non-residents. 2 disabled parking bays do not provide suitable parking. Whitbread estimate that 20% of guests are likely to travel by car, which would generate between 28 and 35 additional cars per night. Surrounding streets and car parks cannot cope with additional pressure when other developments and future closure of car parks proposed.
- Possible solution to parking problem by stating that hotel is car free, whereby visitors are informed before booking – that there is no nearby space for private vehicles. This would be secured via a S106 agreement. Also helpful if the hotel operated a shuttle van to/from Wimbledon station (hybrid or electric engine)
- Basement could have been provided for deliveries and car parking
- Parking bay should be restricted to delivery vehicles and coaches, not guests using their cars. Bay should not be used during construction phase
- Layby will take up part of pedestrian pavement
- There should be restrictions on parking permits for the hotel

Residential Amenity

- Noise and disruption from hotel activity (including antisocial behaviour). Ground floor restaurant – area already has diverse eateries – concerns with extra rubbish and collection and noise disturbance. Former bar/restaurant use operated late hours with police in attendance regularly -late night restriction should be placed on restaurant (11pm) to avoid repetition of problems in this residential area. The site is situated in a cumulative impact zone and should be a condition of planning that the licence ends at 11.00pm each day to avoid noise, crime and anti-social behaviour
- Loss of value to surrounding properties
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of light and overshadowing of properties in Griffiths Road
- Very invasive for the houses on Griffiths Road which it backs onto (i.e. too tall, too wide and too near the boundary)
- Increased air pollution

Hotel Use

- The number of hotel rooms exceeds previous planning permission, another hotel has been granted permission on Hartfield Road – why is this hotel necessary?

Other

- Public consultation carried out during holiday period

- Should be reviewed in light of Crossrail 2
- Can the development of the 2 houses planned at the back on Griffiths Road be linked as a condition of the hotel?
- Proposed houses and impact upon light to adjoining properties. What assurance is that the houses would be built, could be changed to block of flats.

5.4 Love Wimbledon

- Supportive of a new business and a hotel in the town centre. Keen to encourage development on this site as it has lain empty for many years and does present an eyesore. It also attracts a level of antisocial activity around it, as it is evident it is not being maintained.
- Not supportive of the current proposal in relation to the design - quality of materials should be improved, preference is for brick taking into account its relationship to its surroundings, and to avoid current proposed clash with the CIPD building, Wimbledon needs high quality, intelligent architecture to take it through to the next century and therefore cannot support an application for a building with green metal cladding on the façade.
- Would like to see the signage approved as part of the planning application as this can also detract

5.5 Councillor Neep

- Residents are concerned with late night activity in The Broadway
- The materials are not in keeping. DRP note that the building should be in line with the CIPD building next door which uses brick to the side and rear which is what the majority of people from the Broadway and Griffiths Road see. The Premier Inn uses metal cladding which is not in keeping with the area. Request for conditions relating to materials.
- Welcome commitment to prevent loading or access from Griffiths Road. Losing 22 spaces will place pressure on car parking in surrounding streets. Premier Inn note that approx. 33-35 cars will be expected a night, Griffiths Road and surrounding areas already face issues for space in terms of parking after CPZ hours.
- A layby for loading and dropping off from The Broadway is welcomed but this needs to be separate to the bus lane which would cause chaos on The Broadway, we would like planning committee to make this a condition of development.
- The height of the building whilst already considered as part of the appeal for the previous application is something residents are concerned with. Not in keeping with CIPD and sets a precedent. There are also big questions about the impact on light on what is

already a shady side of the street.

- We welcome the proposal for two houses on the entrance on Griffiths Road but would like to see this as part of a condition of development.

5.6 Councillor Chirico (on half of Trinity ward residents and Trinity Councillors)

- Additional parking pressure on Trinity ward due to lack of parking for the hotel and potential underestimation of users bringing their own vehicles to the area
- Substandard finished look of the hotel and the use of metal clad in Wimbledon. Materials will look tired and ugly and are not in keeping with the current look of the surrounding area. Residents require alternatives such as appropriate London brick work.
- The 9 storeys, if granted, would set a dangerous precedent for other buildings in the area to expand vertically. Residents feel that the height is obtrusive.
- The hotel density is too great.
- Deliveries at the front of the hotel would cause further congestion on an already busy Wimbledon Broadway. Residents who use the buses do not want service access vehicles stopping in a bus lane in busy commuter traffic, which the Council currently favours. An alternative should be considered.
- Trinity councillors do not object to the development of this site but any application should consider the concerns raised above.

5.7 The letters of support raise the following points

- The current building is old and dilapidated
- The proposed building with restaurant would reinvigorate the block and the whole area surrounding
- Increase value of the existing viscount point property and should be a positive development for all owners
- Will provide direct employment and support businesses along the Broadway
- Given that the buildings on both sides are 6 storeys, 9 storeys is not excessive
- Wimbledon is in need of a mid-range hotel
- The design and materials are in keeping with the other buildings and will fit in with the surrounding area.

