

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

19th October 2017

APPLICATION NO.

DATE VALID

16/P4853

11/01/2017

Address/Site:

Former Wolfson Neurological Rehabilitation Centre,
Copse Hill, SW20

(Ward)

Village

Proposal:

Erection of 7 x flatted blocks with a maximum height of 5 storeys (including roof space and lower ground floor accommodation) to provide 75 residential units with associated arrangements including basement car parking and the provision of public and private landscaped spaces.

Drawing Nos:

P_001,P_051(02), P_101(P01), P_102(03), P_103(05),
P_104(05), P_105(04), P_106(04), P_107(04),
P_111(03), P_112(03), P_201(P01), P_212(P01),
P_211(P01), P_202(P01), P_203(P01), P_221(P01),
P_222(02), P_223(02), P_224(02), P_225(02),
P_226(02) P_231(02), P_232(02), P_235(02), P_241(01),
P_242(01), P_243(02), P_246(01), P_245(02),
P_251(01), P_255(02), P_256(01), P_265(01), P_266
P_271, P_272(01), P_273(01), P_275(01), P_276(01),
P_401(01), P_402(01), P_421(01), P_422(01), P_431(01)

Contact Officer:

David Gardener (0208 545 3115)

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and S106 Agreement

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Heads of agreement: Affordable Housing
- 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 (Pre-application stage)
- Number of neighbours consulted: 389
- External consultations: Transport for London, Natural England, Thames water, Historic England

1. INTRODUCTION

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

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The red line boundary of the application site covers approximately 0.96 hectares with a frontage to the south side of Copse Hill. The bus turning facility for the 200 bus service extends in front of almost half the Copse Hill front boundary. The site adjoins the former Firs site to the west which comprises 8 detached houses. Woodland wraps around the southwest and southern boundaries, and the majority of the east boundary adjoins a north-south orientated path between Copse Hill to the north and Cottenham Park Road to the south with the bulk of the former Atkinson Morley hospital where the residential redevelopment has recently been completed located on the other side of the path.
- 2.2 The site contains the marketing suite for the Berkeley suite for the Berkeley redevelopment of both Atkinson Morley and Wolfson and temporary office and welfare accommodation associated with the construction works. It formerly contained the Wolfson Centre building, a neurological rehabilitation centre vacated by the NHS in February 2012. There is a very steep fall in levels from the front to the back of the site.
- 2.3 There are a number of mature trees scattered across the site and along the street frontage and the site is covered by Tree Preservation Order No. 376 (2004).
- 2.4 The whole of the site is within the Copse Hill Conservation Area. The woodland to the west and south of the site, outside the application site boundary, forms part of an area designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) in the Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map July 2014. The land to the west and south is also part of a larger parcel of land designated as Metropolitan Open Land and this designation extends north beyond the boundary of the SINC to form a corridor extending either side of the access road running between the Firs and the Wolfson Centre site to link the main parcel of MOL land with Copse Hill. Part of this MOL corridor falls within the application site boundary behind the bus turning facility.
- 2.5 The site falls within an Archaeological Priority Zone. The site also has a Public Transport Accessibility (PTAL rating) of 1b (low) and is not within a controlled parking zone (CPZ).

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 There is consented scheme on the application site for a total of 16 houses, comprising 11 private houses permitted under 15/P2029, together with five private houses fronting the north-south link permitted under 15/P2027.

3.2 The current application as originally submitted proposed four buildings comprising a total of 85 flats. The application has been amended twice since it was first submitted. The first amendment increased the number of blocks from 4 to 7 with the number of flats reduced from 85 to 77 with the second and latest amendment reducing the number of flats further to 75. From the 75 flats, 57 will be private and 18 affordable. It should be noted that the amount of affordable housing has been reduced from 30% to 24% following the latest amendments.

Type	No. of bed per unit			
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Private	11	24	19	3
Affordable rent	0	0	0	
Intermediate	12	6	0	
Total	23	30	19	3

3.3 The proposal would have a traditional design approach with the proposed blocks ranging between 4 and 5 storeys including lower ground floor accommodation. The public square has also been relocated so that it is now framed by blocks B, E, F & G.

3.4 Block A & G

These blocks are located on the west side of the application site and have a maximum height of 4 storeys. Facing materials comprise red multi-stock brick and a slate roof. The front elevation of block G forms the western side of the relocated public square.

3.5 Block B

This block is centrally located within the site and has a maximum height of 5 storeys including lower ground floor accommodation. Facing materials would comprise buff London Stock brick and a slate roof. The front elevation fronts the relocated public square.

3.6 Blocks E & F

These blocks comprise the 18 affordable units and are 4 floors in height including mansard roof accommodation. The front elevation addresses Copse Hill and the rear elevation faces the public square. Facing materials comprise red multi-stock brick and a slate roof.

3.7 Blocks D & C

These blocks are located on the east side of the site with their frontages facing the north/south path. Block C is a maximum of 4 storeys including lower ground floor and mansard roof whilst Block D has is a maximum of 5 storeys including lower ground floor. Facing materials would comprise buff London Stock brick and a slate roof.

3.8 The applicant has advised that the current application is a response to the housing market and the wider economy since the original house-based

scheme was drawn up in 2012, and that the house-based development is no longer viable to deliver.

- 3.9 The application as originally submitted proposed a total of 90 car parking spaces with 86 of these spaces located in the basement and 4 located at ground floor level in front of Block C. Another 6 visitor parking spaces were proposed at ground adjacent to the north-south route level immediately to the south of the proposed concierge. These spaces would have required car access from the north/south path. The amended plans also propose 90 car parking spaces with 88 of these spaces now provided at basement level and 2 spaces in front of blocks E & F (formerly block C). The number of visitor car parking spaces, which will now be located at basement level has been increased to 10. A further 13 visitor spaces located within Phase 2 of the development will also be made available for visitors of the site if required. The basement car park would be accessed from Atkinson Close on the west side of the application site.
- 3.10 Above the new entrance road, a 4m wide footpath would be provided to create a link from the bus turning facility down into the main parcel of MOL land being transferred into public ownership as part of the Atkinson Morley hospital development.
- 3.11 The application originally proposed included giving land located in the southeast corner of the site over to MOL with a new pedestrian path linking the north/south path and east/west path within the MOL. This element of the proposal has now been omitted.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 Wolfson Centre

The Wolfson Neurorehabilitation Centre opened in 1967, already flanked to the east by Atkinson Morley neurosurgical hospital and broadly contemporary with the construction of The Firs hospital staff accommodation to the west.

- 4.2 In December 2011, St George's Healthcare Trust declared the Wolfson Centre surplus to requirements. The building was vacated and the services were re-located in early 2012, prior to the sale of the site.

- 4.3 Planning permission was granted for redevelopment of the site for 8 detached family houses following completion of a legal agreement in May 2013, planning ref 12/P2157

- 4.4 The Wolfson Centre was subsequently demolished and the site is in use for Berkeley's marketing suite (granted temporary permission on 9th October 2014 until June 2017 (14/P2576) as well as site accommodation for construction works.

- 4.5 Permission was granted to vary planning ref 12/P2157 increasing the number of houses from 8 to 11 on 19th August 2015 (Ref: 15/P2029). This application was compatible with application ref 15/P2027 which was a simultaneous

application to replace three consented units on the Atkinson Morley hospital site with 5 smaller houses. This site also now forms part of the current application site.

5. POLICY CONTEXT

5.1 Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014):

DM D1 (Urban design and the public realm), DM D2 (Design considerations in all developments), DM D4 (Managing Heritage Assets), DM F2 (Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure), DM H2 (Housing mix), DM H3 (Support for affordable housing), DM O1 (Open space), DM O2 (Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features), DM EP2 (Reducing and mitigating noise), DM EP4 (Pollutants), DM T1 (Support for sustainable transport and active travel), DM T2 (Transport impacts of development), DM T3 (Car parking and servicing standards)

5.2 Adopted Core Strategy (July 2011):

CS8: Housing Choice: Requires new developments to be well designed, socially mixed and sustainable, and requires sites for 10 units or more to provide 40% affordable housing (60% Social Rented and 40% Intermediate)

CS9: Housing Provision: Supports provision of new housing and aims to facilitate delivery of the Borough's housing targets

CS11; Infrastructure: Requires new development to provide for any necessary infrastructure

CS13: Open Space, nature conservation, leisure and culture: seeks to protect and enhance the Borough's public and private open spaces including MOL, improve access to open space and nature conservation by sustainable forms of transport, expects development to incorporate and maintain appropriate elements of open space and landscape features such as trees, improve opportunities for the public to experience nature by enhancing biodiversity, encouraging green links and corridors and refusing development that has a significant adverse impact on protected or priority species and priority habitats, demonstrate that development will not adversely affect the nature conservation values of designated Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation, safeguard recreational and sporting facilities, require where appropriate, development to integrate new or enhanced habitat or design and landscaping that encourages biodiversity

CS14: Design. All development to be designed to respect, reinforce and enhance the local character of the area, conserving and enhancing Merton's heritage assets and wider historic environment and promoting high quality sustainable design. Development must comply with the most appropriate minimum space standards.

