

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
17 NOVEMBER 2016**

ITEM WITHDRAWN FROM THIS AGENDA

	<u>APPLICATION NO.</u>	<u>DATE VALID</u>
	16/P2942	02/08/2016
Address/Site:	Wellington House, 60 – 68 Wimbledon Hill Road, Wimbledon, SW19 7PA	
(Ward)	Hillside	
Proposal:	Refurbishment of the existing building including the recladding of the exterior of the building, erection of two additional floors and infilling of the surface level car park to create an additional 2,055sqm of office (Use Class B1). Change of use and amalgamation of two ground floor units from A2 use (financial and professional services) to a single A3 use (café / restaurant). Reconfiguration of existing basement to accommodate plant with reduction in basement car parking	
Drawing Nos:		
Contact Officer:	David Gardener (0208 545 3115)	

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and S106 Agreement

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Short stay cycle parking contribution, S278 Agreement, Carbon Emissions Offset Contribution
- 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: 354
- External consultations: None

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application has been brought before the Planning Applications Committee due to the number of objections received following public consultation..

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The application site comprises a four storey (plus plant room) mixed use building on the corner of Wimbledon Hill Road and Mansel Road on the edge of the designated Wimbledon Town Centre area.
- 2.2 At ground floor level, facing Wimbledon Hill Road, it comprises 2 estate agents and 1 letting agency (A2 financial and professional services) and 1 restaurant (A3 café / restaurant). The 3 floors above are in office use (Use Class B1) served by an entrance lobby on Mansel Road. Adjacent to the entrance lobby on Mansel Road is a surface car park and refuse storage area with a ramped access down to a basement car park. There are 7 parking spaces at surface level and 27 at basement level.
- 2.3 Mansel Court, which is a recently remodelled and extended five and six-storey office building, sits adjacent to the site on Mansel Road, separated by the car park. 58 Wimbledon Hill Road is a four storey building attached to Wellington House on the Wimbledon Hill Road frontage comprising restaurant use at ground floor level with office above. Forming part of the redevelopment of 58 Wimbledon Hill Road is a four storey element at the rear comprising six self-contained residential flats on its first, second and third floors. This element is known as 58 Worple Road Mews.
- 2.2 Wellington House is located in the Merton (Wimbledon Hill Road) conservation area. The immediate area comprises an eclectic mix of building styles and sizes. Wellington House on one side of Wimbledon Hill Road and Melbury House, a modern four-storey building on the opposite side (on the corner of Wimbledon Hill Road and Woodside) replace earlier terraces. Traditional Victorian terraces comprising commercial uses at ground floor level and a mixture of office and residential uses above are located on the application site of Wimbledon Hill Road. On the opposite side, south of Alwyne Road, are the highly ornate Jacobean style 'Bank Buildings' of 37-47 Wimbledon Hill Road.
- 2.3 Mansel Road is a predominantly residential street running between Wimbledon Hill Road and Raymond Road to the south. Towards Wimbledon Hill Road the residential terraces give way to larger office, school and church buildings that mark the start of the town centre area. The boundary lies between the office building known as Mansel Court and the neighbouring nursery use. Trinity Church and Hall is a grade II listed building from 1885, built in a Gothic style of red brick and stone dressing. There are a further eleven locally listed buildings along Mansel Road that are considered to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 2.4 The application site has excellent public transport links (PTAL rating of 6b) being sited in very close proximity to Wimbledon tube, railway and tram station and a number of bus routes.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal is for the refurbishment of the existing building with significant changes to the external appearance of its principal street elevations, including recladding of the existing concrete frame with new patterned brickwork, curving the corner with large glass panels and new shopfronts, alterations to the principal street elevations, reconfiguration of internal spaces and erection of two additional floors.
- 3.2 An infill building is proposed in the location of the surface car park with access maintained to a reconfigured basement to accommodate plant with the total number of car parking spaces reduced from 34 (basement and ground level) to 11 basement spaces including two blue badge holder spaces. At ground floor level, the parking would be replaced with 56 cycle spaces with shower and locker facilities.
- 3.3 A total of 2,055sqm of GIA (Gross Internal Area) additional office space is proposed. The new office floor plates would be high quality A grade office.
- 3.4 The application has been amended since it was first submitted with the roof plant significantly reduced. Some of the plant has also been relocated to the rear part of the building at level 5. The floorplate of level 5 has also been reduced in size with the southeast elevation on Wimbledon Hill Road set further back from No. 58 Wimbledon Hill Road.
- 3.5 The façade has also been further developed from the original submission with the colour of the brickwork lightened, introduction of ornate patterning to the horizontal spandrel panels and patterned metal horizontal panels. Glazing has also been introduced to the level 4 brick return whilst the metal vertical railings have been replaced with glass.
- 3.5 The building will have a maximum height of approx. 20.22m to the top of level 5 and 22.7m to the top of the roof plant. The building would have terraces at levels 4 and 5 and would also step in at the rear at levels 4 and 5.
- 3.6 It is proposed to change the use of the two A2 estate agents closest to the corner with Mansel Road to A3 (café/restaurant) use.
- 3.7 The application as originally submitted proposed that servicing of the proposed development would take place on the highway via a loading bay on Mansel Road in front of the proposed development. In order to accommodate the loading bay, it was proposed that the two existing central islands on Mansel Road would be removed. The plans have now been amended with the central islands retained. An off-street loading area for small to medium sized vehicles is now provided on-site within the basement access area, with larger

vehicles loading on-street. In the case of on-street loading and unloading, the vehicle would be required to park in front of Mansel Court although part of the vehicle would be able to park in front of the basement access. The proposed on street loading arrangement would be facilitated by re-locating and re-configuring four existing on-street parking bays, with the loss of one bay but an improvement in their dimensions.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history is relevant:

