

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

7<sup>th</sup> June 2018

<b><u>APPLICATION NO.</u></b>	<b><u>DATE VALID</u></b>
17/P4202 & 17/P4184	14/11/2017
<b>Address/Site</b>	The Study, Preparatory School, Wilberforce House, Camp Road, Spencer Hill and Peek Crescent, Wimbledon, SW19 4UN.
<b>Ward</b>	Village
<b>Proposal:</b>	<b>Partial demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of a two storey extension (and associated Listed Building Consent application 17/P4184).</b>
<b>Drawing Nos</b>	702-WH-PL-001 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-002 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-003 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-004 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-010 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-011 Rev 04, 702-WH-PL-012 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-050 Rev 00, 702-WH-PL-100 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-101 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-201 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-300 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-301 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-305 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-306 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-307 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-400 Rev 02, W-L01 Rev Q, W-L03 Rev H, W-L12 Rev B, W-L20 Rev G and 25719-100 Version 2.
<b>Contact Officer:</b>	Tim Lipscomb (0208 545 3496)

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Grant planning permission and Listed Building Consent subject to conditions.**

---

### **CHECKLIST INFORMATION**

- S106: Not required.
- Is a Screening Opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No

- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes
- Site notice: Yes
- Design Review Panel consulted: No
- Number of neighbours consulted: 36
- External consultations: Yes (Historic England)
- Controlled Parking Zone: Yes Zone VQ
- PTAL: 0
- Flood Zone: Flood Zone 1 (low probability)
- Conservation Area: Yes – Wimbledon Village
- Listed Building: Yes – (Grade II)
- Protected trees: Yes, by virtue of being within a Conservation Area.

## 1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the number of objections received.

## 2. **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

- 2.1 The site comprises Wilberforce House, which forms part of The Study Preparatory School, which is split across two sites; Wilberforce House and Spencer House (which is located approximately half a mile away from Wilberforce House).

- 2.2 The site is approximately 0.46 hectares in area.

- 2.3 Wilberforce House is a Grade II Listed Building, whereby the key feature is the Octagon building, which forms the core of the school building. The listing text describes the building as follows:

“School. 1758-61, extended 1834 and later. Restored 1974-6 by Dry Halasz Dixon with the Borough Architects Department. Brick. Steeply pitched tiled roof. Octagonal plan with short wing extending to west. 2 storeys. Segmental headed flush framed sashed windows, glazing bars. Pair of oculi flank ground floor window to south. Segmental entrance to north side. Segmental arches to ground floor western projection. Brick eaves cornice.”

- 2.4 The site is within the Wimbledon West Conservation Area (Sub Area 3). Sub Area 3 encompasses the buildings bounded by Camp Road, Camp View, West Place and North View. The West Wimbledon Conservation Area Character Assessment describes

the Study School as follows:

“The Study Preparatory School: A single storey group of modern brick buildings fronted by a grade II listed two storey octagon described by Pevsner as:

- 2.5 A most engaging building. A simple two-storey octagonal brick schoolhouse of 1758-61, built as a charity school for fifty poor children, originally containing both schoolroom and master's accommodation. Extended in 1834 to the SE, and altered and added to after 1870. Restored in 1974-6 by Dry Halasz Dixon with the Borough Architect's Department, when it was converted as an E.S.N. school, with a low NW polygonal extension sympathetically detailed. Brown brick with pantiled roofs. [Pevsner, p. 454].
- 2.6 The original almshouses were set up by the Vestry with the financial assistance of the Marryat family [Milward 1989 p.52], but was closed down as a result of the Poor Law Administration Act of 1834. It was shortly afterwards replaced by almshouses which were themselves replaced in 1929 by the modern buildings described under Sub Area 3D, below [Milward “Historic Wimbledon” pp.66-7]. The Vestry was responsible for providing at least 20 children with clothes and an allowance to enable them to “go into service”, and John Cooksey (1707-1777) a local vicar, persuaded the Dorothy Cecil Charity to pay schoolmasters to teach boys from the workhouse.
- 2.7 Then in 1757 he persuaded the Vestry to set up a committee of leading gentlemen to plan and build a school and secured Earl Spencer's permission to enclose two acres of the Common, by the modern Camp Road. There an octagonal schoolhouse (the present William Wilberforce School) was built with money raised from the local gentry.
- 2.8 In 1813 it was linked to the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church and so became known as the National School, later becoming the Old Central. [Milward, “Historic Wimbledon” pp. 63 & 66].
- 2.9 The schoolhouse was extended in 1834 and altered and added to after 1870. In the 1960s the Church of England built a new primary school in Lake Road and the octagonal building was taken over by Merton Education Committee. It was partly rebuilt and reopened as William Wilberforce School for handicapped children. [Milward, “Historic Wimbledon” p.66] It was restored in 1974-6 and converted to a school for the “educationally sub-normal” [Pevsner p.454] and