CS15: Climate Change. All major development required to demonstrate how it minimises water use and CO2 emissions, all new dwellings to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4

CS16: Flood Risk Management. Applies sequential test to avoid inappropriate development in relation to flood risk, seeks to implement Sustainable Urban drainage systems across the Borough and work towards effective management of surface water flooding

CS18: Active Transport Encourages walking and cycling through design of new developments, enhancement of pedestrian and cycle networks, and safe, covered cycle storage

CS19: Public Transport, Encourages support and enhancement of public transport network CS20: Parking, Service and Delivery. Seeks to implement effective traffic management.

5.3 London Plan March 2016:

Relevant policies comprise: Policy 3.3 - Increasing Housing Supply, 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential (provides a density matrix), 3.5 Quality and Design of New Housing Development (associated Table 3.3 sets out minimum GIA standards for different dwelling types), 3.6 Children and Young People's Play 3.8 Housing choice, 3.11 Affordable Housing Targets, 3.12 Negotiating Affordable Housing, 3.13 Affordable Housing Thresholds, 3.16 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure, Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide emissions, 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, 5.7 Renewable Energy, 5.10 Urban Greening, 5.13 Sustainable drainage, 5.21 Contaminated Land, 6.7 Better streets and surface transport, 6.9 Cycling, 6.10 Walking, 6.13 Parking, 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods, 7.2 An Inclusive Environment, 7.3 Designing Out Crime, 7.4 Local Character, 7.5 Public Realm, 7.6 Architecture, 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology, 7.14 Improving Air Quality, 7.17 Metropolitan Open Land – supports its protection from development having an adverse impact on its openness and from inappropriate development, 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature, 7.21 Trees and Woodlands

5.4 Planning Policy Statement

The relevant national planning policy statement is the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012). (NPPF)

The NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions. It sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Although it only makes reference to Green Belts and not MOL, MOL is generally deemed similar to Green Belts in the metropolitan context. It advises 74 that once Green Belts have been defined, L.P.A'S should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access, to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity, or to improve damaged and derelict land. The Green Belt guidance in NPPF states that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development and such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances, where any harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It refers to new buildings (with a list of exceptions, including facilities for outdoor sport, and extensions or alterations to existing buildings provided that they are not disproportionate) as being inappropriate development. It also advises that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. It states that in defining boundaries, physical features should be used that are easily recognisable and likely to be permanent.

5.5 Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (March 2016)

- 5.6 Department for Communities and Local Government 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard'
- 5.7 The following Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is also relevant:
New Residential Development (September 1999)

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1 The application was advertised by means of statutory site and press notices and the dispatch of individual letters to neighbouring residents as well as local amenity groups.
- 6.2 The application was not required to be referred to the Mayor of London.
- 6.3 Representations have been received from 241 addresses whose concerns can be summarised as follows:
- Overdevelopment and too high density (in excess of London Plan density matrix) for the location given poor public transport accessibility (PTAL 1b), which is also considered to have a semi-rural character in the character appraisal. Change of open character/loss of views. Would not preserve or enhance the conservation area. Detached houses are more suitable for location given low density. Departure from previously agreed design principles
 - Too high and out of character with existing area. Would dominate views from Copse Hill and Morley Park/MOL. Wolfson by comparison had a low profile and permitted uninterrupted views
 - Impact on drainage and flooding from underground car park which has already been impacted by the Atkinson Morley development
 - Adverse effect on local traffic/congestion and safety. Not enough car parking spaces/ car parking spaces would be too expensive therefore encouraging residents to park elsewhere/overspill parking on surrounding streets. Inadequate space for manoeuvring vehicles in underground car park. Insufficient parking for blue badge holders/car parking spaces insufficient size to accommodate larger vehicles. Blocking of emergency vehicles on Copse Hill. Transport assessment is flawed. Noise from additional traffic. Provision for collection of refuse inadequate
 - Air pollution which on Copse Hill already exceeds safe limits (WHO and EU limits) with development only exacerbating this. A recent progress report published by LB Merton confirms that both nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and PM₁₀ levels continue to be exceeded at various locations in the borough with Copse Hill being one of these locations. Additional traffic and proposals mass/height would increase this
 - Overlooking/light pollution from windows, balconies and roof terraces
 - Privileged access to park is not acceptable particularly given security issues
 - Detrimental impact on SINC as well as wildlife including Bats and Badgers. Impact on bird flight paths. Loss of ecological value.
 - Wolfson Lawn should be excluded from the application site

- Too few affordable homes/affordable homes will not be affordable. Viability assessment should be made public
- Provision of larger houses improves borough housing mix which is under represented by larger houses
- Impact on trees
- Development is profit driven
- Development should be zero carbon
- Add further pressure on local infrastructure such as schools and GP surgeries/hospitals
- Developer should be providing an Environmental Impact Assessment
- Change in market conditions not planning related
- Impact on surrounding area during construction works

Local Groups and Organisations

6.4 LUNG

- The density of the proposed development (339 hr/ha) is far in excess of the recommended level (150 – 200 hr/ha) for a site with poor access to public transport
- The development would be inconsistent with the character of the Conservation Area which is a 'heritage asset' and described in the character appraisal as having a 'semi-rural' character, and the Copse Hill street scene
- High rise buildings would create canyon and therefore seriously impair views over the woodland to the rear
- Proposal given its scale would detract from the importance and impact of adjacent locally listed hospital building.
- Copse Hill are mainly large detached 2 storey houses, sitting on large plots with considerable gaps. The development would thus be contrary to policy which requires development to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings and existing street patterns, historic context, urban layout and landscape features of the surrounding area, use appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials
- The close proximity of the development to MOL would have a seriously adverse impact on the amenity value of the MOL and therefore contrary to policy. This is amplified by steep slope of ground. Trees, particularly in winter would offer little shielding. Loss of feeling of openness.
- Overshadowing, loss of privacy. Light pollution into adjacent SINC woodland and impact on biodiversity and wildlife habitats. Flooding risk
- Poor quality private and public amenity space within the development
- Serious traffic and safety issues regarding refuse vehicles using Atkinson Close and visitor vehicles using the north/south path/turning circle in front of block B. No provision for larger delivery vehicles. Air pollution from additional vehicles
- Should not include Wolfson Lawn in development site. No boundary treatment shown and gated entrance between private land and Morley

Park is not acceptable. No requirement for additional path into Morley Park

- Misleading information concerning consented scheme boundary and strip of land proposed in previous application for inclusion in Morley Park
- Welcomes the proposed MOL designation of 1043sqm and transfer to the Council
- Affordable housing provision (30%) is below target level of 40%

6.5 Wimbledon Society

- Site boundaries are incorrect as they include Wolfson Lawn and Firs access road.
- Overdevelopment as proposed density would exceed London Plan standards. Impact on Conservation Area with proposed buildings far exceeding height and density of Wolfson building.
- Effect on MOL with for example Block A adversely affecting the daylight to the MOL. Would also compromise the adjoining SINC.
- Loss of privacy to users of park and residents themselves. No part of MOL to the west of the North/South path should be seen as private. Unclear how private/public circulation interact
- Shortfall in terms of affordable housing provision
- Combined impact of all phases on local traffic movements is problematic. Additionally, the access route within the site appears to be a single two-way shared surface, with no protected footways so has to be shared with pedestrians. Parking and servicing to the east of block B also involves conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.
- All flats should be dual aspect
- Hydrology of site has been misunderstood and an independent hydrology assessment should be undertaken. Drainage strategy does not clearly propose how to overcome current flooding
- Omission of previously approved house on southern tip and inclusion of its site area is seen as a positive. Also use of a CHP scheme is seen as a benefit in terms of sustainability.

6.6 Raynes Park & West Barnes Residents' Association

- Design approach does not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area
- Excessive density and height of buildings. No requirement for additional units in borough given Merton is exceeding housing targets
- Detrimental impact on SINC and nocturnal wildlife
- Impact on traffic on Copse Hill including pollution

6.7 Parkside Residents' Association

- Overdevelopment of site and excessive density given semi-rural character of area
- Impact on traffic pollution

6.8 Belvedere Estates Residents Association

- Severe overdevelopment, excessive height and density for location which is also in a Conservation Area and adjacent to MOL and SINC. The area is semi-rural in character and has a poor public transport accessibility
- Overlooking, overshadowing, light pollution and disturbance to wildlife
- Excavation of basement would result in increased flood risk
- Impact on traffic and air pollution

6.9 North West Wimbledon Residents' Association

- Claims made by the applicant regarding market conditions cannot be believed
- Significant departure from previously established design principles and would impact on character of wider area
- Light pollution to SINC
- Substantial blocks will seriously damage both character and appearance of Conservation Area which is characterised by large detached houses set back from the road and enhanced by landscaped settings. Undermines Atkinson Morley hospital building which is locally listed.
- Impact on MOL particularly from block A which is six storeys. Canyon effect when viewed from Copse Hill. Impact on SINC and applicant has not approached the welfare of protected species seriously.
- Ecological report and planning statement both fail to consider policy 7.19 of London Plan which states that development should take opportunities for positive gains for nature through its layout, design and materials. The proposal will cause significant noise pollution and impact on nocturnal animals such as badgers and bats
- Applicants claim that more affordable housing (currently below policy requirements) is not viable should not be believed
- Not sustainable location for size of development given low public transport accessibility. Furthermore the number of car parking spaces would add to existing traffic and pollution levels, particularly on Copse Hill.
- Have conducted own survey of fine particles in the air (PM10) on 26th January 2017, which is one of most common causes of air pollution alongside nitrogen dioxide. Show exceptionally high levels of particles in the air
- Excessive density of 339 hr/ha based on site size of 0.82 Hectares

6.10 Ursuline High School

- Security concerns regarding the pavilion due to having a seamless boundary into the woodland from the proposed flats. This access seriously compromises security for both the park and Pavilion
- Safety concerns regarding UHS pupils using the north/south pedestrian route due to visiting vehicles also using this route

6.11 The Residents' Association of West Wimbledon (RAWW)

- The impact on the view from Copse Hill would be the virtual loss of open views, dominance and overshadowing by tall buildings and

creation of a canyon effect on the street. Impact on Locally Listed Atkinson Morley hospital.