- 4.1 MER676/76 - Retention of a 4 storey building with 4 shops on ground floor, showrooms on 1st floor, and offices on 2nd and 3rd floors with a basement car park. Granted - 07/02/1977
- 4.2 MER109/77 – Change of use to offices. Granted - 14/04/1977
- 4.3 95/P0177 - Enclosure of 1 car parking space in basement area to provide covered area for power supply system. Granted - 05/05/1995
- 4.4 02/P1940 - Installation of a two metre high sliding security gate and railings to the Mansel Road frontage of the rear service yard. Granted - 11/11/2002
- 4.5 Pre-application advice was sought in March 2016 (LBM Ref: 16/P0974/NEW) for re-cladding of external elevations of current mixed use building, erection of a two storey extension to the roof and infilling of surface car park to create 2,500sqm of additional office space, change of use and amalgamation of two A2 units into a single A3 use.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

- 5.1 The following policies from the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):
DM D1 (Urban design and public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D3 (Alterations and extensions to existing buildings), DM D4 (Managing heritage assets), DM E1 (Employment areas in Merton), DM E2 (Offices in town centres), DM R1 (Location and scale of development in Merton's town centres and neighbourhood parades), DM R4 (Protection of shopping facilities within designated shopping frontages), DM R5 (Food and drink/leisure and entertainment uses), DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel)
- 5.2 The relevant policies in the Adopted Core Strategy (July 2011) are:
CS.6 (Wimbledon Town Centre), CS.7 (Centres), CS.12 (Economic development), CS.14 (Design), CS.15 (Climate Change), CS.18 (Active Transport), CS.19 (Public Transport), CS.20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)
- 5.3 The relevant policies in the London Plan (July 2011) are:

4.2 (Offices), 5.2 (Minimising carbon dioxide emissions), 5.6 (Decentralised energy in development proposals), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction), 5.9 (Overheating and cooling), 6.3 (Assessing effects of development on transport capacity), 6.9 (Cycling), 6.13 (Parking), 7.2 (An inclusive environment), 7.4 (Local character), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.7 (Location and design of tall and large buildings), 7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology)

5.4 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.5 Merton's Tall Buildings Background Paper 2010

5.6 Wimbledon Hill Road Character Assessment 2006

6. CONSULTATION

6.1 The application was originally publicised by means of a site notice and individual letters to occupiers of neighbouring properties. In response, 37 letters of objection were received including objections from the Raymond & Mansel Road Residents Association, Wimbledon E Hillside Residents' Association and the Wimbledon Society. The letters of objection are on the following grounds:

- Mansel Road is an inappropriate location for a loading bay whilst maintaining the current traffic islands is critical to safety of the street. The two traffic islands on Mansel Road have a long history and have been deemed to be the most suitable way to prevent cars using Mansel Road as a way of bypassing the traffic lights at the end of Worple Road to turn up Wimbledon Hill Road. The proposal to use no left turn signs was not considered to offer sufficient protection
- Loading bay and associated implications including changes to islands should be subject to separate formal consultation. Loading bay should be located on-site
- If there is a requirement for a short term loading bay during construction then appropriate provision needs to be made for temporary changes to the location of the islands to both keep the protection offered by the islands whilst allowing vehicles making a left turn from Wimbledon Hill Road into Mansel Road when a vehicle is loading and unloading. Disruption caused during construction as well by increase in traffic generated by larger building
- Underground parking area is chaotic and with only one access ramp would result in delays due to waiting vehicles disrupting traffic flows. Reduction in on-site car parking spaces is unacceptable
- Weekend closures for construction would have significant impact on church congregation including elderly and the disabled
- CPZ includes parking meters, which means there would be greater pressure on metered bays. S106 must be included prohibiting any business/visitor permits in the CPZ
- Proposed restaurant use would put greater pressure on parking. Increase in footfall

- Extended building would be too tall, dominating, overpowering and too bulky. Building should match height of Melbury House
- Does not respect or relate to rich architectural styles of other buildings in local/conservation area. Dark bricks and large glass windows is insensitive to its setting. Unacceptable impact on conservation area
- Overdevelopment of the site. Sustainability should be 'excellent' and not 'very good'
- Lack of demand for restaurants on this part of Wimbledon Hill Road and if proposed A3 use granted could lead to anti-social behaviour and increased street rubbish. Could also easily offer fast food as no control over food. Should be retained as an A2 unit.
- Loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing and overlooking of flats at 58 Worple Road Mews (Rear of 58 Wimbledon Hill Road) and Wimbledon High school classrooms
- Noise

6.2 The Wimbledon Society

6.2.1 The increase in height is not sufficiently set back and the scale of the building would be increased significantly. The impact of this proposal is to introduce an unacceptable dominance of the existing streetscene on Wimbledon Hill Road. On Mansel Road the closing of the gap would overshadow the road and reduce sunlight extending the commercial, tree less character into the residential road. The blandness of the elevations does not relate well to the terrace on Wimbledon Hill Road, Melbury House which has clearly aimed to introduce a variety of brick based detailing or the conservation area. The opportunity should be made to erect a canopy above the pavement.

6.2 Following amendments to the proposal a further two re-consultations were undertaken. A further 9 objections have been received including further objections from the Wimbledon Society and Wimbledon E Hillside Residents' Association on the following grounds:

- Amendments to the proposal are minimal and the building would still be out of scale and too tall compared to existing buildings. Building would also be too dominant and any infill should not extend beyond front building line of Mansel Court. The 'gateway' aspect remains lost.
- Lack of on-site parking and granting of parking permits for occupiers. Loss of on-street parking bay
- Removal of traffic islands during construction and road safety due to car drivers making illegal left turns out of Mansel Road. Too little consideration given to residents both during and after construction.
- Increased air pollution and impact on sewers
- Change of use of much of ground floor to A3 is unwarranted and unwanted
- Green roof area is green wash
- Proposed cycle storage is poorly configured
- Would encourage on-street loitering from e.g. smokers