5.8 **July 2016 Re-Consultation on Amended Plans**

A re-consultation was carried out following revised plans which

- Moved the ground floor further away from Griffiths Road at the rear and incorporated 2 additional disabled spaces,
- Changed the materials palette to introduce more brickwork to the front and rear elevations
- Changed the servicing arrangements to remain as on-street from the Broadway, subject to existing loading restrictions

In response, 18 additional representations were received, mainly reiterating previous objections, and as summarised below:

- 9 storeys too high, impact on neighbours and incompatible with adjoining buildings and CIPD, will create cold, windy microclimate
- Use of cladding cheap and unsightly, alien to Wimbledon, building will be damaging to Wimbledon and set a poor precedent, should be more imaginative and in character with town centre, pleased that some brickwork proposed but should be more/all brickwork, easier to maintain and more visually pleasing, all brickwork been used on other Premier Inns, developer has advised that brick no more expensive than cladding
- Changes to building too minor to be significant, don't affect previous objections
- Shame no green roofs, solar panels, are there proposals to attenuate surface water run off?
- Servicing arrangements using drop off rather than inset lay by seem ill thought and will interfere with bus lane, detrimental to highway safety,
- Still insufficient parking, Increased parking pressure on surrounding streets
- Basement car park could provide parking and servicing solution
- Increase in number of bedrooms from 149 to 176 unacceptable in terms of additional parking, traffic, noise and disturbance
- No change to daylight/sunlight report despite new readings taken in June and errors in initial report, impact on light and outlook to Griffiths Road, there are breaches of certain of the BRE guidelines in respect of 73 and 79 Griffiths Road and rights of light injury to 67, 69, 71, 73 and 79 Griffiths Road. Although rights of light not a material planning consideration, want decision deferred until satisfied that complies with BRE guidelines and legal rights of light criteria.
- Question need for hotel

5.9 Councillor Neep

Has made the following additional comments in respect of the changes –

- concerned not enough time for report to be published in advance of Aug

PAC and that many residents with an interest will be on holiday, would support application being heard at Sept PAC

- introduction of more brick and stone does not go far enough. Inclusion of metal cladding not in keeping with Broadway or Griffiths Road and does not complement the design of the CIPD building next door. Metal cladding presents concerns in terms of durability and aesthetics. Premier Inn at Colliers Wood has not aged well. Whitbread have successfully designed and built brick hotels within Kings Cross without lack of balance between lightness and gravitas. Welcomes removal of some of the cladding but wants this to go further and ensure building is reflective of the character of the Broadway and Griffiths Road.

- height is still a concern for residents and for future development along the Broadway, which in many places retains its historical character and value, 9 storeys is higher than CIPD building next door- questions about light and rights of light for residents at the rear and pedestrians on already dark and windy Broadway.

- Servicing needs to be addressed. Broadway is a busy thoroughfare, already heavily congested. Suggestion that a 176 room hotel and restaurant will not need servicing stop off more than 14 days a week is at best an estimate. Inset loading bay should be looked at again – will help to ease the pressure on the Broadway and without it will be increased pressure on the road and inconvenience for users. Should be a condition of planning and bus lane should be protected.

-Parking remains an issue. With proximity of theatre and recent approval of a hotel with no parking around the corner the surrounding streets will take the strain. This needs further consideration and a clearer articulation of how this will be prevented.

- Whilst development and its benefits is welcomed in Wimbledon it can and should deliver for residents. The amendments have addressed residents' comments to a degree but fall short of delivering something that enhances what is currently in situ on the Broadway and surrounding roads. Metal cladding could be removed from the design and other successful Premier Inn developments across London do not include it. The above considerations should be taken into to create a development that works for all and stands the test of time.

5.10 Energy Officer – No objection

5.11 Transport Planning Officer- Core Planning Strategy:

- CS18 – Active Transport – *Working to ensure the pedestrian environment is safe, enjoyable and attractive.*
- CS20 – Parking, Servicing and Delivery – *Requiring developers to demonstrate that their development will not adversely affect pedestrian and cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents or the*

quality of bus movements and/or facilities ; on-street parking and traffic management.

Site and Policies Local Plan:

- DM T1 – *Support for sustainable transport and active travel*

5.11.1 Parking

The parking situation in CPZ W4 (Palmerston Road area) is no longer an issue as controlled hours are from 8am to 11pm Monday to Saturday & 10am-2pm on Sundays.

CPZ 4F (Griffiths Rd area) has shorter hours of 8am – 6pm. The Council would review the hours of CPZ operations if we received a petition from residents requesting a review, which might be expected as a result of the development. The associated costs of conducting a review of the 4F CPZ are: Consultation, reporting and decision making £10,000. Implementation (signs, lines, notices and works) £20,000.

5.11.2 Deliveries/Loading

Based upon the number of deliveries to the hotel estimated to be a maximum of 14 a week (equates to 2 a day) Future Merton does not feel that an inset footway loading bay is necessary. Servicing and unloading from the carriageway already occurs along the whole length of The Broadway and the introduction of an inset loading bay here might set the precedent for additional inset loading bays which would negatively impact on pedestrian movement and the quality of the public realm.

5.11.3 TfL Buses had concerns that on street loading would detrimentally impact the operation of the bus lane however the existing westbound bus lane is only operational in the peak morning period (7-10am Monday to Saturday) and loading is already allowed in the bus lane outside the site between the hours of 1000-1600. Future Merton considers that deliveries and servicing for the hotel can be accommodated in the existing carriageway/kerbside without negatively impacting upon bus journey time reliability and traffic congestion assuming there is adequate parking enforcement to deter loading outside of the 1000-1600 period.

5.11.4 The kerbside footway outside the site is currently cluttered by an advertising display, posts and a poorly maintained telephone box which will affect the ability for the hotel to unload and load deliveries and for refuse lorries to empty bins. It is therefore recommended that these footway obstructions should be relocated or preferably removed as part of the reconstruction of the footway (which will be necessary because of damage to the footway during the construction process) to provide clear footway space for safe loading/unloading activities. This should be secured through a S278 agreement and or planning condition.

5.11.5 The Council will require a robust amended Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) that includes mechanisms that restricts deliveries and

servicing activities taking place during peak hours and/or hours of bus lane operations. The DSP should also include procedures for managing taxi drop off and pick up to ensure this activity does not negatively impact on The Broadway. The full DSP will need to be approved prior to start of construction and secured through a condition.