- Two blocks of flats would dominate and overshadow the open lands and distant views beyond the MOL. All sense of openness from MOL would be lost. Loss of privacy and overlooking from flats as well as overshadowing of woodland. Impact on SINC including nocturnal wildlife from light and noise pollution
- Poor quality amenity space
- Misleading images presented in Design and Access Statement
- The treatment of the western MOL boundary is unclear and not clearly defined whilst the earlier transfers of land should be acknowledged. The amounts of open land being transferred to the Council and the land shown as available for new development are incorrect
- Welcomes proposed addition of new MOL land however new boundary treatment would be required and fencing/security proposals not clearly defined. New path not required as would require further gate to be locked. Serious security implications due to gate located on southern boundary of site allowing access to park
- Overdevelopment of site and cannot be sustained by local infrastructure. Too dense at 339 hr/ha which is above London Plan density matrix of 150-200 hr/ha
- Excessive pollution levels from car usage. Safety concerns on Atkinson close and north/south path. Refuse vehicle provision is inadequate as the application fails to demonstrate available space for vehicles to turn. Inadequate delivery vehicle provision.
- Flooding due to excavation of basement

6.12 Stephen Hammond MP

- Building of 85 flats, which would be up to six storeys in height, will not be in keeping with the character of local area and semi-rural designation.
- Impact on MOL and wildlife
- Vastly denser than any other development in local area resulting in excessive traffic. Lack of car parking spaces and impact of this on surrounding road network
- Impact on local schools and health facilities.

6.13 King's College School

- Concerns raised regarding increase in traffic and air pollution on Copse Hill.

AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED

- 6.14 Following the initial consultation and in response to concerns raised, the scheme was amended and further consultation was carried out. All previous consultees, including all local residents and residents' groups were re-consulted on the proposal. Representations have been received from 92 addresses whose concerns can be summarised as follows:

- Amendments to the proposal are minor and make little difference to previous concerns, too high density given poor transport accessibility, overdevelopment, unsustainable, should not be able to off-set density figures of adjoining sites. Development more appropriate for a town centre
- Out of character with conservation area which is described in the character assessment as having a semi-rural character, influx of too many households would also impact on this character, loss of views from Copse Hill, completely different to approved scheme for 16 houses, visuals are inaccurate
- Excessive height and scale of development would dominate and adversely impact amenity value and views from of Morley Park/MOL/SINC, blocks A & C too close to MOL boundary,
- Poor quality materials, public square is unwelcoming
- Serious traffic and safety issues within site/north-south path and surrounding road network, not enough car parking provision for private cars or service vehicles, overflow parking in adjoining roads, impact on residential streets during construction, double bays unworkable, not clear which are visitor parking bays, some blocks have no direct access to basement parking, what measures are there to prevent parking on north-south link, parking in phase 2 should not be considered guaranteed
- Where will block C put its rubbish
- Buildings fronting Copse Hill are too large
- Does not address lack of larger family sized houses in borough, over reliance on small units
- Increased risk of flooding due to underground car park, potential for sewage overflow
- Affordable housing provision below Council target, developer claims that this would make the proposal unviable should be dismissed
- Pollution (light, air noise)
- Access to local amenities is limited
- Flats in this location would set a poor precedent
- Impact on wildlife
- Private access to Morley Park, overlooking from windows/balconies, loss of privacy
- Play area dangerously close to north-south path where vehicle movements will take place
- The profit of the developer should not be at expense of local residents, lack of demand for apartments
- Lack of local infrastructure
- 35% reduction in carbon emissions is inaccurate as it is 34%

6.15 LUNG

- Too high, too dominant, too polluting and unsuitable in this area which is semi-rural in character. More appropriate for a town centre with good transport links which this site does not have
- Proposal would put unnecessary pressure on local roads, especially Copse Hill and No.200 Bus service
- Too dense. Density calculation should be stand-alone and not include the other developments on adjoining sites

- The proposed development would seriously detract from the setting of the locally listed Atkinson Morley hospital. New development would afford only glimpses of the woodland behind whereas before there were views over the building
- Close proximity to MOL would have a seriously adverse impact on the amenity of the MOL as well as open feeling. Visual dominance of blocks A & B. Trees will offer very little shielding.
- Loss of privacy from balconies and windows to both users of park and occupiers of flats
- Light pollution to adjacent SINC and adversely affect biodiversity including nocturnal wildlife
- The foul water strategy will result in an increased risk of further sewage spills. Flood risk from surface water flow
- Inadequate parking provision for residents, visitors, service visits and deliveries which would result in overspill parking and bring additional vehicles onto north/south path. Turning circle large wide enough for vehicles shown outside block C. Increase in vehicles would be dangerous. Increase in traffic volume and air pollution
- Affordable housing below Council target.
- Planning documents contain errors, inconsistencies and omissions

6.16 Wimbledon Society

- Block A's closeness to the site edge adversely affects the MOL with only narrow openings remaining between buildings whereas previously there had been views over the building
- Density remains too high
- Introduction of block C not acceptable as no longer dedicating open space
- Loss of daylight/sunlight
- Design should incorporate more modern approach
- Car spaces too narrow
- Refuse store shown at corner of block F is too dominant and should be relocated
- Development should provide 40% affordable housing

6.18 North West Wimbledon Residents' Association

- Significant departure from previously established design principles and would impact on character of wider area
- Light pollution to SINC and MOL
- Seven blocks will seriously damage both character and appearance of Conservation Area which is characterised by large detached houses set back from the road and enhanced by landscaped settings. Undermines Atkinson Morley hospital building which is locally listed.
- Development would block views from Copse Hill to MOL. Canyon effect when viewed from Copse Hill.
- Impact on SINC and applicant has not approached the welfare of protected species seriously.
- Ecological report and planning statement both fail to consider policy 7.19 of London Plan which states that development should take

opportunities for positive gains for nature through its layout, design and materials. The proposal will cause significant noise pollution and impact on nocturnal animals such as badgers and bats

- Lack of affordable housing not policy compliant
- Not sustainable location for size of development given low public transport accessibility. Furthermore the number of car parking spaces would add to existing traffic and pollution levels, particularly on Copse Hill as well as overspill parking
- Have conducted own survey of fine particles in the air (PM10) on 26th January 2017, which is one of most common causes of air pollution alongside nitrogen dioxide. Show exceptionally high levels of particles in the air
- Excessive density of 305 hr/ha based on site size of 0.82 Hectares which exceeds London Plan policy
- Do not accept developer claim that consented housing scheme is unviable

6.19 The Residents' Association of West Wimbledon (RAWW)

- The proposal would enclose the Copse Hill street frontage resulting in loss of open views and semi-rural setting and as such fails to comply with conservation area appraisal. Would obstruct views and impact on setting of Atkinson Morley Hospital
- Buildings would dominate views from MOL with loss of privacy due to overlooking. Light and noise pollution from block A given close proximity
- Proposal would generate unsafe levels of air pollution
- Adverse impact on existing traffic levels, public transport, safety and congestion including on access road generated by drivers waiting for space in the basemen car park, would conflict with buses attempting to park and turn. Insufficient number of car parking spaces with those without dedicated spaces parking on adjoin streets. Insufficient parking for delivery vehicles.
- Clarity required concerning hardstanding outside block C. Block C also has no refuse storage and explanation that refuse containers would be handles manually to a central collection point not credible
- Too dense
- Impact on surface and ground water flows and lack of provision for existing flows of sewage which is extending into surface water drainage systems. Recent mitigation measures have not addressed the sites overall lack of tolerance to further major changes
- Inadequate amount of affordable housing

6.20 Friends of Morley Park

- The site is located on a slope which means the development would be very dominant when viewed from Morley Park
- Balconies and windows which overlook the park will also increase light pollution to the detriment of nocturnal wildlife
- Impact on drainage including impact of basement parking on groundwater and surface water flows

- Occupiers of blocks C & D likely to park on north-south path given distance to basement parking. Why is a turning circle shown outside block C if not for a vehicle?
- Applicant is trying to squeeze too much onto site to the detriment of the amenity and safety of park users

6.20 Transport Planning

Transport Planning have assessed the application and considers the proposed application to be acceptable in terms of parking, trip generation and refuse and service vehicle provision. Transport planning have requested that conditions are attached requiring the submission of a travel plan, servicing and delivery plan, travel plan, parking management plan and construction logistics plan.