6.3 Design and Review Panel – (23rd September 2016)

- 6.3.1 The Design and Review Panel (DRP) commented on the originally submitted scheme.
- 6.3.2 The Panel were clear that the proposal as it stands does represent an improvement on the current building. However, this reason alone was not considered sufficient to grant consent on design grounds. The conservation area character and gateway location of the site also needed to be better taken into account.
- 6.3.3 The Panel noted that at its previous review it had recommended removing the top storey as it seemed too high for its location and in relation to other buildings, and that this floor had not been removed in the current design. Whilst it was acknowledged there had been some alterations to the upper storeys mass and appearance, the plant room was still prominent and the darker colours proposed made the top of the building seem too heavy.
- 6.3.4 The Panel were concerned that the approach to scale, bulk and massing was to assume it was similar to the built and successful Mansel Court and that this would be okay. This was not considered a valid argument by the Panel as that site was clearly different in many respects. The design needed to look to good nearby buildings in more detail to develop design cues and build on the generally good analytical work already done.
- 6.3.5 The building is essentially 3 storeys higher than the adjacent building and the Panel felt that, despite the changes, the transition in height was not successful and could probably not be managed successfully within the building itself, and that their opinion that a storey should be removed was still valid. It was felt that this fundamental aspect had to be resolved and that a high quality frontage would not atone for this.
- 6.3.6 The building is located at a point where the suburban feel of Wimbledon Village gives way to the urban feel of the town centre. It was considered to mark this transition with an urban building, but that it simply needed to make the gateway statement more positive. This could be done in many ways with alterations to the curved corner – which itself was a positive element. One suggestion was that the corner element alone could support an additional storey as a landmark – similar to a cupola. Another suggestion was to work closely with an artist to generate creative ideas for the corner to make it distinctive.
- 6.3.7 In terms of the general design and appearance of the building, the Panel felt that it had a number of good qualities, notably the attention to detail with the brickwork, which was picking up on some local distinctiveness. There were other issues however, that did not work well. The brick colour was considered too dark and uniform, rather than the warmer brick and terracotta used on the former bank building opposite. It was felt that the infilling of the gap in the Mansell Road frontage needed to be managed sensitively in order for it not to be overbearing in the street scene.

- 6.3.8 There was also some discord felt with respect to the vertical and horizontal elements. These seemed too uniform, reminiscent of industrial warehouse buildings, and therefore made the building seem more at home in Clerkenwell rather than Wimbledon. As the building was a re-clad, it was felt important to retain vertical separation between the bays at ground floor to reflect the rhythm of adjacent shops.
- 6.3.9 This uniform feel led the Panel to suggest that different floors of the building should have subtly different elevational treatment. This would add interest, as well as dilute the uniformity without compromising the overall design, for which there was a degree of support. It was also noted that the ground floor seemed too squat and that this was probably due to inaccurate and inconsistent CGI images. This led to the request for elevational drawings of the whole façade to show the building properly in context and scale.
- 6.3.10 The Panel felt that, although there had been some changes, they considered them relatively minor. The key element of the bulk and mass of the building had not been addressed, despite being raised at a previous review. The Panel were also disappointed that the generally good quality appearance of the building had not been further developed to make it better relate to adjacent buildings and ensure the design was finer grained and more appropriate for Wimbledon.

VERDICT: **RED**

6.4 Design Review Panel – further review by email October 2016

- 6.4.1 In response to the comments received at DRP in September 2016, further revisions were made which were then circulated for email feedback from individual DRP members. Panel members in response stated that there are positive aspects of the latest amendments including the imaginative brick detailing, lighter colours on the top floor and the brick colour relating better to surroundings. There were also positive comments regarding the decorative panels/spandrels under windows that look like part of the window frame and texture detail of the brickwork. The reduced height was also considered to be an improvement.
- 6.4.2 There were however still considered to be a number of negative aspects. This includes the height/massing still being too bulky (this would benefit from removal of another storey) and the building has a 'wall' effect when viewed from Wimbledon Hill Road. Reducing the height would address this, and a more discernible gap with Mansel Court could also possibly help. A more explicit corner treatment was needed to create a positive gateway, rather than the current 'wraparound'. The corner needs more excitement and life – the building is weakest here, where it should be strongest. The ground floor was also considered to still look too cramped at the corner due to the higher ground level and it was suggested that as a start, the masonry ground floor band could be raised or thickened, but an artist could be commissioned to aid in the design of this corner. Concerns were also raised concerning each of the storey bays from 1st to 4th being identical and the building does not evolve

as it goes up – the adjacent building does this very distinctly. Doing this in a more subtle way would address this, add richness and address the point of the building looking a bit ‘Clerkenwell’ rather than ‘Wimbledon’.

6.5 Future Merton - Urban Design

- 6.5.1 The applicant and land-owner is the same as the adjacent Mansel Court which has recently been re-clad and refurbished to provide better quality office accommodation, and improvements to the local architecture and street scene. This gives the Council confidence in terms of delivery of the scheme and long-term stewardship of the development. Merton’s Core Strategy and Economic Development Strategy both emphasise the need for additional high quality office space in Wimbledon to support jobs and the local economy. The principle of these proposals are sound and will be a benefit to Wimbledon town centre.
- 6.5.2 A scheme that would involve a complete demolition and re-build would cause greater local disturbance and have a greater effect on local businesses than the current proposals presented here. It is the council’s view that it’s inherently more sustainable to re-use and remodel an existing building for new purposes and a prolonged lifespan. However, working with the existing columns and floor slabs of the current 1970s building presents challenges; for example the floor to ceiling heights, plot rhythm and squat ground floor do not match those of the adjacent Victorian terraces on the hill and are, by necessity; fixed.
- 6.5.3 It is considered that the applicant has successfully created a more contemporary, open and active building (set within the limitations of the existing frame and existing building proportions). The proportion of the ground floor shop-fronts have been made slightly taller through clever positioning and of new shop signage zones (located higher up) to echo, as much as possible within the existing frame, those in the adjacent terrace. The upper floors have been opened up with floor-to-ceiling windows. This visually reduces the effect of the solid mass of the existing 1970s brick and smoked glass façade. The extent of the floor-to-ceiling ratio has been decreased in response to DRP comments and now includes a low-bronze banding at the lower part of the windows; so that office floor clutter (bins/bags etc) aren’t directly visible from the street. This is a welcome change and adds further detailing to the depth and reveals of the windows and façade.
- 6.5.4 The proposal extends onto the rear car park. Whilst this fills in a gap, the natural end to the commercial uses on this street is west of the adjacent office building of Mansel Court. This urban form is replicated to a degree on the other side of the street, with the elevations of the school buildings (sitting higher up the hill), and it is not until further along Mansel Road that the character becomes strongly residential. This infilling is considered sensible and appropriate, particularly as the current view between the buildings is of the less attractive service areas, backs of buildings and blank flank wall of Mansel Court. The proposed development is also an appropriate way to fill an