Other transport related conditions will include:

- H4 - Provision of Vehicle Parking area plans
- C6 - Cycle Parking - Details to be Submitted
- C7 - Cycle Parking to be implemented
- H8 – Travel Plan
- H9 – Construction Vehicles Traffic Management Plan
- H10 – Construction vehicles – washdown
- H11 – Parking Management Strategy
- H12 - Delivery and Servicing Plan
- H13 – Construction Logistics Plan

5.12 Urban Design Officer

Overview

5.12.1 This is a proposal that supports the continued improvement of Wimbledon as the borough's commercial centre and the increase in employment planned through a number of office developments. It supports policies on intensification and efficient use of land and making the best use of existing good quality transport assets. It also supports the improvement of vitality and activity at the eastern end of The Broadway, complementing the existing and planned office and other uses in the immediate vicinity.

Urban design principles

5.12.2 Wider scale urban design principles of permeability, legibility etc. are not directly relevant to this single site proposal.

Siting, density, scale, height

5.12.3 The building is appropriately sited towards the pavement and public realm, stepping back to the rear and the adjacent residential area. Changes made from the previously approved hotel scheme have seen the building set back further from these properties and this is welcomed. The siting of the building is such that it does not compromise re-development of the building to the east.

5.12.4 The density is considered appropriate for the area, being similar to other

existing and planned developments. The density is not causing any design issues in terms of height, plot coverage or overlooking that would suggest it is overdevelopment and thus too dense.

5.12.5 The Council has a tall buildings policy for Wimbledon. This states that the town centre is appropriate for intensification for a variety of appropriate uses. Because this is not possible to expand outwards, it is considered appropriate to expand upwards within certain limits. The policy seeks a general uniformity of building heights where most buildings sit within a certain height range. This range is to be informed by the taller of the commercial buildings in the town centre or immediate vicinity. Whether new buildings should be slightly higher or lower than existing ones is a matter of assessment of the immediate context and justification in terms of urban design, visual impact and other planning matters such as privacy and daylight. For this site, the obvious comparison building is the adjacent CIPD office building. This is 6 storey with generous floorplates. The proposed hotel is 9 storey, with an appearance in elevation, of being approx. 1.5 storey higher. This is a slight reduction in height from the approved scheme. Street views submitted by the applicant show that this height does not have an adverse impact on the street scene, nor does it unduly detract from views of the CIPD and its signature cantilevered glass frontage. It is therefore considered that the height of the building is appropriate and fulfils the wording and spirit of the tall building policy for Wimbledon town centre.

Massing, rhythm, proportions, materials

5.12.6 The massing of the building is to the street frontage, stepping down to the rear. The rear section is sited in the middle of the plot and this maximised the ability of adjacent sites to intensify in the future and deals well with any existing or future privacy issues. Thus the siting is considered appropriate.

5.12.7 The proportions of the building are set out with a projecting ground floor with canopy, a first floor, a central section of 6 storey and a set-back top floor. These elements are identified in different materials, which, generally, work well together. The central section projects forward from a brick surround, and is divided up into four elements, picked out by a subtle change in the metal panels of the façade. All these elements appear to create a cohesive and understandable form to the frontage that relates well to the human scale. There are both vertical and horizontal features that give rhythm to the elevation. At ground and first the horizontal is more dominant, and above in the main façade, vertical is more dominant. However, neither are overpowering. This is a similar approach achieved with the CIPD building, but done in its own complementary manner. This is considered an appropriate and well considered response for a building

next to one of Wimbledon's iconic modern buildings.

5.12.8 Prior to the latest changes, the frontage of the building was exclusively metal panelling above ground floor. This was done differently for the different components of the building façade. It gave the building a distinctive appearance, the success of which was highly dependent on the quality of panelling chosen. This still remains an issue that needs careful scrutiny when discharging conditions. However, the surround to the main elevation has now been changed to brick. This has a number of positive effects. It picks up on a similar approach taken by the CIPD, and so better relates to the local context. It makes the building feel more grounded and solid. It draws attention to the other elements of the building, enabling them to be read more clearly – the ground floor (now in high quality stone) and the first floor.

5.12.9 The main elevation will also now appear more distinctive and not be lost in a sea of panelling, becoming more of a positive feature rather than a bland cover-all. The balance of this now seems far better and, allowing for the windows in the frontage, the actual amount of panelling has been vastly reduced, as it was the surrounds to the building that constituted most of the panelling. To take this change further, by adding more brick, would run the risk of losing the effect of each material. It could also make the building look too heavy. To make the elevation work successfully using predominantly brick would probably require a complete redesign of the whole frontage. The balance of lightness and gravitas looks to be about right as currently proposed.

5.12.10 The rear of the building is also now incorporating more brick and this is to be welcomed for similar reasons.

The local urban context and historic context

5.12.11 To comment more particularly on materials in terms of the local context, a modern building has to strike the right balance between being clearly modern and fitting harmoniously into its surroundings. It also has to have at least a nod to some local distinctiveness.

5.12.13 With a frontage predominantly of metal panels, the building was struggling to do this. The addition of a brick surround to the main frontage is a nod to the predominant building material in Wimbledon, although the offices are of varying materials and varying brick types. The brick surround does however, pick up on the form and material of the CIPD building which is not only adjacent, but seen as a positive modern building in Wimbledon.