6.21 Transport for London

It is considered that the proposal would not have any major impact on the Transport for London Road Network or Strategic Network. However, it is considered that the applicant should consider reducing the number of car parking spaces in order to meet the London Plan objective to reduce traffic and congestion levels and avoid undermining sustainable travel. The number of residential car parking spaces designated for disabled use, the number which are active Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCPs) or passive EVCPs as well as the number of cycle spaces is also welcomed. The information provided on delivery and servicing in the Transport Assessment is also welcomed however further details on this should be provided in a Delivery and Servicing Plan which should be secured by condition. It is also requested that a Construction Logistics Plan which identifies efficiency and sustainability measures to be undertaken while developments are being built is submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to commencement of works.

6.22 Climate Change Officer

The submitted Energy & Sustainability Assessment Addendum (dated August 2017) indicates that the proposed development can achieve a 35% improvement in CO2 emissions on Part L 2013 (option 2) which meets the minimum sustainability requirements of a 35% improvement over Part L 2013 as required by Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2016) and Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS15 (2011) and therefore cannot be deemed policy compliant.

It is noted the intention for the development to utilise passive design and energy efficiency measures combined with on-site CHP and solar PV and we are broadly supportive of this approach, subject to the site achieving the necessary on-site emissions reductions. The applicant should demonstrate that they have referred and adhered to the technical design principles and concepts outlined in the GLA's London Heat Network Manual and ensure that any decentralised heating system is designed so as to allow connection to an existing or future heat network. The latter aspect will be dealt with by way of a suitably worded planning condition.

All residential major development proposals valid from the 1st of October 2016 will be liable to demonstrate compliance with the zero emissions target

outlined in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015). Major residential developments will be expected to achieve a minimum on-site emissions reduction target of a 35% improvement against Part L 2013, with the remaining emissions (up to 100% improvement against Part L 2013) to be offset through cash in lieu contribution, and secured via Section 106 agreement. The zero carbon cash in lieu contribution will be collected according to the methodology outlined in the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG. This will require each tonne of CO2 shortfall from the target saving to be offset at a cost of £60 per tonne for a period of 30 years (i.e. £1800 per tonne CO2). A S.106 will be finalised prior to planning approval to allow this collection.

The internal water consumption calculations submitted for the development indicates that internal water consumption should be less than 105 litres per person per day. The submitted Energy & Sustainability Assessment (dated December 2016) indicates that the development will target this level of consumption. I am therefore satisfied that this can be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition alongside the onsite CO2 performance, once this matter has been resolved.

6.23 Design and Review Panel

The proposal was considered at the meeting of the DRP on 24th November 2016 prior to submission of the planning application (it does not therefore take account of revisions made to the application following submission).

The Panel were aware of the previously approved plans for the site and the visually permeable feel they gave the site overall. It was also noted that the sum of the three adjacent sites was possibly less than could have been achieved than if they had been better co-ordinated. The current proposals were acknowledged as a completely different approach to the site that was equally legitimate. However, the contrast was as if a 'battlecarrier' had landed on the site, the comment being based on the uniform scale of the proposed buildings' height and continuous footprint. This had a significant impact on the feel of the development, irrespective of the amount of public and communal private space was being proposed (which was welcomed).

There was concern about the scale of some of the buildings, presenting quite tall elevations directly to the MOL – notably Block A – that would likely have a detrimental impact on the open space in the vicinity of the building. The Panel were concerned that the same traditional architectural style was being proposed for all of the blocks without any significant reference to the immediate context and that this was making the whole development have a monolithic feel. It was also suggested that an approach of free-standing pavilion blocks of flats – similar to those south of the original hospital building – might provide an open feeling, unify the scheme with the adjoining site and address the massing on the site.

The Panel had some concerns about the actual need for the E-W route and open space and that is simply provided a semi-private means for residents of the wider development to access the bus stop. This said, it also seemed to have the potential to be a place devoid of activity and life due to the

arrangement of public and private landscaped areas and the lack of front doors to ground level flats or front gardens. It could be a quite sterile space. The Panel were also quite critical in general that there were few entrances to the buildings – offering poor legibility - and none of the ground floor units had their front doors directly to the pedestrian spaces, particularly the principal area. The Panel felt there was a lack of clarity about what was public and private, whether there were ‘left over’ spaces and about the reliance on good management of the space instead of a sense of personal ownership and natural surveillance. They felt that a plan was required that showed just the landscaping, open spaces and access to dwellings that clearly indicated how these spaces would work and how people would be encouraged to use them. It was felt that fences and railings might be necessary rather than changes in level and could be detrimental to the concept. It was noted that the larger block had an unlit internal corridor and how light could be introduced into this needed to be explored.

It was noted that the parking was 1:1 ratio and this and all the cycle parking would be in an underground garage. It was felt that this would not help ensure activity in the open spaces above. The likelihood of future reductions in car ownership needed to be considered, as providing for car sharing could result in less parking being required. This meant that the underground space needed to be adaptable to other uses or this change needed to be anticipated and perhaps an underground option was not needed, with parking integrated into the open spaces on the surface.

VERDICT: **AMBER**

6.24 Urban Design Officer

The urban designer considers that the proposed amendments have addressed a number of concerns raised by the Design and Review Panel which had commented on the scheme at pre-app stage immediately before its formal submission. There is now a clear rationale to the scheme with the inclusion of a public square whilst the reduction in the massing of block A in particular addresses concerns regarding the impact that this block will have when viewed from the MOL.

6.25 Flood Engineer

The site is located in Flood Zone 1 as shown on Environment Agency flood maps. The site falls from north to south, falling in elevation from 40m to 25.46m AOD. The published surface water risk maps in the area show that the majority of the application site is at very low risk of surface water flooding, however, the wider site including the MOL have some pockets at high and medium risk of surface water flooding. The geology in the area is understood to comprise of the Claygate Formation. Ground investigation borehole results show made ground (sands and gravels) between 0.3m and 2.7m thick, overlying London Clay.

As mentioned in previous comments, it is evident that in this location a perched water table is present, sitting above the London Clay. As mitigation in this revised scheme to reduce the risk of a backwater effect occurring around

the structure/s, the application proposes waterproofing of the basements and the installation of perimeter land drainage system around the propose retaining walls. This will comprise of gravel filled trenches with perforated pipes around the basement structure, in order to maintain the passage of waters within the made ground. These trenches are proposed to eventually disperse into a series of drainage dispersal fields (x3 locations) as indicated on the proposed Below Ground Drainage drawing (produced by JSA Dwg No: L16083/DS/02 Rev P4). While this is acceptable in principle, further work is required prior to commencement of construction in order to appropriately demonstrate that these dispersal fields will not cause an adverse impact to ground stability or encourage overland flow points/surcharging, during times of peak rainfall exceeding the infiltration capability of the soil.

The drainage strategy is not a detailed design but it is indicative of the proposed arrangement and has undertaken hydraulic modelling to demonstrate that the scheme will not increase flood risk either onsite or offsite. The proposal seeks to utilise attenuation volume within the already constructed attenuation pond, which is already restricted to discharge at no more than 10l/s. We will require details to demonstrate that the attenuation pond is being maintained as part of the agreed wider site drainage and maintenance operation & maintenance plan. Soft landscaping is proposed on the podium deck (between 45%-55% coverage) of total deck area. We strongly advise that further external areas include permeable paving in the final drainage design. Attenuation tanks have been designed to accommodate the 1 in 100 year climate change (+40%) flows. The attenuation provision and restricted discharge rates proposed are compliant with planning policy including the London plan 5.13, the supporting design and construction SPG and Merton's policy DM F2.

6.26 Planning Policy – Biodiversity/Open Space

No longer proposing to designate any land as MOL which is welcomed as it is considered that this would not be the optimum use of land due to the development being located close to a number of local open spaces and the area is not identified as having insufficient access to open space. Direct access to the MOL has been removed which is welcomed, reducing the potential for disturbance and impact on the MOL. Private areas for residents have also been made more distinctive as previously requested. Protected trees are being retained to ensure screening between the proposed development and woodland/MOL. Planting is encouraged as shown in the landscaping plans to enhance the linkages with the open space and improve biodiversity. The height of buildings has been reduced and setbacks increased between the development and the MOL and SINC. The applicant provided new wireline drawings to show the proposed buildings when viewed from the MOL which illustrate the reduced visual impact.

The Ecological report addendum has addressed concerns regarding the identified badger setts to the south of the site and considers that there will be no direct or indirect effects on these from the development, particularly bearing in mind that the setts have been recently surveyed as inactive. However it also identifies the need for a resurvey of the setts and surrounding

area prior to commencement to ensure protection. It is recommended that a suitably worded condition be included to ensure that a survey of the identified badger setts and surrounding land be carried out immediately prior to commencement of the development to confirm the current status of these and the need, or otherwise, for a license to carry out work in proximity to an active badger sett. This is to ensure that the development protects the species under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. A suitably worded condition should also be included to ensure that there is no damage or harm to the adjoining MOL, SINC or any protected species during the construction of the development.

The reduction in height and scale and the increased setbacks of Block A are welcome changes to the previous proposal and are likely to have less of an effect on bats. The reduction in the number of windows on Block A facing the western SINC/MOL boundary will lessen the extent to which this building may impact on bats through harmful artificial light. The newly proposed building which forms Block C was not in the original application and also has potential to impact indirectly on bats in the SINC through being an additional artificial lighting source. Although this building is close to the MOL, it is further setback from the SINC and as identified by the Ecological survey is positioned where a previous building was located and where previous planning approval has been granted for two houses. As such the impact of this building on bat activity is likely to be minimal. The Ecological report addendum also identifies that fewer windows will reduce the illumination and considers that the three species of bats recorded in 2012 are more likely to adapt quickly to new buildings. In addition, given the proximity of the site and proposed buildings to the MOL and SINC it is necessary to ensure that any other external lighting minimises the impact on bats and wildlife.