urban block, and is one of the few ways a site can achieve an intensification of use in this part of Wimbledon town centre.

- 6.5.5 The proposals include an increase in height of an additional two storeys. The height and massing has been revised through the planning process resulting in a significantly reduced plant area and a more pronounced stepping up of the floors from the adjacent terrace (somewhat mimicking the topography of the site). It should be noted that to fund the quality of improvements to the office space and the architecture of the building; value has to be created through some growth and intensification. The proposals presented here represent a viable and acceptable level of intensification. A part 5/6 storey development in a major town centre is not considered as tall and the building set-backs mitigate the height and bulk of scheme. The building performs the function of both gateway and 'book-end' of an urban terrace where you'd expect the corner block to be emphasised in height. The height of the building is higher than the building opposite, but this in itself does not make it inappropriate. It is also important that the building has sufficient presence to act as a gateway building to the town centre, and height has a legitimate role to play in achieving this. The building, as amended, will not appear as a building that is significantly taller than those around it, nor as a landmark solely because of its height.
- 6.5.6 The building is not considered excessively tall for its location and shouldn't be a 'shouty' or dominant landmark. The proposals are respectful to the neighbouring context whilst achieving a measure of growth. Whilst the building extends taller than the adjacent buildings, it does not do so significantly and can still be read as part of the terrace of shops going up the hill. The corner of the building with increased height and curved wraparound begins to mark the building as a local landmark. However, it reads primarily as simply a way the building turns the corner. This curved hinge is in part dictated by the existing floor-plates and column positions, but presents a more rounded, softer corner – again, referencing the larger curves of Melbury House as it turns into Woodside opposite.
- 6.5.7 As the building is a recladding, the rhythm and proportions are largely inflexible at the large scale. The effect of this is that the building does not have the opportunity to step up the hill bay-by-bay, as the older buildings do. This loses a degree of grain to the building, but does clearly mark the difference in use – as an office, and this is not inappropriate given the site constraints. It does however mean that what should be the most imposing part of the building – the corner, is less imposing. However, as mentioned earlier – landmarks don't need to shout or stand out. There is an understated and restrained simplicity in these proposals, when viewed from a distance, and up-close the extremely detailed brickwork becomes the point of interest and adds a layer of quality and texture to the building.
- 6.5.8 The current proposal has a front elevation at the top level of vertical fins. These work well as a subservient form to the main elevation and lighten the mass of the building at the upper levels (similar to Elys). The use of brick at the lower levels emphasises the relationship with the adjacent terrace and

other gateway building of Melbury House. The proposed material of brick is clearly appropriate for this type of building and location in Wimbledon. It fits the local context well. The detailing in the brick, with the angled brick texture (borrowed from Mansell Road Church) moulded frieze and spandrel panel, introduce an exceptional level of detail, texture and human scale that is clearly of high quality and is a level of craftsmanship often lacking in many modern buildings. Following DRP, the brown bricks have been lightened (to be more red) to fit in with the Bank Buildings and Melbury House. This must be tightly governed through planning conditions to maintain quality. It is a good contemporary interpretation of some local vernacular.

6.5.9 As this is a recladding, there is a limited degree to which the local context can be interpreted in the form or topography. The detailing and materials however, do this well. This level of richness in the facades will be an improvement to the heritage asset of the conservation area it sits within. The impact of building on the car park has already been discussed above. The importance of side gaps at the end of terraces in the conservation area character, or in Wimbledon in general is considered of limited or no significant importance, and is not picked out in the conservation area appraisal as an important characteristic. In fact, the hiding of the rear elements of buildings will improve the street scene and ensure the intensification blends well with its surroundings. The appearance of the existing building is clearly of its time, despite being based on a 1970s frame. The proposed scheme looks and feels like a good quality, flexible office building that belongs in a town centre. Its appearance also responds reasonably well to local context at the detailed level.

6.5.10 The public realm is improved by the change of use from A2 to A3, as this will generally mean more open frontages and better natural surveillance, as well as more evening activity. The footway here has recently been replaced. On Mansell Road, the car park gap has been filled in, screening the service uses and improving the distinction between public and private realm. The corner unit has been wrapped around to add active frontage to Mansell Road, which was previously a dead blank wall. Overall, the public realm has been improved as the scheme has progressed through planning.

6.6 Future Merton - Transport Planning

6.6.1 It is considered that whilst there will be some highway impacts they would be slight and insufficient to merit refusal as they predominantly relate to the applicants own day to day operations which can be managed through their site servicing and management plan. The proposal would result in the net loss of one on-street parking bay however it is considered that the four current bays are too short for modern vehicles and as such their replacement with three longer bays is acceptable. The applicant will also be required to enter into a S106 agreement to provide a financial contribution for short stay cycle provision in the local area given the applicant has only provided long stay spaces.