is now The Study Preparatory School.”

2.10 The Character Assessment goes on to states that:

“All the buildings in Camp View are either of considerable historic interest (The Study Preparatory School) or exceptional architectural quality (Nos. 1 to 4 Camp View and Keir Cottage)”.

2.11 The site has an area of 0.46ha in a roughly rectangular site bounded by Camp Road to the south and Camp View to the west. To the southwest of the site is Wimbledon Golf Club and Helston Court Business Centre. To the north and east are primarily residential dwellings.

2.12 The road network in the immediate vicinity of the site is relatively narrow, which can contribute to congestion at peak times.

2.13 To the south of the Site is Cannizaro Park, a Grade II\* Listed Park and Garden. Royal Wimbledon Golf Club is situated on the opposing corner of Camp Road and Camp View situated to the south west. To the north and east are residential dwellings.

2.14 The school is currently 2 form entry with up to 24 pupils per class, giving a total of 336 pupils. Wilberforce House accommodates the lower four years, (Reception and years 1, 2 and 3), totalling 192 pupils, while Spencer House accommodates years 4, 5 and 6 with a total of 144 pupils.

2.15 There are 38 staff members at Wilberforce House.

2.16 There is currently on site parking for 19 cars and 21 cycle parking spaces.

2.17 The majority of the site is laid to hardstanding with a car park to the northwest part of the site and a hard surfaced playground to the eastern part of the site. There is a lawned area to the southwest and southern part of the site.

2.18 The main vehicular access into the site is to the western side, leading off from Camp View. There are also pedestrian accesses into the site along Camp Road.

2.19 There are mature trees along the southern boundary of the site, also near the vehicular access and more to the norther site boundary.

- 2.20 The site has a PTAL of 0 (the lowest). The site is within an Archaeological Priority Zone. The Site is located in Flood Zone 1

### 3. **CURRENT PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 The proposal is for the erection of a two-storey extension to the south elevation, following demolition of the existing single storey built form. The proposal would effectively replace the existing single storey wing with a two-storey wing.
- 3.2 The extension would have a GIA of 1263sqm (demolishing 562sqm of existing GIA). The proposal would provide the following:
- Six classrooms.
  - Two group rooms.
  - Library.
  - New entrance, reception and gallery.
  - A multipurpose hall for performance, with 160 retractable seats.
  - New cloakrooms and toilets.
  - Remodelled year 1 classrooms to provide specialist group rooms.
  - Re-landscaped external areas.
- 3.3 The proposed extension would stand to the southeast of the existing Octagon building. The proposed extension would have a roughly square shaped footprint with a mixture of gabled and hipped roofs above to a maximum ridge height of 9.379m. The eaves height of the two-storey extension would be 6.428m in height.
- 3.4 To the west elevation, there would be a glazed gable projection. To the east elevation there would be three glazed gable projections, with balconies overlooking the playground. To the south elevation would be a hipped roof ending sloping away from the southern boundary.
- 3.5 The roof would be covered in an aluminium covering (powder coated in grey) with the walls being buff brickwork, with areas of brickwork detailing. Window reveals would be dark grey aluminium extrusions.
- 3.6 Plant machinery and solar panels would be located on the roof.
- 3.7 To the frontage of the building (west), there would be an external seating area with benches.