6.27 Planning Policy – Child’s Play Space

The proposed doorstep play area would benefit from a play feature for ages 0-3 (for example a small sandpit area). This has not been included in the amended Landscape Strategy and there has been no other provision of a specific and suitable play area for 0-3 year olds. Images included in the Landscape Strategy indicate that the stepping play structures will be appropriate for 3-5 year olds which is considered suitable. The proposed sensory play planting by the doorstep play space is a suitable feature. In line with SPG Table 4.6, there should also be some provision of seating for parents / guardians supervision close to the doorstep play area. The applicant appears to have included additional play features in the playable woodland space as per previous comments to better cater for 5-11 year olds.

The former Atkinson Morley Hospital Site (re-developed by the applicant) situated next door to the proposed site provides a play space for under 5 year olds which includes a number play features including a playhouse, turning tyre and wood chipped area. This space is located approximately 350 metres from the site (approximately a 2-3 minute walk). This play space was approved under Application 12/P2030 and condition 4 of the decision notice for this approval required the development of this play space. This condition was discharged on 7th March 2013 under Application 11/P0346. The applicant needs to ensure that there is a safe accessible walkway between

the two sites for residents with children to be able to access and use the under 5 play space.

6.28 Tree Officer

No arboricultural objection is raised to the proposed development provided the trees are protected during the course of all site works. The two trees referred to as 109 and 110 are shown for removal (and replacement). This had been previously approved under LBM Ref: 15/P2029. The landscaping provides a good overview of the approach to be taken with early indications of the species of new trees to be planted. However, more detailed information is required and should be made subject to a planning condition.

6.29 Environmental Health Officer

The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the Air Quality Assessment Addendum and considers the proposed development to be acceptable in terms of its impact on building and traffic emissions. The proposal is also considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact during the construction phase subject to final details of mitigation measures being approved by the Local Planning Authority.

6.30 Natural England

Have not assessed the application and associated documents for impacts on protected species. However, Natural England has published Standing Advice on protected species and has advised that this should be applied to this application as it is a material consideration in the determination of applications in the same way as any individual response received from Natural England following consultation.

6.31 Historic England

Have concluded that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest. No further assessment or conditions are therefore necessary.

6.32 Thames Water

No objections with regard to water infrastructure.

Surface water drainage – Responsibility of the developer to ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off-site storage. Where it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.

7.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 Principle of Development

7.2 The principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential use has already been established through the grant of permission LBM Ref: 12/P2157 for eight houses and then subsequent permissions 15/P2027 and 15/P2029 to increase the number of houses to a total of 16. This includes 5 houses in the Atkinson Morley development which now forms part of the site. A valid start has been made on site so the planning permission can still be implemented and as such it is therefore a material consideration since it provides a backstop position.

7.3 Design, Appearance and Impact on Copse Hill Conservation Area

7.4 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that proposals for development will be required to relate positively and appropriately to the siting, rhythm, scale, density, proportions, height, materials and massing of surrounding buildings, whilst using appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting.

7.5 The majority of the Wolfson site itself prior to demolition of the buildings, was covered with either existing buildings or associated hardstanding areas, with very little soft landscaping other than the deep front curtilage between the building and Copse Hill and within the central courtyard. There were views through to the woodland/MOL behind and to the west of the site as a consequence of (i) the low profile of the building on the Copse Hill frontage (with a marked increase in height towards the rear of the site on the southern boundary with the woodland due to the steep gradient of the site) and (ii) views down through the access road on the western boundary. Although the actual buildings which made up the Wolfson Centre all sat to the east of the MOL, parts of its associated structures and hardstanding lay in it.

7.6 The Design Review Panel's comments on the scheme in November 2016, just prior to its submission, are set out in para. 6.23. The proposal was given an amber rating. There were concerns about the scale of some of the buildings, presenting quite tall elevations directly to the MOL – notably Block A – that would likely have a detrimental impact on the open space in the vicinity of the building. The Panel had some concerns about the actual need for the E-W route and open space and that it simply provided a semi-private means for residents of the wider development to access the bus stop whilst it also had the potential to be a place devoid of activity and life due to the arrangement of public and private landscaped areas and the lack of front doors to ground level flats or front gardens. It could be a quite sterile space. The Panel were also quite critical in general that there were few entrances to the buildings – offering poor legibility - and none of the ground floor units had their front doors directly to the pedestrian spaces, particularly the principal area.

7.7 The application has been significantly amended since it was first submitted and it is considered that it has addressed a number of concerns raised by the Design and Review Panel. The large footprint of buildings, combined with the similar building heights despite the steep slope of the site, gave the development as originally submitted a monolithic feel. The footprint of blocks

A, B & C has now been substantially reduced with the creation of a number of smaller blocks or pavilion style buildings. The proposed building heights have also been amended so that they better respond to the sloping ground levels of the site and surrounding buildings with a clear stepping down in building heights from the north/east to the south/west part of the site. For example, block A, which is located in the southwest corner of the site reduced from 6 to 4 storeys and is now only a single storey taller than the previous building that was on this part of the site. The proposed buildings are also significantly lower than the buildings in the Atkinson Morley hospital development although it is noted that this in part is due to the lower ground levels. Nevertheless it is considered that the proposal would also offer a sensitive transition between the Atkinson Morley hospital development and the lower density Firs development. The proposal will have a traditional design approach with blocks E & F being similar in terms of their design approach to the houses from the Firs development fronting Copse Hill with two storey massing plus accommodation within the roofspace lit by dormers to the road frontage, with a lower ground floor on the rear elevation. In terms of facing materials the buildings would comprise buff London Stock brick, red multi-stock brick and slate roofs which is also consistent with other buildings in this part of the conservation area. In terms of the visual impact of the proposal when viewed from the north-south path it should be noted that the consented house scheme would have a similar appearance to the proposal with block D having a similar massing to the three consented town houses in this location whilst it is considered that block C would have less of an impact given one of the consented houses in this location would be a storey taller.

- 7.8 The east-west path originally submitted has now been replaced by an attractive public square which is framed by blocks E & F to the north, block G to the west and block B to the south. The blocks would all have entrances which open directly onto the square whilst the square would feature seating to encourage activity as suggested by the DRP. It should be noted that the current Atkinson Morley Hospital development features two pavilion buildings which positively frame the main hospital building when viewed from the south with a private landscaped garden located between. Borrowing an element of this design approach, blocks E & F have been split so that a gap is created offering a glimpse of the public square when viewed from Copse Hill with the central part of block B framed behind the square to the south. The submitted drawings show block B topped off with a clock tower to give this building more visual interest however the final design of this is indicative at this stage. Accordingly, a condition will be attached requiring detailed 1:20 scale drawings of this element are submitted prior to commencement of works. The council's Urban Design officer has reviewed the amended scheme and considers that the current scheme has addressed the concerns raised by the Design and Review Panel. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy DM D2 of the adopted Sites and Policies Plan July 2014.

7.9 Impact on MOL

- 7.10 Part of the application site is within land designated as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL), which is the urban equivalent of Green Belt. The parcel of land

still within the application site is rectangle in shape and is located on the northern part of the western site boundary, sitting between the bus turning facility to the north and the woodland to the south. It forms part of a larger rectangle shape area of MOL which forms a physical and visual connection between the road along Copse Hill and the much larger parcel of MOL woodland and open space which were the former Atkinson Morley Hospital sports grounds. This is to be transferred into public ownership as part of the legal agreement for the redevelopment of the former Atkinson Morley hospital and Firs sites.

- 7.11 There are a number of policies within the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps, Core Strategy, London Plan and NPPF which relate to MOL. Policy DM O1 of the Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps states that development in proximity to and likely to be conspicuous from MOL will only be acceptable if the visual amenities of the MOL will not be harmed by siting, materials or design. Within the Justification section of Policy DM 01 it states that development of land outside the boundaries of MOL, but in proximity to it, may damage the open character of the MOL. MOL therefore needs to be protected from development proposals which would be visually intrusive, particularly high buildings or other high structures.
- 7.12 No built development is proposed within the part of the site which is located in the MOL to the east of block G. This land will comprise a 4m wide footpath abutting the west side of the access road and a landscaped parcel of land between the footpath and block G. Block G has also been further amended with the top floor now mansard further reducing its bulk and massing. There would be a 33.5m gap between the walls of the nearest houses on the Firs and this block which is similar to the gap maintained in the current consented house scheme (LBM Ref: 15/P2029). It is therefore considered that the development would preserve the visual link with the MOL beyond along and this western aspect. It is considered that although there would be some loss of view over the site from Copse Hill due to the low profile of the previous building the proposed scheme is still acceptable. In addition to the preservation of the aforementioned visual link, an 11m wide corridor between blocks A & G and B & F which gives clear views to the woodland behind would also be created.
- 7.13 It is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on views from within the MOL to the south and west with a thick layer of trees which are located within the MOL enclosing the sites south and west boundaries. These trees would screen the development from longer views from within the MOL in summer and still offer significant screening in winter. Block A, which is located in the southwest corner of the site is considered to be the most sensitively sited building given the steep drop in land levels immediately to the west. The tree layer is also thinner within the MOL to the west of this building and the path linking the ecological area with Copse Hill is located close to the site boundary. This building, on the advice of council planning officers, has been substantially reduced in size with it height reduced from six to four storeys whilst its footprint also reduced. It should be noted that the previous building built on site was itself three storeys

in this location and as such the proposed building would only be a single storey taller which is considered acceptable. Block B would be five storeys when viewed from the south given the drop in ground levels with the lower ground floor visible from this direction. However, it is considered that the impact of this block is also acceptable with the top two floors set back reducing its bulk and massing. The footprint of this building has also been substantially reduced following the original submission with blocks A and C also helping to screen views of this building from the west and southeast. It should be noted that the Atkinson Morley hospital development itself features two five storey pavilion buildings which sit adjacent the MOL and these are not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the MOL.