6.7 Future Merton - Climate Change

- 6.7.1 The BREEAM design stage assessment provided by the applicant indicates that the development should achieve an overall score of 63.02%, which meets the minimum requirements to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS15. This is particularly commendable in light of the use of BREEAM New Construction scheme to undertake the assessment. In order to make allowance for the additional difficulties assessing a refurbishment project under the BREEAM New Construction scheme it is suggested that a condition is attached to allow a BREEAM Good rating to be accepted in this case. Additionally the applicant has requested that allowance be made for the time taken to finalise the code certificates and reflected in the wording of the condition.
- 6.7.2 The BRUKL output documentation submitted for the proposed development indicates refurbished element of the works will achieve the target emissions reduction of 35% whilst the new build element of the development will only achieve an emissions reduction target of 11%. This leaves a carbon shortfall of 13.87 tCO₂ which will need to be addressed through a S106 payment according to the offset methodology outlined in the Mayors Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
- 6.7.3 Future Merton are satisfied that the all potential on-site carbon abatement opportunities have been considered and implemented where feasible and that the constraints placed on the site by virtue of it being an existing building limit the potential of achieving a 35% improvement for the new build element. The reimagining carbon shortfall can be dealt with via a S106 payment of £24,966.

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Principle of Development

- 7.1.1 The Council supports the development of major offices in Wimbledon town centre, which is defined in Policy DM R1 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) as having more than 1,000sq.m. Policy CS.7 of the Core Planning Strategy states that in Wimbledon Town centre the council will support high quality offices, especially major development. Policy DM E1 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals relating to employment sites will only be supported that subject to Policy DM E2 and DM E3, retain existing employment land and floor space. The Council will support proposals for the redevelopment of vacant and underused existing employment land and floor space for employment use and proposals for large and major offices (B1(a) use class) in town centres. Policy DM E1 notes that as Wimbledon town centre is tightly bound by residential areas, the possibilities for growth include increasing density on existing sites. This policy states that the council will work with landowners to meet market demand for high quality, well designed large floorplate offices commensurate with Wimbledon's status as a major centre and to take advantage of the internationally recognised Wimbledon 'brand'.

- 7.1.2 At a regional and national level it should be noted that Policy 4.2 of the London Plan states that the Mayor will encourage renewal and modernisation of the existing office stock in viable locations to improve its quality and flexibility. Paragraph 19 of the NPPF states that the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.
- 7.1.3 The applicant has submitted a market overview and summary which demonstrates that there is a significant shortage of office space in Wimbledon town centre with total stock levels recorded at circa 1.8m sq. ft. with current availability being limited to only two buildings with over 5,000 sq. ft. This represents only 1% of total stock and is considered to be exceptionally low. There is potentially a further 10,000 sq. ft. of space coming through on the ground floor of Wimbledon Bridge House when Unibet move into the refurbished Pinnacle House building on completion of works.
- 7.1.4 Wellington House is located in Wimbledon Town centre and has excellent transport links (PTAL rating of 6b), which means it is a highly suitable location for a major office development. It is considered that the proposal would comply with local, regional and national planning policies by providing a modernised and sustainable office building with well-designed large floorplates commensurate with Wimbledon's status as a major centre.

7.2 Design, Impact on Streetscene and Wider Context

- 7.2.1 The extended building would be six storeys and have a maximum height of approx. 20.22m (22.7m to top of roof plant). The top floor would be recessed approx. 3m behind the building's Wimbledon Hill Road elevation and 2 – 2.4m behind the buildings Mansel Road elevation. Level 4 is also stepped back from the building's Wimbledon Hill Road and Mansel Road frontages.
- 7.2.2 The London Plan states that tall buildings are those buildings that are substantially taller than their surroundings, cause a significant change to the skyline or are larger than the threshold sizes set for the referral of applications to the Mayor. Policy 7.7 states that tall buildings should generally be limited to sites in town centres that have good access to public transport.
- 7.2.3 Given the proposed building would have a maximum height of 22.7m it would not require referral to the Mayor of London as its proposed height would fall below the 30m height limit for buildings located outside the City of London. Nevertheless it is considered that given it would be two storeys taller than the buildings on this side/part of Wimbledon Hill Road that in this instance the proposal might be classed as a tall building.
- 7.2.4 In terms of local planning policy, Policy CS.14 of the Core Planning strategy promotes high quality sustainable design that improves Merton's overall design standard. Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and

Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be expected to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings. More specific guidance is outlined in the Tall Buildings Background Paper (2010) which forms part of Merton's Local Development Framework, as an evidence base in support of the Design Policy outlined in the Core Strategy. This states that in Wimbledon Town Centre, tall buildings should contribute to creating a consistent scale of development based on a range of similar but not uniform building heights. These should be determined by reference to surrounding building heights and townscape characteristics.

7.2.5 Wimbledon is the borough's largest town centre, identified as a major centre in the London Plan. The centre has the highest level of public transport accessibility in the borough and this makes the centre a sustainable location for a tall building. It should also be noted that the proposal is located in the Merton (Wimbledon Hill Road) so there needs to be careful consideration of its wider impact on the conservation area. The proposed building given its height and prominent location at the junction of Wimbledon Hill Road and Mansel Road would be visible from a number of vantage points along both these roads.

7.2.6 The Design and Review Panel reviewed the proposal as originally submitted. It should also be noted that the panel reviewed a previous scheme at pre-application stage. The Panel were clear that the proposal as it stands does represent an improvement on the current building. However, the Panel noted that at its previous review (pre-application stage) that it had recommended removing the top storey as it seemed too high for its location and in relation to other buildings, and that this floor had not been removed in the current design. Whilst it was acknowledged there had been some alterations to the upper storeys mass and appearance, the plant room was still prominent and the darker colours proposed made the top of the building seem too heavy. The panel also felt that the transition in height was not successful and could probably not be managed successfully within the building itself, and that their opinion that a storey should be removed was still valid. In terms of the general design and appearance of the building, the Panel felt that it had a number of good qualities, notably the attention to detail with the brickwork, which was picking up on some local distinctiveness. There were other issues however, that did not work well. The brick colour was considered too dark and uniform, rather than the warmer brick and terracotta used on the former bank building opposite.