5.12.14 The ground floor is to be in stone and this is a local material to be seen in

the old town hall and railway station amongst others. The use of metal panelling is not considered inappropriate in the context proposed. New buildings are expected to relate to and pick up on positive elements of local context to add local distinctiveness. It is inappropriate for them simply to ape existing buildings. New buildings should be of their time and it is appropriate in most cases for them to employ modern materials.

5.12.15 Therefore in this case, it is considered that the use of metal panelling is not inappropriate. To dictate building materials to an applicant without very strong justification would be inappropriate and contrary to relevant policies on architecture.

Architecture

5.12.16 Given the comments above on local distinctiveness and materials, it is considered that the architectural approach is appropriate. Care will need to be taken with the approval of materials at the discharge of conditions stage. Details of the cladding system submitted in the revised DAS would appear to suggest a reasonably robust system of construction.

Landscape

5.12.17 In this highly urban location there is little scope for landscaping. However, the proposed tree line at the rear is welcomed. Further tree planting at the front should also be considered in conjunction with the Council's highways team.

The public realm

5.12.18 The removal of the suggested off-street servicing lay-by is very welcome. Reasons why this would be inappropriate and poor for the public realm and contrary to a number of policies have been detailed in previous e-mail correspondence. It is recommended that the paved area in front of the building should be at the same level as the public footway and appear as a contiguous space irrespective of ownership.

Summary

5.12.19 The recent changes to the building to include more brick and natural stone are considered to be a subtle but significant improvement to the design, and are very welcome.

5.13 Environmental Health – No objection subject to conditions

5.14 Design Review Panel
Extant Planning Permission

Design Review Panel were consulted on the previous extant planning permission allowed on appeal and gave it a GREEN verdict but considered that the exact colour of the cladding panels should be carefully considered and be controlled by condition.

5.15 Pre-Application Advice

Design Review Panel considered the pre-application scheme in July 2015. The notes of that meeting advised that

‘The Panel were generally happy with the scale, form and massing of the proposed building established by the appeal decision. They also welcomed the improvements to the rear elevation resulting from the loss of the ground floor bar use. The Panel had concerns in 2 key areas. Firstly, the effect on the public realm resulting from the proposed front servicing bay and secondly the composition of the front facade of the new building and how it related to the new internal layout.

The Panel questioned why the potentially sensible solution of rear servicing in the previously permitted scheme had been abandoned for a recessed on-street delivery bay. It was felt that this could have adverse effects on the quality of the pavement in front of the new hotel. It was suggested that the parking bay was taking space out of the public realm as it would not operate as part of it. The Panel did however acknowledge the practical difficulties of servicing from Griffiths Road due to its narrowness. Some members were opposed to on street servicing, others were not. Concerns raised related to the ability to move advertising panels and phone boxes, the dog leg nature of the footway and the route pedestrians would need to take to avoid the bay, and its narrowness, being about 2m wide at its narrowest point. The Panel felt the footway needed to be as wide as possible and that the public realm in front of the building should be generous and contribute to the attractiveness and appeal of the new building. The proposed solution would prevent the ability for the restaurant use to spill out onto the pavement. It would affect the quality and appearance and setting of the building if vehicles were parking in the bay for much of the day. The Panel were concerned about the Council’s ability to control how intensively the bay was used and that this would result in the building frontage and footway being obscured for much of the day, reduce quality of the environment for both pedestrians and hotel guests.

Regarding the building frontage, the Panel noted there was now a more efficient internal layout, but this was not reflected in the form and composition of the elements of the main elevation. Of particular note was the strong vertical element adjacent to the CIPD building. In the consented scheme, this reflected the hotel entrance and the stair core, however this was not the case in the proposed scheme. The Panel felt that whilst this was not inappropriate to follow the design of the consented scheme in principal, the architecture nevertheless needed to have the freedom to

reflect the internal arrangement and amended accordingly. Thus, whilst the design should be guided by the appeal decision, it should not be entirely governed by it.

The Panel felt that the justification for the design and composition needed to be stronger and based on clear local policy guidance. Whilst the solid ground level concrete frontage was considered a good solution, it needed to be better integrated with the rest of the frontage. It was suggested that the alteration to reflect the re-positioned entrance and stair core resulted in an opportunity to reassess the number of bays in the whole elevation at ground floor. The sedum roof was felt to be a bit impractical and a box hedge on the canopy or other planting boxes would be an alternative.

Finally, the Panel expected to see more detail on materials as referenced in the appeal for the proposal with planning permission but acknowledged that some substantive changes to the design needed to be addressed first. Overall, the Panel were supportive of the proposal, notably the improved internal arrangement and building massing.

Verdict: AMBER

5.16 DRP E-mail Review September 2015

Following July 2015 DRP, a number of design revisions were made to the facade to better relate to the new internal layout. The ground floor restaurant was pulled forward to add interest at pavement level, the main body of the hotel was squared off and materials used to define the corner returns and top floor. A review by DRP Members via individual e-mails was carried out. Generally, the front elevation was considered to be much improved and the applicant was commended for addressing the DRP comments. On balance the preference for an on street servicing rather than an inset loading bay remained in the interests of the public realm.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 Adopted Sites and Policies Plan (July 2014)

DM R1 Location and scale of development in Merton's town centres and neighbourhood parades

DM R5 Food and drink/leisure and entertainment uses

DM R6 Culture, arts and tourism development

DM E1 Employment areas in Merton

DM E4 Local employment opportunities

DM O2 Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features

DM D1 Urban design and the public realm

DM D2 Design considerations in all developments

DM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise

DM T1 Support for sustainable transport and active travel

DM T2 Transport impacts of development
DM T3 Car parking and servicing standards

6.2 Adopted Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS 7 - Centres
CS 12 - Economic Development
CS14 - Design
CS15 – Climate Change
CS18 – Active Transport
CS19 – Public Transport
CS20 - Parking, Servicing and Delivery

LDF Tall Buildings Background Paper (2010) is also pertinent to the application.