- 7.14 It was originally proposed to include a gate in the southern boundary of the application site which would have given residents private access to the MOL/Morley Park. This has now been removed from the proposal given security concerns as the park will be locked at night. A condition will also be attached requiring details of the boundary treatment given the importance of how the private amenity areas of the development interact with the MOL. The proposal is considered to comply with policy DM O1 of the Sites and Policies Plan.

7.15 Ecology/Nature Conservation/SINC

- 7.16 Policy CS13 advises that the Council will refuse development that has a significant adverse effect on the population or conservation status of protected or priority species and priority habitats, and will require any development proposals likely to affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) to demonstrate that it will not adversely affect the conservation values of the site. The woodland blocks to the west and south of the site are designated as a SINC.
- 7.17 The Ecological report addendum has addressed concerns regarding the identified badger setts to the south of the site and considers that there will be no direct or indirect effects on these from the development, particularly bearing in mind that the setts have been recently surveyed as inactive. However it also identifies the need for a resurvey of the setts and surrounding area prior to commencement to ensure protection. A condition will be attached requiring that a survey of the identified badger setts and surrounding land be carried out immediately prior to commencement of the development to confirm the current status of these and the need, or otherwise, for a license to carry out work in proximity to an active badger sett. This is to ensure that the development protects the species under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992.
- 7.18 On the advice of council planning officers the applicant has significantly reduced the massing, height and footprint of block A with the number of storeys reduced from six to four and the rear elevation reduced in depth by approx. 2.4m. In terms of its impact on the adjoining SINC it is important to consider the impact of the previous building. Block A would be only a single storey taller than the southwest element of the previous building whilst its rear elevation would be located approx. 4.5m further away from the facing south

boundary of the site. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact that artificial light would have on nocturnal wildlife such as bats. It should however be noted that the previous building also featured a number of large windows in its west elevation, whilst the number of windows in this block has also been substantially reduced compared to the originally submitted scheme lessening the extent to which this building may impact on bats through harmful artificial light. Block B is taller than Block A however it is considered that it would have less impact given it is located much further away from the SINC than block A. It should also be noted that the rear elevation has also been reduced in depth whilst its top two floors are set back.

7.19 The newly proposed building which forms Block C was not in the original application and also has potential to impact indirectly on bats in the SINC through being an additional artificial lighting source. Although this building is close to the MOL, it is further setback from the SINC and as identified by the Ecological survey and is positioned where a previous building was located and where previous planning approval has been granted for two houses. As such the impact of this building on bat activity is likely to be minimal. The Ecological report addendum also identifies that fewer windows will reduce the illumination and considers that the three species of bats recorded in 2012 are more likely to adapt quickly to new buildings. Given the proximity of the site and proposed buildings to the SINC it is necessary to attach a condition requiring details of lighting to ensure that it minimises the impact on bats and wildlife. Another condition will also be attached ensuring that there is no damage or harm to the adjoining SINC or any protected species during the construction of the development.

7.20 Housing Provision – Mix/Density/Affordable Housing

7.21 Mix

Policy DM H2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that residential proposals will be considered favourably where they contribute to meeting the needs of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people by providing a mix of swelling sizes, taking account of the borough level indicative proportions concerning housing mix. Therefore in assessing development proposals the council will take account of Merton’s Housing Strategy (2011-2015) borough level indicative proportions which are set out as follows:

Number of bedrooms	Percentage of units
One	33%
Two	32%
Three +	35%

7.22 It is considered that the proposal provides a good mix of properties with 23 one bedroom units (31%), 30 two bedroom units (40%) and 22, three + bedroom units (29%) proposed which is similar to the requirement in the above table. There is a small in-balance of two bedroom and three + bedroom

units however given how minor this is it would not warrant a refusal of the application.

7.23 Density

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan advises that Boroughs should seek to ensure that development optimises housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range shown in Table 3.2 of the Plan and should resist proposals which compromise this policy. This advice is re-stated in paragraph 18.27 of the Core Planning Strategy.

7.24 The application site has poor Public Transport Accessibility with a PTAL rating of 1b and sits within a suburban setting with predominantly lower density development. It is also within the Copse Hill Conservation Area. The appropriate density range within the London Plan matrix would be 150-200 habitable rooms per hectare (ha/hr), or given the average dwelling size 40-65 units per hectare (u/ha). The red line boundary area shown in the application drawings is 0.96 hectares however this includes the Wolfson Lawn which is a parcel of land to be transferred to the Council. The application site would be 0.875 hectares if this parcel of land is not included, giving a density of 298 ha/hr per hectare and 86 u/ha.

7.25 Although the figures in the previous paragraph illustrate that the proposed development would provide for a density that exceeds the recommended density range for both units and habitable rooms, it is not considered to be excessive. This view is supported by the fact that despite the low PTAL rating there is a bus stop which serves the No.200 bus route located directly outside the development offering regular and direct services to Wimbledon Town Centre, Raynes Park and Mitcham. It is also important to assess the application in this respect in the wider context. It should be noted that there is extensive parkland, which includes sports playing pitches located to the south and west of the site which is soon to be transferred to public ownership. In addition, occupiers of the units would also have access to the private south lawn to the south of the Atkinson Morley development. Finally, it is considered that although this is a stand-alone development the density of all three phases should be taken into consideration which gives a figure of 170 hr/ha which sits comfortably within the 150-200 hr/ha London Plan density range.

7.26 Affordable Housing

A total of 18 affordable units (12 x 1 bed & 6 x 2 bed) are proposed within the development in the two blocks (blocks E & F) which front Copse Hill. Terraces and balconies are provided for all of the units whilst the public square is located immediately to the south of these blocks.

7.27 The proposed housing offer equates to 24% of the total number of units and all 18 units would be intermediate housing units with no social rent proposed. This falls short of the 40% affordable housing target with a 60/40 split between social rented/intermediate sought by policy CS.8 of the Core Planning Strategy however the applicant have submitted an Affordable Housing Viability Appraisal, which the Council has independently assessed by specialist consultants, who conclude that the affordable housing offer has

been maximised in relation to financial viability. In this instance the provision of intermediate housing enables the applicant to maximise the amount of affordable homes on site. It should be noted that on-site affordable housing is being proposed on the Wolfson site for the first time, as the current planning consent for 16 houses provided no on site affordable housing, and a payment of £2.86m towards offsite provision instead. It is considered that if Social Rent were to be delivered instead of Shared Ownership or a mixture of the two then, the overall quantum of delivery would be significantly reduced. This would mean that private homes would have to be located in one of these blocks to fill it, and Registered Providers are unlikely to accept mixed tenure blocks due to management and service charge issues.

7.28 Residential Amenity

7.29 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.

7.30 In terms of any impact on properties facing the development from the opposite side of Copse Hill, the closest blocks are E & F which are set back approximately 11m from the Copse Hill road frontage with their front elevations flush with the front elevation of the adjacent block (Ambrose House) on the Atkinson Morley development. These buildings would generally have a massing of two-storeys plus mansard when viewed from Copse Hill, although due to the drop in levels at the corner with the bus turn the west facing flank wall of block F would be three storeys plus mansard. There would be a 33m minimum separation distance between these two blocks and the houses on the opposite side of Copse Hill. Accordingly, it is considered that there will be no adverse impact on these properties. It is also considered that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the adjacent block, Ambrose House, with Block E sited approx. 5.4m from the side elevation and only projecting 1.1m beyond the rear wall of this block. The north facing side elevation of block D which fronts the north/south path is located approx. 16m from the rear elevation of Ambrose House. Although this distance is 5m short of the minimum separation distance set out in the Council's SPG it should be noted that the flank wall of this block is very similar in terms of its height and siting to the flank wall of a house that forms part of an extant permission (LBM Ref: 15/P2027). A condition will be attached requiring the windows in the north facing elevation of Block D, are obscure glazed to protect privacy.

7.31 The application site wraps around the southern end of the bus turning facility with Block G located in the northwest corner of the site and set back approx. 10m from the sites frontage with the turning facility. The closest properties to this block are located on the eastern part of the former Firs site (1 Atkinson Close & 39 Copse Hill). Block G has a similar appearance to blocks E & F given it is also two/three storeys plus mansard. The west elevation of block G,

which is three storeys plus mansard is located directly to the east of 1 Atkinson Close however it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on this property given there would be a 33m separation distance whilst only being visible from the side elevation of this property which is not a principle elevation. Although Block G would be visible at an oblique angle from the rear elevation of No. 39 Copse Hill it is considered that given there would be a separation distance of 38m that it would also not have an adverse impact on this property. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policies DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan.