7.2.7 The applicant has made further amendments in response to comments received from the Design and Review Panel and council planning officers following its original submission. This includes the setting back of level 5 from the buildings southeast facing elevation, reducing the size of the roof plant with some plant relocated to level 5 and lightening the brick colour. The metal vertical railings have also been removed and replaced with glass and ornate patterning to the horizontal spandrel panels has been introduced. Although the top floor has not been removed it has been reduced in size in response to the original comments received from DRP with it now stepped in further from

the buildings southeast elevation which means there is a more gradual transition in scale to the terraced buildings along Wimbledon Hill Road and also means the building no longer appears top heavy.

7.2.8 To fund the quality of improvements to the office space and the architecture of the building; value has to be created through some growth and intensification. The proposals presented here represent a viable and acceptable level of intensification and it is considered that a part 5/6 storey development in a major town centre is not considered as tall and the building set-backs mitigate the height and bulk of scheme. The building performs the function of both gateway and 'book-end' of an urban terrace where you would expect the corner block to be emphasised in height. It is also important that the building has sufficient presence to act as a gateway building to the town centre, and height has a legitimate role to play in achieving this. The building, as amended, will not appear as a building that is significantly taller than those around it. The reduction in size of the roof plant also means this element would now be barely visible from the street. Given the large size of the roof plant on the originally submitted scheme, this effectively removes a floor sized element from the top of the building further reducing the building's scale and mass. It is considered that the reduction in size of the roof plant would significantly improve the appearance of the scheme when viewed along Wimbledon Hill Road, particularly from further up the road towards Wimbledon Village where the plant was particularly prominent. Although DRP continue to have reservations about the height and massing of the building, Merton's Urban Design Team have been involved in negotiations and have reviewed the changes and are strongly supportive of the scheme as set out in paragraphs 6.5.1 – 6.5.10 and is summarised below.

7.2.9 The building is not considered excessively tall for its location and shouldn't be a 'shouty' or dominant landmark. The proposals are respectful to the neighbouring context whilst achieving a measure of growth. Whilst the building extends taller than the adjacent buildings, it does not do so significantly and can still be read as part of the terrace of shops going up the hill. The corner of the building with increased height and curved wraparound begins to mark the building as a local landmark. However, it reads primarily as simply a way the building turns the corner. This curved hinge is in part dictated by the existing floor-plates and column positions, but presents a more rounded, softer corner – again, referencing the larger curves of Melbury House as it turns into Woodside opposite.

7.2.9 The proposal extends onto the rear car park. Whilst this fills in a gap, the natural end to the commercial uses on this street is west of the adjacent office building of Mansel Court. This urban form is replicated to a degree on the other side of the street, with the elevations of the school buildings (sitting higher up the hill), and it is not until further along Mansel Road that the character becomes strongly residential. This infilling is considered sensible and appropriate, particularly as the current view between the buildings is of the less attractive service areas, backs of buildings and blank flank wall of Mansel Court. The proposed development is also an appropriate way to fill an

urban block, and is one of the few ways a site can achieve an intensification of use in this part of Wimbledon town centre.

7.2.10 As the building is a recladding, the rhythm and proportions are largely inflexible at the large scale. The effect of this is that the building does not have the opportunity to step up the hill bay-by-bay, as the older buildings do. This loses a degree of grain to the building, but does clearly mark the difference in use – as an office, and this is not inappropriate given the site constraints. It does however mean that what should be the most imposing part of the building – the corner, is less imposing however this is not a significant concern as landmark buildings do not have to necessarily stand out. There is an understated and restrained simplicity in these proposals, when viewed from a distance, and up-close the extremely detailed brickwork becomes the point of interest and adds a layer of quality and texture to the building.

7.2.11 The current proposal has a front elevation at the top level of vertical fins. These work well as a subservient form to the main elevation and lighten the mass of the building at the upper levels (similar to Elys). The use of brick at the lower levels emphasises the relationship with the adjacent terrace and other gateway building of Melbury House. The proposed material of brick is clearly appropriate for this type of building and location in Wimbledon and fits in well with the local context. The detailing in the brick, with the angled brick texture (borrowed from Mansell Road Church) moulded frieze and spandrel panel, introduce an exceptional level of detail, texture and human scale that is clearly of high quality and is a level of craftsmanship often lacking in many modern buildings. Following DRP, the brown bricks have been lightened (to be more red) to fit in with the Bank Buildings and Melbury House and it is considered to be a good contemporary interpretation of some local vernacular.

7.2.12 Overall, it is considered that the proposal is an imaginative design that responds well to its surrounding context contributing positively to the Merton (Wimbledon Hill Road) conservation area and the Wimbledon Hill Road and Mansel Road streetscene. It has benefited from the Council's design review process and the Council's Urban Design officer is fully supportive of the scheme.

7.3 Residential Amenity

7.3.1 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to ensure provision of appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight, quality of living conditions, amenity space and privacy, to both proposed and adjoining buildings and gardens. Development should also protect new and existing development from visual intrusion.

7.3.2 A block of six self-contained flats known as 58 Worple Road Mews are located to the rear of No.58 Wimbledon Hill Road. The flats are arranged over the first, second and third floors and abut the southern corner of the application

site. The occupiers of the flats have access to a rear courtyard area, which is located at first floor level to the rear of No. 58 Wimbledon Hill Road. Mansel Court, which is a recently refurbished office building, is located immediately to the southeast, whilst Wimbledon High School is located on the other side of Mansel Road. Melbury House, which is a four storey commercial building, is located on the opposite side of Wimbledon Hill Road at the junction with Woodside.