6.3 London Plan (July 2011):

2.15 (Town Centres)
4.1 (Developing London' s Economy)
5.1 (Climate Change Mitigation),
5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction).
7.3 (Designing Out Crime)
7.4 (Local Character)
7.5 (Public Realm)
7.6 (Architecture)

7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

7.1 **Background to the Application and Principle of a Hotel Use**

There is an extant planning permission in place, 11/P3437, allowed on appeal for a 149 bedroom hotel. This is still capable of implementation and is therefore a strong material planning consideration. The principle of the redevelopment of the site for hotel purposes is therefore considered to be established.

7.2 The ground floor and upper floors have been vacant since the departure of Henry J Beans Bar and Grill in 2014 and the Job Centre in 2008. The appearance and condition of the existing building creates a negative influence on the visual amenities and character of the town centre. Given the condition and necessary investment to bring the existing building up to modern standards it is unlikely to attract interest. Although it results in a loss of office space, the proposed use would be compatible with London Plan and adopted Merton planning policies for the town centre and would generate approximately 50 jobs. The town centre location with excellent links to public transport and a use that would help support the vitality and

viability of the town centre considered to be in line with national and local planning policies.

7.3

Key Differences between the Current Proposal and the Previous Appeal decision

Following the allowed appeal for 11/P3437 (the 'fallback' scheme), the site was acquired by Whitbread, the parent company for Premier Inn with a view to implementing the hotel scheme. The design was developed to meet their requirements and the key differences between the 'fallback' scheme and the current proposal are as follows:

- Permission 11/P3437 is for 149 hotel rooms, demolishing the floors above the retained A3 bar/restaurant use, and rebuilding above it whereas the application seeks permission for complete demolition and comprehensive redevelopment that incorporates 176 bedrooms with a ground floor restaurant.
- The permitted hotel was 8 storey (existing ground floor plus 7 floors) plus a rooftop plant enclosure. Although the current proposal is 9 storey plus a rooftop plant enclosure, it sits within the envelope of the permitted scheme. On the Broadway elevation, the fallback scheme was 45.425 m AOD to the parapet whereas the parapet of the proposed scheme is 43.625 AOD. The proposed scheme is therefore 1.8m lower to the parapet than the 'fallback' scheme and also 1.8m lower to the top of roof plant.
- The permitted hotel is a 'T' shape in plan, stepping back at a number of levels away from Griffiths Road. The proposal is also a stepped 'T' design. However, it does not have a rear staircase enclosure like the fallback scheme and as a consequence, it is up to 6.6m less deep than the envelope of the permitted scheme in relation to Griffiths Road.
- The 'fallback' scheme incorporated 22 car parking spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) within a rear parking area sited between the side garden boundaries and flank walls of residential properties at 73 and 79 Griffiths Road and accessed from Griffiths Road. Servicing and delivery was proposed to take place in a service yard accessed through the car park from Griffiths Road. The current proposal incorporates 4 disabled car parking spaces at the rear, servicing is to be from the Broadway and not Griffiths Road. Most of the previous car parking area is excluded from the hotel application and a separate application (Ref: 16/P2330) for 2 family houses adjoining the boundaries with 73 and 79 Griffiths Road, has been submitted.
- The 'fallback' scheme materials consisted of metal cladding and glazing to the front and rear facades. At the rear, the current scheme proposes buff brick to the elevations forming the rear projecting part of the T shaped footprint closest to Griffiths Road, with cladding to the 2 faces either side, and a mixture of buff brick surround, stone ground

floor and metal cladding and glazing within the brick 'frame' on the Broadway elevation.

7.4 **Key Planning Considerations**

- 7.5 The key planning issues are considered to be
- the acceptability of the design, height, massing, materials and impact on the streetscene
 - parking and servicing arrangements
 - impact on nearby residents, particularly Griffiths Road

- 7.6 These issues need to be considered in the context of the previous planning history and the conclusions of the Planning inspector in relation to the 'fallback' scheme, which are a strong material planning consideration.

7.7 **Height, Design, Massing and Appearance within the Street Scene**

- 7.8 The design rationale in terms of height, massing and facade treatment has evolved from the previous appeal decision on the site. Changes have been made to the design and palette of materials both pre and post-application submission in response to the public consultation, the Design Review Panel, the Council's Urban Design officer. The Urban design officer's full detailed comments are set out at paras 5.12.1 to 5.12.9 report.

7.9 Height and Massing

Although the proposal differs from the fallback scheme as outlined above in a number of respects, the following comments from the appeal inspector are considered to be of relevance :

The proposed resultant building on the Appeal site would be approximately five metres taller than the adjoining building to the west and so would contribute to the varied building heights along this section of The Broadway, without being uncharacteristically tall... It would similarly be consistent with paragraph 16.14 of the Core Strategy which states that new taller buildings should contribute to the clusters of tall buildings found within Wimbledon town centre, to create a consistent scale of development based on a range of similar but not uniform building heights.

The proposed hotel fits within the building envelope of the previously approved scheme. Its parapet and plant screening is actually 1.8m lower in height on the Broadway frontage than the fallback position.