- 3.8 The proposed extension would be wheelchair accessible and served by an internal lift.
- 3.9 Cycle and scooter parking would be accommodated in three areas on site - to the western part of the site near the pedestrian access and also to the southeast part of the site, near the existing pedestrian access onto Camp Road. There would also be a cycle rack to the northern part of the site, adjacent to the existing car park. A total of 31 cycle parking spaces would be provided (16 cycle parking spaces and 15 scooter parking spaces). No additional on-site car parking is proposed.
- 3.10 The proposed extension would be separated from the south boundary of the site by between approximately 4.9m and 7.6m.
- 3.11 The proposal would necessitate the removal of three on-site early mature pollarded Lime trees (Category B), to the southern part of the site. In addition, one autumn flowering Cherry tree would be removed (Category C).
- 3.12 The scheme proposes the planting of nine semi-mature trees to the southern and western site boundaries.
- 3.13 The ground level of the majority of the existing playground to the eastern part of the site would be raised by approximately 300mm to create a level surface flush with the finished ground floor level of the proposed extension.
- 3.14 A hard landscaped path would be installed between the entrance of the new extension and a new pedestrian access onto Camp View. (One of the existing pedestrian accesses onto Camp View would be closed). A herb and flower garden, adjacent to the Octagon, would be incorporated into the landscape design.
- 3.15 The southern boundary of the site would be demarcated with close board fencing to a height of 1.8m. To the western part of the site the boundary would be demarcated with metal railings, including the pedestrian and vehicular access (gates formed from metal railings).
- 3.16 The proposal does not seek to increase the number of pupils attending the school but would facilitate use of the Wilberforce House site by pupils at the Spencer Hill site.
- 3.17 The submission indicates that there would be a 'Stop and Drop' plan for pupil drop off/collection which would involve relocating the

existing yellow zig zag road markings further to the west along Camp View and providing a space along the street for drop offs.

- 3.18 The existing arrangement has one vehicular access and 5 pedestrian points of entry along the boundary. This would be changed to:
- Retain the vehicular access for staff and school deliveries, with a controlled entry gate.
  - Maintain the existing school entrance, but alter it to staff entry only.
  - Relocate the main school entry to the south of the listed building
  - Close the existing entry to the garden space (off Camp View) and close the entry, close to the bend in the road, to the south of the main building being demolished (off Camp Road)
  - Relocate the existing pedestrian access to the playground further east. This will require the relocation of the existing highway barrier.

#### 4. **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.1 14/P0807 - Demolition of existing shed and erection of a single storey wooden outbuilding - Grant Permission subject to Conditions 14/04/2014.
- 4.2 13/P2429 - Listed building consent for erection of a single storey wooden outbuilding involving demolition of existing shed - Grant Listed Building Consent (alteration/extension) 20/02/2014.
- 4.3 12/P2977 - Application for listed building consent for the demolition of toilet and majority of northern elevation and replacement with full height glazed windows and a timber framed canopy, plus erection of single storey brick extension to west elevation and the replacement of roof over north and west elevation - Grant Listed Building Consent (alteration/extension) 21/12/2012.
- 4.4 12/P2974 - Demolition of toilet and majority of northern elevation and replacement with full height glazed windows and a timber framed canopy, plus erection of single storey brick extension to west elevation and the replacement of roof over north and west elevation - Grant Permission subject to Conditions 21/12/2012.
- 4.5 12/P2099 - Application for listed buildings consent for internal alterations including a new opening to the corridor, the removal of two doors, the removal of an internal wall and the replacement of

three internal door with fire doors in connection with the use of the former caretakers flat as additional teaching rooms. - Grant Listed Building Consent (alteration/extension) 21/09/2012.

- 4.6 12/P2098 - Change of use of former caretakers flat to additional teaching rooms involving internal alterations including a new opening to the corridor, the removal of two doors, the removal of an internal wall and the replacement of three internal doors with fire doors. - Grant Permission subject to Conditions 21/09/2012.
- 4.7 There are a large number of other planning/listed building applications prior to 2008 as well as a number of tree works applications on the site, however these are not considered relevant.