7.3.3 No. 58 Worple Road Mews comprises two, one bedroom flats on each floor at first, second and third floor levels with each of the flats being dual aspect. The proposed development would only be visible from the rear of these flats. The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment which assesses the impact of the proposed development on No.58 Worple Road Mews. The Vertical Sky Component (VSC) is a measure of the skylight reaching a point from an overcast sky. The proposal would fail the VSC to the rear habitable room windows of each of the flats. However, it is important to note that the VSC is a simple geometrical calculation which provides an early indication of the potential for daylight/sunlight entering the space. It does not assess or quantify the actual daylight levels inside the rooms. In this instance, the close juxtaposition of buildings requires a more detailed approach and therefore the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) is calculated. This uses the VSC calculation in order to confirm the angle of obstruction and visible sky, but goes on to consider the area of glass receiving light and the transmittance qualities of the glass. This is then related to the surface area and reflectance value, of the room beyond. This provides a far more comprehensive review of daylight and is judged against the room's use. The British Standard sets the minimum diffuse daylight levels that should be available to the main habitable room windows, such as bedrooms, living rooms and kitchens. The following minimum average daylight factors should be achieved in the main habitable room: 1% in bedrooms, 1.5% in living rooms and 2% in kitchens. In this instance all but one of the habitable room windows would fully comply with BRE guidance, with only the bedroom window of one of the first floor flats failing. However, it is considered that this is considered to be acceptable given this window already fails the average daylight factor measurement, which means this bedroom already receives a limited amount of daylight/sunlight. It should also be noted that the living room windows to each of these flats are located to the front of the building and would not be impacted at all by the proposed development.

7.3.4 There would be some loss of outlook from the flats at No.58 Worple Road Mews due to the filling of the gap between the current building and Mansel Court. However, it is considered that given the application site is located in Wimbledon Town Centre, where more dense development is expected and encouraged it is considered that the proposal in this instance would not be visually intrusive or overbearing when viewed from these properties. It should be noted that the rear elevation of these properties already directly face the rear elevation of No. 58 Wimbledon Hill Road, which itself is a four storey commercial building. To further mitigate the impact of the extension on these properties the southeast facing rear wall would be located approx. 5m from

the side boundary the application site shares with No.58 with levels 4 and 5 stepped further back.

- 7.3.5 In terms of privacy, it should be noted that the building would comprise two terraces, which would be located at level 4 on the front of the building facing Wimbledon Hill Road and at level 5 on the southeast facing side of the building. It is considered that given their location there would not be any impact in terms of privacy. The rear of the building would feature windows that directly face the courtyard area and bedroom windows of three of the flats of No.58 Worple Road Mews. It is considered that given there would only be a separation distance of between 14.5m and 17.5m between the southeast facing windows and the bedroom windows of three of the flats at No.58 that it would be necessary to attach a condition requiring these windows are obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m internal floor height.
- 7.3.6 It is considered that given the above considerations that the proposal would not be visually intrusive or overbearing when viewed from surrounding residual properties, or result in an unacceptable level of daylight/sunlight or privacy loss. The proposal would therefore accord with policies DM D2 and DM D3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) and is acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

7.5 Parking and Traffic

- 7.51 Policy 6.1 of the London Plan (2015) supports development which generates high levels of trips at locations with high levels of public transport accessibility and improves the capacity and accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling. At a local level Policy CS.18 promotes active transport and encourages design that provides attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers). Policy CS.20 of the Core Planning Strategy states that the Council will require 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 movement and/or facilities; on-street parking and traffic management. Developments should also incorporate adequate facilities for servicing to ensure loading and unloading activities do not have an adverse impact on the public highway.
- 7.52 The application as originally submitted proposed an on-street loading bay directly outside the development site on Mansel Road, which would have necessitated the modification of the existing contra flow cycle facility, including the removal of two segregation islands. Whilst this was considered to be satisfactory from a transport perspective concerns were raised during the consultation stage that the loss of these islands may encourage motorists to ignore the No Entry restrictions and turn left onto Wimbledon Hill Road. As a result a number of alternative options were explored including modifications to the existing cycle lane arrangements outlined in a second consultation. However, this option was dropped following concerns raised in a safety audit. The current proposal provides an off-street loading facility suitable for small to medium delivery vehicles by utilising the area in front of the entrance gates to

the basement ramp. Refuse vehicles and occasional larger delivery vehicles would make use of a new section of double yellow line waiting restriction adjacent to the site in front of Mansel Court. This can be achieved by relocating the adjacent on-street car parking bays westwards a short distance. Given these bays are considered to be too short for modern vehicles (approx. 4.4m to 5.4m), three longer bays of between 5 and 6m in length will be re-provided. It is noted that the applicant's own service vehicles would restrict access to the underground car park for short periods, however it is considered that given the low level of movements from the car park and the presence of alternative on-street car parking close by that this would be acceptable in this instance. The proposed delivery and servicing plan would also actively seek to manage servicing to outside office hours/off peak times to minimise the number and frequency of movements to further mitigate this impact.

7.53 The applicant has submitted a transport statement and Travel Plan demonstrating that the transport impacts associated with the proposals can be accommodated within the surrounding transport network. The proposal includes reducing the number of car parking spaces from 34 to 11 spaces including two Blue Badge parking spaces which will be located at basement level and accessed via a ramp from Mansel Road. It replaces surface level parking with high quality cycle parking provision. This is considered to be acceptable as it encourages sustainable travel in this highly accessible location. Wellington House is well connected and has excellent public transport links (PTAL rating of 6b).

7.53 The London Plan expects outer London Centres that have high PTALs to have cycle parking standards to match those of inner/central London (1 space per 90sqm). The proposed development would have a total ground floor area of approx. 4,530sqm and will provide 58 long stay cycle spaces at ground floor level which means it would comply with London Plan standards. It is also considered that this element of the proposal would comply with Policy CS.18 of the Core Planning Strategy as the cycle storage would also be secure, covered and other facilities such as showers and lockers would be provided. The London Plan also requires a development of this size to provide 9 short stay cycle spaces (first 5,000sqm: 1 space per 500sqm, thereafter: 1 space per 5,000sqm). Given the constraints of the site the proposal would not provide any short stay cycle spaces. As such, the applicant will be required to provide a financial contribution of £2700 (9 x £300 per short stay cycle space) for short stay cycle provision in the local area.