7.32 Standard of Accommodation

7.33 The technical housing standards – nationally described space standard (March 2015) as well as the London Plan 2015, and Table 3.3 of policy 3.5 of the London Plan (March 2016) sets out a minimum gross internal area standard for new homes. This provides the most up to date and appropriate minimum space standards for Merton. In addition, adopted policy CS.14 of the Core Strategy and DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) encourages well designed housing in the borough by ensuring that all residential development complies with the most appropriate minimum space standards and provides functional internal spaces that are fit for purpose. New residential development should safeguard the amenities of occupiers by providing appropriate levels of sunlight & daylight and privacy for occupiers of adjacent properties and for future occupiers of proposed dwellings. The living conditions of existing and future residents should not be diminished by increased noise or disturbance.

7.34 The proposed residential units all meet national and regional standards in terms of gross internal floor size and bedroom sizes. The vast majority of flatted units within both the affordable and private blocks are dual aspect and all have adequate levels of light and outlook. The proposed flats all have private balconies and terraces which comply with the minimum space standards set out in policy DM D2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) which requires for flatted dwellings, a minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person flatted dwellings with an extra 1sqm provided for each additional occupant. It should also be noted that residents would benefit from a new public square which will be enclosed by units B, E, F & G as well as access to the private south lawn to the south of the Atkinson Morley development. This is in addition to public access to the MOL to the south and west of the application site.

7.35 Parking and Traffic

7.36 Policy CS.18 of the Core Planning Strategy states that the Council will promote active transport by supporting schemes that prioritise the access and safety of pedestrian, cycle and other active transport modes. Policy CS.18 also encourages design that provides attractive, safe, covered cycle storage,

cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers). Policy DM T3 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development should only provide the level of car parking required to serve the site taking into account its accessibility by public transport (PTAL) and local circumstances in accordance with London Plan standards unless a clear need can be demonstrated. Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (March 2016), Table 6.2 states that flats of 1-2 bedrooms should have no more than one car parking space, 3 bedroom units should have no more than 1.5 spaces per unit and units of 4 or more bedrooms a maximum of 2 car parking spaces although in outer London areas with low PTAL boroughs should consider higher levels of provision.

7.37 The application site has a PTAL rating of 1b which indicates that it has poor access to public transport services. The proposal comprises a total of 53 1-2 bed units, 30, 2 bed units, 19, 3 bed units and 3, 4 bed units which means, a total of 87.5 car parking spaces should be provided in the development if it is to comply with London Plan policy. The proposal would comprise 90 car parking spaces with 88 car parking spaces located in a basement car park with 2 spaces located at ground level outside blocks E & F and as such it is considered that the number of car parking spaces proposed is acceptable. It should be noted that although the site has a low PTAL rating it is considered that it is not necessary to provide more car parking spaces in this instance given the proposal is a flatted development which means car ownership rates are likely to be lower. In addition, although Copse Hill is not located in a Controlled Car Parking Zone (CPZ) there is only a small amount of on-street parking located to the east of the site along Copse Hill. It should be noted that the Council is expected to consult on additional parking controls i.e. double yellow lines along that section of Copse Hill therefore reducing the threat of significant overspill car parking on adjoining roads. The proposal would include a total of 10 visitor car parking spaces which would be located in the basement car park and a further 13 will be located in the Atkinson Morley hospital development. The visitor car parking would be controlled by a concierge with visitors allocated a car parking space when they arrive.

7.38 The proposed peak AM and PM residential vehicle trips are summarised in the table below:

Time Period	Arrivals	Departures	Two-Way
Weekday AM Peak (0800-0900)	3	14	17
Weekday PM Peak (1700-1800)	8	6	14

The data detailed in the table above is the result of a robust assessment of the trip rates from the proposal using the TRICS database to test the proposal in comparison with other sites with similar characteristics and PTAL ratings which is then cross referenced with census data from the local ward area. This showed that there is likely to be only 17 two-way peak AM vehicle movements and 14 peak PM two-way vehicle movements which amounts to one less than every 3 minutes. It should be noted that this amounts to a 1.2%

increase in vehicle movement along Copse Hill during AM peak hours based on the number of car movements observed along Copse Hill in an October 2016 survey. It is considered that an increase of less than 5% is not considered significant for a road of this type. Accordingly the proposal impact on traffic is considered to be acceptable. It is also recognised that there was an existing hospital use on site which also generated traffic.

7.39 Refuse is stored in the basement with refuse collection proposed to be undertaken from the existing access road to the west of the application site. It should be noted that refuse vehicles currently use this access to service the existing houses in the Firs development to the west of the site. The refuse vehicle would reverse along Atkinson close with refuse collected at the bottom of the access road. The applicant has provided swept path analysis which shows that there will be enough space for a car to pass whilst refuse is being collected. There is also a dedicated parking space for smaller service vehicles in the basement. The applicant has estimated that there will be a total of 16 service trips generated per day (9 arriving and 9 departing) with deliveries booked in through the concierge. Transport Planning have assessed the application and have raised no objections. Accordingly it is considered that the proposed servicing arrangements are acceptable. Conditions will be attached requiring the submission of a travel plan, servicing and delivery plan, travel plan, parking management plan and construction logistics plan.

7.40 **Drainage and Flood Risk**

7.41 Policy DM D2 of the Adopted Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) requires proposals that incorporate basements and subterranean development to include a hydrology report which set out the impacts of the development on groundwater and surface water movements and how these will be addressed. In accordance with this requirement the applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy with the application. The council Flood Engineer has assessed the application and has raised no objections.

7.42 The site is located in Flood Zone 1 as shown on Environment Agency flood maps. The site falls from north to south, falling in elevation from 40m to 25.46m AOD. The published surface water risk maps in the area show that the majority of the application site is at very low risk of surface water flooding, however, the wider site including the MOL have some pockets at high and medium risk of surface water flooding. The geology in the area is understood to comprise of the Claygate Formation. Ground investigation borehole results show made ground (sands and gravels) between 0.3m and 2.7m thick, overlying London Clay.

7.43 It is evident that in this location a perched water table is present, sitting above the London Clay. As mitigation in this revised scheme to reduce the risk of a backwater effect occurring around the structure/s, the application proposes waterproofing of the basements and the installation of perimeter land drainage system around the propose retaining walls. This will comprise of gravel filled trenches with perforated pipes around the basement structure, in order to

maintain the passage of waters within the made ground. These trenches are proposed to eventually disperse into a series of drainage dispersal fields (x3 locations) as indicated on the proposed Below Ground Drainage drawing (produced by JSA Dwg No: L16083/DS/02 Rev P4). A condition will be attached requiring further details are provided prior to commencement of construction which appropriately demonstrate that these dispersal fields will not cause an adverse impact to ground stability or encourage overland flow points/surcharging, during times of peak rainfall exceeding the infiltration capability of the soil.

- 7.44 The drainage strategy is not a detailed design but it is indicative of the proposed arrangement and has undertaken hydraulic modelling to demonstrate that the scheme will not increase flood risk either onsite or offsite. The proposal seeks to utilise attenuation volume within the already constructed attenuation pond, which is already restricted to discharge at no more than 10l/s. A condition will be attached requiring details which demonstrate that the attenuation pond is being maintained as part of the agreed wider site drainage and maintenance operation & maintenance plan. Soft landscaping is proposed on the podium deck (between 45%-55% coverage) of total deck area. It will be a requirement as part of the final drainage design that further external areas include permeable paving. Attenuation tanks have been designed to accommodate the 1 in 100 year climate change (+40%) flows. The attenuation provision and restricted discharge rates proposed are compliant with planning policy including the London plan 5.13, the supporting design and construction SPG and Merton's policy DM F2.

7.45 Sustainability and Energy

- 7.46 The development will utilise passive design and energy efficiency measures combined with on-site CHP and solar PV and this is supported, subject to the site achieving the necessary on-site emissions reductions. A condition will be attached requiring the applicant to demonstrate that they have referred and adhered to the technical design principles and concepts outlined in the GLA's London Heat Network Manual and ensure that any decentralised heating system is designed so as to allow connection to an existing or future heat network.

All residential major development proposals valid from the 1st of October 2016 will be liable to demonstrate compliance with the zero emissions target outlined in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015). Major residential developments will be expected to achieve a minimum on-site emissions reduction target of a 35% improvement against Part L 2013, with the remaining emissions (up to 100% improvement against Part L 2013) to be offset through cash in lieu contribution, and secured via Section 106 agreement. The zero carbon cash in lieu contribution will be collected via S106 according to the methodology outlined in the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG and will require each tonne of CO₂ shortfall from the target saving to be offset at a cost of £60 per tonne for a period of 30 years (i.e. £1800 per tonne CO₂). The submitted Energy & Sustainability Assessment Addendum (dated August 2017) indicates that the proposed

development can achieve a 35% improvement in CO2 emissions on Part L 2013 (option 2) which meets the minimum sustainability requirements of a 35% improvement over Part L 2013 as required by Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2016) and Merton's Core Planning Strategy Policy CS15 (2011) and therefore cannot be deemed policy compliant. The estimated zero carbon cash in lieu contribution will be £153,622

The internal water consumption calculations submitted for the development indicates that internal water consumption should be less than 105 litres per person per day. The submitted Energy & Sustainability Assessment (dated December 2016) indicates that the development will target this level of consumption. It is considered that this can be dealt with by way of a suitably worded condition alongside the onsite CO2 performance, once this matter has been resolved.