- 7.10 The height and massing of the proposed building is considered to respond to the height and massing of surrounding buildings within this town centre

location. The Council has a tall buildings policy for Wimbledon. This states that the town centre is appropriate for intensification for a variety of appropriate uses. Because it is not possible to expand outwards, it is considered appropriate to expand upwards within certain limits. The policy seeks a general uniformity of building heights where most buildings sit within a certain height range. This range is to be informed by the taller of the commercial buildings in the town centre or immediate vicinity. Whether new buildings should be slightly higher or lower than existing ones is a matter of assessment of the immediate context and justification in terms of urban design, visual impact and other planning matters such as privacy and daylight. For this site, the obvious comparison building is the adjacent CIPD office building. This is 6 storey with generous floorplates. The proposed hotel is 9 storey, with an appearance in elevation, of being approx. 1.5 storey higher. Street views submitted by the applicant show that this height does not have an adverse impact on the street scene, nor does it unduly detract from views of the CIPD and its signature cantilevered glass frontage. It is therefore considered that the height of the building is appropriate and fulfils the wording and spirit of the tall building policy for Wimbledon town centre.

7.11 Materials and Appearance

The proportions of the building are set out with a projecting ground floor with canopy, a first floor, a central section of 6 storey and a set-back top floor. These elements are identified in different materials, which, generally, work well together. The central section projects forward from a brick surround, and is divided up into four elements, picked out by a subtle change in the metal panels of the façade. All these elements appear to create a cohesive and understandable form to the frontage that relates well to the human scale. There are both vertical and horizontal features that give rhythm to the elevation. At ground and first the horizontal is more dominant, and above in the main façade, vertical is more dominant. However, neither are overpowering. This is a similar approach achieved with the CIPD building, but done in its own complementary manner. This is considered an appropriate and well considered response for a building next to one of Wimbledon's iconic modern buildings.

- 7.12 In response to consultation responses, the surround to the main elevation has been changed to brick. This is considered to have a number of positive effects. It picks up on a similar approach taken by the CIPD, and so better relates to the local context. It makes the building feel more grounded and solid. It draws attention to the other elements of the building, enabling them to be read more clearly – the ground floor (now in high quality stone) and the first floor. However, Future Merton officers consider that adding more brick, would run the risk of losing the effect of each material and could also make the building look too heavy.

7.13 In response to concerns about the quality of the appearance of the cladding and its relationship to its specifically Wimbledon location, officers' view is that it reflects the neighbouring CIPD, providing a brick frame around a projecting green box element and that the colour choice, being largely subtle greens, would echo the copper dome of the theatre, the green roof of Centre court rotunda and the copper circular mansard window of the old town hall. The ground floor is to be in stone and this is a local material to be seen in the old town hall and railway station amongst others. The use of metal panelling is not considered inappropriate in the context proposed.

7.14 Concerns from residents about the quality of the appearance of cladding and its appearance over time can be addressed by careful attention to the specification and detailing of the cladding. and its appearance, which is indicated as being frameless and which will give a flush joint - this is considered to be a crucial detail. This can be controlled by condition and examined in detail prior to commencement of development in a similar manner to the details for the metal and glazed frontage of the new front extension to the office building at Mansel Court in Mansel Road, which demonstrates that cladding can have a high quality and subtle appearance. It should be noted that the Colliers Wood Premier Inn referred to by some residents as an example of poor weathering is not built to Whitbread's own specification but was a 'turnkey' development provided by an independent developer.

7.15 The appeal inspector in relation to the fallback scheme, which had a front elevation which was predominantly metal cladding and glazing stated the following:

The design of the resultant building would respect the strong horizontal and vertical lines of the CIPD building and the front elevation would comprise a series of uniform metal rainscreen cladding, buff brickwork and extensive areas of aluminium framed glazing. The general colour scheme used on the external surfaces, including bronze, buff and turquoise would complement both the CIPD building and the building to the east.

Overall, subject to the use of high quality materials and careful attention to the precise colours/tones used in the glazing and cladding, the proposed resultant building would contribute positively to the street scene and would complement the adjacent buildings.

7.16 It should be noted that the current proposal reduces the amount of cladding in the front elevation relative to the previous scheme, with the benefits outlined above. In addition, in response to concerns from

residents, a large proportion of the rear elevation is buff brickwork, in contrast to the allowed scheme, which comprised cladding and glazing to the rear. Only the elevations furthest away from Griffiths Road are now cladding. Officers consider that this helps to break up the mass of the building although the applicant has indicated that these cladding elements can be removed from the rear elevation if Members prefer.

7.17 The introduction of brickwork to parts of the front, side and rear elevations of the building and stone detailing on the ground floor frontage pick up on building themes within the town centre. The palette of materials is now considered to help the building appear more 'Wimbledon' and appropriate to the urban character of Wimbledon Town Centre. Concerns of neighbours relating to the use of metal panels has been noted, however the planning inspector and the Councils Urban Design Officer considered this approach acceptable subject to detailing. The Council can control the quality of the materials via a suitable planning condition to ensure that the materials are high quality.

7.17 Overall, the proposed design is considered meet planning policy as the proposed building would relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings.