7.6 Sustainability and Energy

7.6.1 The BREEAM design stage assessment provided by the applicant indicates that the development should achieve an overall score of 63.02%, which meets the minimum requirements to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' in accordance with Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS15. This is particularly commendable in light of the use of BREEAM New Construction scheme to undertaken the assessment. In order to make allowance for the additional difficulties assessing a refurbishment project under the BREEAM New Construction scheme it is suggested that a condition is attached to allow a

BREEAM Good rating to be accepted in this case. Additionally the applicant has requested that allowance be made for the time taken to finalise the code certificates and reflected in the wording of the condition.

- 7.6.2 The BRUKL output documentation submitted for the proposed development indicates refurbished element of the works will achieve the target emissions reduction of 35% whilst the new build element of the development will only achieve an emissions reduction target of 11%. This leaves a carbon shortfall of 13.87 tCO₂ which will need to be addressed through a S106 payment according to the offset methodology outlined in the Mayors Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
- 7.6.3 Future Merton have assessed the application and are satisfied that the all potential on-site carbon abatement opportunities have been considered and implemented where feasible and that the constraints placed on the site by virtue of it being an existing building limit the potential of achieving a 35% improvement for the new build element. The reimagining carbon shortfall can be dealt with via a S106 payment of £24,966.

7.7 Change of Use

- 7.7.1 The proposal would involve the amalgamation of two A2 units (professional and financial services) to create a single larger A3 unit. The application site is located in a secondary shopping frontage and as such uses such as restaurants are encouraged because they contribute to the vitality and viability of the shopping frontage. It should also be noted that the site is also located at the edge of Wimbledon Town Centre and a number of other restaurant uses are located along this part of Wimbledon Hill Road which means that it is a suitable location for a restaurant use. It should also be noted that the proposed change of use would not result in the loss of an A2 unit and not a retail unit.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.2 The application does not constitute Schedule 1 or Schedule 2 development. Accordingly, there are no requirements in terms of EIA submission.

9. LOCAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 9.1 The proposal would result in a net gain in gross floor space and as such will be liable to pay a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The funds will be spent on the Crossrail project, with the remainder spent on strategic infrastructure and neighbourhood projects.

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 Wellington House is located in Wimbledon Town centre and has excellent transport links (PTAL rating of 6b), which means it is a highly suitable location for a major office development. The proposal would provide an enlarged, modernised and sustainable office building with well designed large

floorplates commensurate with Wimbledon's status as a major centre. Wimbledon is also the borough's largest town centre, identified as a major centre in the London Plan, which also makes it a sustainable location for a tall building. It is considered that the proposal will respect its context, in terms of its height, scale and massing and would be very high quality and a significant improvement in design terms compared to the tired and dated existing building. The impact on residential amenity and transport and highways is considered to be acceptable subject to the imposition of suitable conditions. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and heads of terms set out below.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PLANNING PERMISSION subject to the completion of a S106 agreement covering the following heads of terms:

- 1) Carbon emissions offset contribution (£24,966)
- 2) S278 agreement to be entered into covering the following:
 - Footway reconstruction;
 - Relocation of access to basement area;
 - Modification to existing waiting restrictions/parking bay layout on Mansel Road including traffic management order and access area
 - The removal and replacement of contraflow cycle lane splitter during construction if necessary.
- 3) Financial contribution for cycle parking in the local vicinity (£2,700)
- 4) Paying the Council's legal and professional costs in drafting, completing and monitoring the legal agreement.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. A.1 (Commencement of Development)
2. A.7 (Approved plans)
3. B.1 (External Materials to be Approved)
4. C.3 (Obscured Glazing (Fixed Windows))
5. C.7 (Refuse and Recycling (Implementation))
6. C.8 (No use of flat roof)
7. C.9 (Balcony/Terrace (Screening))
8. D.10 (No external lighting)

9. D.11 (Construction Times)
10. H.4 The disabled parking space shown on the approved plan 064-A-11-09(E) shall be provided and demarcated as disabled parking spaces before first occupation of the extended office building and shall be retained for disabled parking purposes for occupiers and users of the development and for no other purpose.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of Section 76 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which relates to the provision of satisfactory access to buildings for people with disabilities and to ensure compliance with policy CS20 of the Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy 2011.

11. H.7 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the cycle parking, washing and locker facilities shown on the approved plan 064-A-11-10(F) have been provided and made available for use. These facilities shall be retained for the occupants of and visitors to the development at all times.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities to promote sustainable modes of transport and to comply with Policy CS18 (Active Transport) of the Adopted Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011

12. H.8 (Travel Plan)
13. H.12 (Delivery and Services Plan to be submitted)
14. H.13 (Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted)

15. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, 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 'Good' has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority within six months of the occupation of the developer '. 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 part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until evidence has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority confirming that the development has achieved not less than a 35% improvement on Part L2B and an 11% saving on Part L2A for the refurbished and new build elements respectively.

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

17. Before the commencement of the development, details of the proposed green/brown roofs (including: species, planting density, substrate, a section drawing at scale 1:20 demonstrating the adequate depth availability for a viable green/brown; and a maintenance plan) shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and be permanently retained as such.

Reason: In order to conserve and enhance biodiversity and wildlife habitats in accordance with the provisions of policy CS.13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

18. No external windows and doors shall be installed until detailed drawings at 1:20 scale of all external windows and doors including materials, set back within the opening, finishes and method of opening have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Only the approved details shall be used in the development hereby permitted.

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 Policies Plan 2014.

[Click here](#) for full plans and documents related to this application.

Please note these web pages may be slow to load

This page is intentionally left blank