7.47 Impact on Air Quality

- 7.48 Policy DM EP4 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development should be designed to mitigate its impact on air, land, light, noise and water both during the construction process and lifetime of the completed development. A number of objections have raised concerns regarding the developments impact on air pollution in particular. Policy DM EP4 seeks in accordance with the aims of the National Air Quality Strategy and the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy to minimise the emissions of key pollutants and to reduce concentration to levels at which no, or minimal effects on human health are likely to occur. To meet the aims of the National Air Quality Objectives, the council has designated the entire borough of Merton as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Therefore development that may result in an adverse air quality including during construction, may require an Air Quality Impact Assessment in order for the Council to consider any pollution impact linked to development proposals.
- 7.49 The applicant submitted an Air Quality Assessment and a further Air Quality Assessment Addendum following comments from the council's Environmental Health Officer. The Environmental Health Officer has assessed the Air Quality Assessment Addendum and considers the findings in the report to be acceptable with the development proposed to be air quality neutral which is a requirement of policy 7.14 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Air Quality Strategy, based on studies and data review (The London Borough of Merton Air Quality Annual Status Report for 2016 Date of publication: April 2017 is available on the Council's website). Nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM10) levels were calculated for transport and building emissions. In terms of the developments impact during the construction phase a qualitative assessment of dust levels was also carried out where it was considered that the impact of dust soiling and PM10 can be reduced to negligible through appropriate mitigation measures. Conditions will be attached requiring that the provisions stipulated and referred to in the air quality assessment are adhered too during construction works and following the developments completion with details of construction and mitigation submitted for approval by the LPA. He

proposal is therefore considered to comply with DM EP4 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

7.50 Trees and Landscaping

- 7.51 Policy DM O2 of the Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Maps (July 2014) states that development will only be permitted if it will not damage or destroy any tree which is protected by a tree preservation order, is within a conservation area; or, has significant amenity value. Policy CS.13 in the Core Planning Strategy is similarly protective of trees with amenity value.
- 7.52 The trees within the site are subject to the Tree Preservation Order 366 of 2003 & 376 of 2004. A tree survey report and arboricultural assessment report was submitted with the application. This advises that there are currently 16 trees located on the site with 6 being category A , 4 category B, 5 category C and a single category U. The proposal retains the principle trees with only two (1 x category U & 1 x category C) Sweet Chestnuts (No.109) and a category C broadleaf group being removed. It should be noted that approval has already been given for the removal of these trees under the extant permission LBM Ref: 15/P2029.
- 7.53 The Council's tree officer has assessed the proposal and is satisfied that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the remaining trees with the proposal respecting the RPA of the retained trees with the basement and lower ground floor set outside the RPA of adjacent trees. For example block A to the west of the site broadly is located within the footprint of the former building and outside the RPA's of trees in the adjacent woodland.
- 7.54 Provision is made within the proposed scheme for tree planting and soft landscaping including two replacement trees adjacent to Copse Hill in mitigation of the removal of the two Sweet Chestnut trees. It is considered that this would contribute positively to the future tree cover within the local landscape. Suitable tree protection, supervision of works and landscaping conditions are proposed including conditions relating to boundary treatment and drainage/service runs.

7.55 Children's Play space

- 7.56 The current landscape strategy includes stepping play structures which is considered to be suitable for 3-5 year olds, whilst the proposed sensory play planting by the doorstep play space is also considered to be a suitable feature. The proposed doorstep play area would benefit from a play feature for ages 0-3 such as a small sandpit area. In line with SPG Table 4.6, there should also be some provision of seating for parents / guardians supervision close to the doorstep play area. The applicant also appears to have included additional play features in the playable woodland space to better cater for 5-11 year olds. It should be noted that the landscape strategy at this stage is indicative and a condition will be attached requiring that final details of children's play space are submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority and this shall include a play space for 0-3 year olds and seating for

parents/guardians as well as details on the playable woodland space. Concerns have been raised regarding the safety of the proposed play area given its close proximity to vehicle traffic on the north-south route. The Mayor's SPG on Children's Play and Informal Recreation identifies the need for recognisable physical barriers for formal play areas to identify the edge of the play space and to provide safe access. Given the proximity of the north-south corridor to the east of the proposed play areas and the fact that a portion of this will be a shared pedestrian / vehicular space, it will be necessary to ensure that there is safe access to and from the play space with no potential for conflict with the vehicles on the adjoining site. A condition will therefore be attached requiring further details in this respect.

In addition, it should be noted that the former Atkinson Morley Hospital Site (re-developed by the applicant) situated next door to the proposed site provides a play space for under 5 year olds which includes a number of play features including a playhouse, turning tyre and wood chipped area. This space is located approximately 350 metres from the site (approximately a 2-3 minute walk). This play space was approved under Application 12/P2030 and condition 4 of the decision notice for this approval required the development of this play space. This condition was discharged on 7th March 2013 under Application 11/P0346.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 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).

10. CONCLUSION

- 10.1 It is considered that the proposed development would deliver a high quality design and layout which preserves the character and appearance of the Merton (Copse Hill) conservation area. It is also considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on views to and from within the MOL whilst it would not harm the adjoining SINC or any protected species during the construction of the development. The proposed development is also considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring properties, traffic/parking and trees. Overall it is considered that the proposal would comply with all relevant planning policies and as such planning permission should be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

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

- 1) Provision of 24 affordable housing in blocks E and F (100% intermediate housing units)
- 2) Zero carbon cash in lieu financial contribution (Estimated to be £153,622)
- 3) 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. B.4 (Details of Surface Treatment)
5. Final design of central tower feature on block B to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement or works
6. Full details of lighting to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement or works
7. B.5 (Details of Walls/Fences)
8. B.6 (Levels)
9. C.7 (Refuse and Recycling (Implementation))
10. C.10 (Hours of Construction)
11. F.1 (Landscaping)
12. F.2 (Landscaping (Implementation)).
13. F.5 (Tree Protection)
14. F.8 (Site Supervision)
15. Utility and Service Routes
16. MOL/SINC and protected species protection measures
17. Prior to the commencement of the development details of the provision to accommodate all site operatives, visitors and construction vehicles and loading / unloading arrangements during the construction process shall be submitted and approved in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The

approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

18. H.4 The disabled parking space shown on the approved plans P_102(03), P_103(05) & P_402(01) shall be provided and demarcated as disabled parking spaces before first occupation of the development 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.

19. H6 (Cycle Parking – Details to be Submitted)
20. H.8 (Travel Plan)
21. H.11 (Parking Management Strategy)
22. H.12 (Delivery and Servicing Plan to be submitted)
23. H.13 (Construction Logistics Plan to be Submitted)
24. The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the details and recommendations set out in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) by JSA Consulting Engineers (Ref: L16083 dated 16/09/17 Rev 3.0).

Reason: To ensure the development is does not lead to an increase in flood risk either to or from the site, in accordance with the NPPF, Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policies 5.12 and 5.13.

25. No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface and foul water drainage has been implemented in accordance with details that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Before these details are submitted an assessment shall be carried out of the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) to ground, watercourse or sewer in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy 5.13 and the advice contained within the National SuDS Standards. Where a sustainable drainage scheme is to be provided, the submitted details shall:

i. provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the

site to greenfield runoff rates (no more than 4l/s), and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;

- ii. include a timetable for its implementation; and
- iii. provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption authority and any other arrangements.

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding and to ensure the scheme is in accordance with the drainage hierarchy of London Plan policies 5.12 & 5.13 and the National SuDS standards and in accordance with policies CS16 of the Core Strategy and DMF2 of the Sites and Policies Plan.

26. 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.

27. Unless otherwise agreed in writing 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 CO2 reductions of not less than a 35% improvement on Part L Regulations 2013 (Option 2: Energy and Sustainability Assessment Addendum August 2017), and wholesome water consumption rates of no greater than 105 litres per person per day.

Reason: To ensure that the development performs in accordance with the approved plans, achieves a high standard of sustainability, and makes efficient use of resources and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: Policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2015 and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

28. No piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which the piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to impact on local underground sewerage utility infrastructure.

29. Survey of all trees to be removed to be undertaken prior to felling to confirm the presence or not of a bat roost.
30. Details of bird boxes and bat boxes
31. All provisions stipulated and referred to in the Air Quality Assessment Addendum (dated August 2017 - Ref: PC-16-0237-RP2) shall be adhered too during construction and permanently thereafter following occupation of the development unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the health of future occupiers of the site and adjoining areas

32. The Construction and Mitigation requirements that are to be produced in accordance with Air Quality Assessment Addendum (dated August 2017 – Ref: PC-16-0237-RP2) shall be submitted for approval by the LPA and shall be strictly adhered to during construction works.

Reason: In order to protect the health of future occupiers of the site and adjoining areas

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

Please note these web pages may be slow to load