7.18 Neighbour Amenity

7.19 In relation to the extant planning permission scheme , allowed on appeal, the Inspector made the following comments;

- *The proposed resultant building is T shaped and at the rear would be stepped away from the boundaries of the site. The scale and depth of the rear part of the resultant building would be smaller than that of the CIPD building and the upper floors would be less than 15 metres in width. The building would be of a scale that is proportionate to and in keeping with the adjacent buildings to the west and east and would sit comfortably between them*
- *Above ground floor level the proposed windows in the rear wing either face west and east or would be obscure glazed. As a result the scheme would not result in a material loss of privacy for residents*
- *For these reasons, although the proposed building will be prominent in views from the rear windows and gardens of the adjacent dwellings between the Appeal site and the gardens to those properties, it would not be visually overbearing or look inappropriate in any way, within this town centre environment. The scheme would not result in a material loss of sunlight for any local residents, would facilitate views of the sky around the building and would not result in a material loss of privacy.*

- *I conclude on this issue that the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining and nearby properties due to its visual impact or loss of daylight and sunlight.*
- 7.20 The proposal has been designed to work broadly within the envelope of the previous planning approval which the Inspector concluded would not materially affect neighbouring amenity. The current proposal is in fact lower in height and would be generally set further away from properties in Griffiths Road.
- 7.21 Griffiths Road
- 7.22 The building has been designed to step down in height as it approaches the rear boundary and would be 1.8m lower in height compared to extant planning approval 14/P3437. In comparison to the extant planning permission, with the exception of a slight increase in height of the fourth floor at the rear of the building, the upper floors of the proposed has been pushed further away from these neighbouring properties and rear gardens (between 1m and 6.6m further away). The proposed building would be distanced 6.3m (ground floor), 8.2 (1st – 4th), 11.5m (5th), 14.7m (6th – 7th) and 18.4m (8th) from the rear garden boundary of properties in Griffiths Road which directly back onto the application site. In comparison to the extant planning permission, the current proposal is considered to have a better relationship with the neighbouring properties in Griffiths Road.
- 7.23 In addition, to the reduced height and bulk of the building, the proposed hotel now seeks to service the proposed Hotel directly on The Broadway rather than via Griffiths Road and the rear car parking area. The new servicing arrangements would ensure that larger vehicles would no longer have to manoeuvre through Griffiths Road and via the car parking area adjacent to the rear gardens of 67 - 73 Griffiths Road. The amended servicing requirements are therefore considered to be an improvement in terms of neighbouring amenity compared to the appeal decision.
- 7.24 There would be a landscaped strip along the rear boundary with gardens of residential properties in Griffiths Road which will provide a green buffer zone and thus reduce noise and visual impact on the proposed buildings when in adjacent gardens/properties. Further details of the landscaping and retention of the approved details can be imposed as a planning condition.
- 7.25 The applicant provided an independent sunlight and daylight report which concludes that there are some limited effects to secondary windows to 73 Griffiths Road to rooms which are in any event lit by other main windows. In relation to 79 Griffiths Road, a more detailed test of Average

Daylight Factor test was carried out which demonstrates that despite VSC reductions to individual windows, the room remains well lit. In summary, very few effects are noted and where they are, there are mitigating factors and the development therefore accord with the BRE guide. The proposed hotel generally has a reduced building envelope compared to the permitted scheme at the rear.

7.26 Highways and Parking Issues

7.27 Development Management Policy DM T1 (Support for Sustainable Transport and Active Travel) states to support and promote to promote the use of sustainable transport modes including public transport, walking and cycling, to alleviate congestion, promote social mobility, contribute towards climate change, air quality targets and improve health and wellbeing through increased levels of physical activity. In addition, Local policy DM T3 (Car Parking and Servicing Standards) requires the provision of parking and servicing suitable for its location and that is managed to minimise its impact on local amenity and the road network.

7.28 Servicing

7.29 The hotel proposal allowed on appeal, 11/P3437, proposed servicing of the proposed hotel from the existing car parking area at the rear of the site, via Griffiths Road. Whilst the Inspector considered this to be acceptable, officers did not consider it to be ideal to be directing vehicles, some of which would be large vehicles, via Griffiths Road which is a narrow residential street.

7.30 This left 2 options – (i) an inset at grade loading bay forming part of the footway when not in use by service vehicles or (ii) deliveries undertaken on-street from the existing single yellow lines at the start of the bus lane on The Broadway. Delivery and servicing activity would take place within the existing loading restrictions.

7.31 The application was originally submitted showing the loading bay option and the applicants have advised that they would strongly prefer this arrangement. The number of deliveries to the hotel are estimated to be a maximum of 14 a week (as set out in the Transport Statement – this allows for linen, food, beer/wine and refuse deliveries). On this basis, Future Merton Urban Design and Transport officers did not feel that an inset footway loading bay was necessary. The Transport Officer has advised as follows;

Servicing and unloading from the carriageway already occurs along the whole length of The Broadway and the introduction of an inset loading bay here might set the precedent for additional inset

loading bays which would negatively impact on pedestrian movement and the quality of the public realm.

TfL Buses had concerns that on street loading would detrimentally impact the operation of the bus lane however the existing westbound bus lane is only operational in the peak morning period (7-10am Monday to Saturday) and loading is already allowed in the bus lane outside the site between the hours of 1000-1600. Future Merton considers that deliveries and servicing for the hotel can be accommodated in the existing carriageway/kerbside without negatively impacting upon bus journey time reliability and traffic congestion assuming there is adequate parking enforcement to deter loading outside of the 1000-1600 period.

7.32 As the existing footway clutter belongs to 3rd parties and its re-location is not required by virtue of an inset loading bay, officers do not consider that a s278 requiring its removal could be insisted upon in relation to the planning application. The Council will require a robust amended Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) that includes mechanisms that restricts deliveries and servicing activities taking place during peak hours and/or hours of bus lane operations and will be required to include arrangements for managing taxi drop off and pick up to ensure this activity does not negatively impact on The Broadway. The full DSP will need to be approved prior to start of construction and secured through a condition.

7.33 Car Parking

Given the high PTAL of the site, it is considered appropriate in policy terms that on-site provision should be limited to operational needs and parking for disabled people. This accords with the London Plan and NPPF approach in this type of location. The reduction in traffic and benefit to the streetscape of two new family houses on Griffiths Road is also considered to be significant.

7.34 The site is located in an area with excellent accessibility (PTAL level 6b) and for this reason it is assumed that the majority of visitors will arrive to the site by the means of public transport. Guests would be informed of the modes of transport available on the hotel website and the lack of off street parking availability other than for disabled guests. The site will provide a 4 disabled parking spaces at the rear. A Travel Plan will be required to maximize staff and guest usage of sustainable forms of transport and ensure that the hotel markets the hotel appropriately.

7.35 Although capacity in public car parks should accommodate demand, concerns have been expressed about overspill parking onto surrounding residential streets. The parking situation in CPZ W4 (Palmerston Road area) has controlled hours from 8am to 11pm Monday to Saturday &

10am-2pm on Sundays, however CPZ 4F (Griffiths Rd area) has shorter hours of 8am – 6pm. There is potential for overspill so a £30k financial contribution will be sought to allow the Council to review the hours of CPZ operations if a petition is received from residents requesting this and implement any necessary changes.

- 7.36 Core Strategy policy CS18 (Active Transport) and London Plan policy 6.9 (Cycling) encourage the provision of adequate secure cycle spaces. The hotel element will provide 4 cycle spaces in two double stands for guests at the front of the building and an additional provision of a 9 bicycle enclosure accessed at the rear of the Site. The level of cycle parking would be in line with local standards and the London Plan.

8.0 Local Financial Considerations

The proposed development is liable to pay the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the funds for which will be applied by the Mayor towards the Crossrail project. The CIL amount is non-negotiable however planning permission cannot be refused for failure to agree to pay CIL.

9.0. **SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS**

- 9.1.1 The proposal is for minor development and an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required in this instance.
- 9.1.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms on EIA submission.

10. **CONCLUSION**

- 10.1 The design and massing of the hotel is considered to improve upon the approved fall back scheme and to be appropriate to its setting. It is lower in maximum height, reduced in bulk at the rear and the materials are considered to relate better to its surroundings. It has an acceptable relationship with neighbouring buildings, including the CIPD building and replaces a tired, empty and unattractive building with a new 176 bedroom hotel with restaurant at ground floor. It is within a sustainable town centre location and that would help support the vitality and viability of the town centre without causing unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity or highway conditions. The proposal is in accordance with Adopted Site and Polices Plan, Core Planning Strategy and London Plan policies. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION

subject to completion of a legal agreement covering the following heads of terms;

1. The developer making a financial contribution towards review of local CPZ hours of operation if requested by residents and implementation of any measures arising from that review
2. The developer paying the Council's legal costs in drafting and completing the agreement and the cost of monitoring the agreement

and subject to the following conditions:

1. A1 Commencement of Development (full application)
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B.1 Materials to be approved
4. B4 Details of surface treatment
5. B5 Details of walls/fences
6. H4 Provision of Vehicle Parking area plans
7. C6 Cycle Parking - Details to be Submitted
8. C7 Cycle Parking to be implemented
9. The restaurant/bar use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers except between the hours of 07.00 and 23.00 (Monday to Thursday) and 07.00 and 24.00 (Friday to Sunday) and no staff shall be present at the premises one hour after the closing time.
10. D09 No external lighting
11. D11 Construction times
12. H8 Travel Plan
13. H9 Construction Vehicles Traffic Management Plan
14. H10 Construction vehicles – washdown
15. H11 Parking Management Strategy

16. H12 Delivery and Servicing Plan
17. H13 Construction Logistics Plan
18. Plant/machinery - Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (15 minutes), from any new plant/machinery from the commercial use shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with the closest residential property.
19. Demolition & Construction Statement - No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

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

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties

- 15 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no part of the development hereby approved shall be used or occupied until a Post-Construction Review Certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment or other equivalent assessors confirming that the non-residential development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good' has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submission shall also include confirmation that the development will meet the London Plan C02 reduction targets.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

- 16 No development shall commence until the applicant submits to, and has secured written approval from, the Local Planning Authority on evidence demonstrating that the development has been designed to enable connection of the site to an existing or future district heating network, in accordance with the Technical Standards of the London Heat Network Manual (2014).'

Reason: To demonstrate that the site heat network has been designed to link all building uses on site (domestic and non-domestic) and to demonstrate that sufficient space has been allocated in the plant room for future connection to wider district heating in accordance with London Plan (2015) policies 5.5 and 5.6.

- 17 Tree Protection: The details and measures for the protection of the existing retained trees as contained in the approved document 'Whitbread Group PLC 153 – 161 The Broadway, Wimbledon Arboricultural Method Statement' dated March 2016 shall be fully complied with. The approved methods for the protection of the existing retained trees shall follow the sequence of events as detailed in the document and as shown on the drawing titled 'Tree Protection Plan' numbered 'PJC/3797/16/c Rev.02' and shall be retained and maintained until the completion of all site operations.

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

18. F8 Site Supervision (Trees)
19. F1 Landscaping/planting scheme
20. F2 Landscaping (Implementation)
21. F05 Tree Protection (Street trees)
22. C08 No use of flat roof

23 The use hereby permitted shall not commence until detailed plans and specifications of the kitchen ventilation system, including details of sound attenuation for a kitchen extraction system and odour control measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The kitchen ventilation extraction system shall be installed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications before the use hereby permitted commences and thereafter the system shall be permanently retained and maintained in full working order in accordance with the manufacturers details and recommendations.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties

24. No goods, equipment, or other materials shall be stacked or stored within the open areas of the site without the prior written approval of the local planning authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties

25. Obscure glazing (staircase)

To view plans, drawings and documents related to this application please follow [this link](#).

Please note that this link and related documents may be slow to load.