## 5. **CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Site Notice, Press Notice and individual letters to 36 neighbours. 14 letters of objection have been received, however, it should be noted that some of the letters are from multiple individuals and therefore, there have been a total of 53 objections, raising objection on the following grounds:

### Visual impact

- Extensions are too large and will dwarf the existing buildings and block views to the Octagon.
- Harmful impact on the character of the Conservation Area.
- The submitted Heritage Impact Statement fails to assess the significance of the Conservation Area, its character or appearance or detail the impacts thereon.
- The substantial harm caused is not outweighed by the public benefit.
- Existing buildings do not compete with the Octagon but this proposal would overwhelm the Octagon.
- Uncharacteristic urban character.
- The windows are not in keeping with the Quadrant.
- The design is ill-proportioned and sits awkwardly with the Octagon.
- The design of the extension draw no reference from the exceptional Octagon building to which it is attached and appears as an ill-conceived bolt-on addition.
- Construction materials should match the existing Octagon – the contrast is ill-conceived.
- The proposed built form would dominate the space to the south and east of the listed building and erode its setting.
- The contrast in materials between the Octagon and the



proposed extension would exacerbate the dominance of the proposed extension.

- Damage to the skyline as a result of the proposed roofline.
- Proposal would be harmful in views from the adjacent Metropolitan Open Land.
- Proposals will be harmful in views from the Grade II\* Listed Cannizaro Park.
- The test for 'Tall Building' suitability set out in the Core Planning Strategy is not met.
- The submission does not detail why a single storey extension could not provide the desired facilities and therefore weakens any justification for the proposal. Assertion that the extension should be single storey only.
- The proposal would cause substantial harm to the heritage asset for which there is no sufficient justification.
- The assertion by the applicant that the proposals were welcomed at the public meeting is not correct. Instead residents were polite and expressed support for some form of development but were concerned over the size of the proposals.
- Suggestion that ground floor should be subterranean to minimize the height of the building.
- Protected trees are likely to be lost.
- Gable to south elevation is inappropriate and damaging to the Listed Building.

#### Highway issues

- Increase in pupil numbers will result in an increase in traffic movements, with knock on impacts for congestion and highway safety, particularly child safety.
- There is no guarantee that pupil numbers will not increase as a result of the proposal.
- Urge the Council to ensure that the pupil numbers and use of the auditorium are controlled by legal agreement.
- Cars already park on the grass verges; this proposal will exacerbate this.
- The Transport Statement does not take account of pupils at Spencer House using the proposed facilities and therefore is seriously flawed as there would be a greater level of use and traffic movements as a result.
- Concerns that proposed 'Stop and Drop' plan would actually increase congestion and create bottlenecks, particularly as it is informal and other drivers using the road network would not conform to (or even be aware of) this informal plan.
- The submission states that there is no intention to increase

pupil numbers. However, with all the additional facilities there are concerns over this and it should be the subject of a legally enforceable agreement.

- Traffic and congestion throughout construction process – suggestion that staff do not park nearby, deliveries are only accepted in off peak hours, staff being assigned to control contractor vehicle operations and deliveries and work with parents to prevent traffic chaos.
- Suggestion that an off-road drop off area be created to reduce congestion.
- A reversal of the existing one-way system would only worsen the existing gridlock.
- Additional vehicles looking to park nearby to the site for extra curricular activities will deprive users of the Common and residents from finding parking spaces.

#### Residential amenity

- Children already make a lot of noise throughout the day, this would increase it to an extent that it would be intolerable.
- The building will be let in the evenings and the increased noise will be disturbing, particularly by teenage parties.
- Overshadowing to the area in general.

5.2 25 letters of support have been received, expressing support for the following reasons:

- Design is high quality and sympathetic to existing building.
- The proposal will enhance the listed building.
- Little impact on surrounding housing.
- Only a small increase in traffic.
- Improved energy efficiency.
- The existing accommodation needs improving and the works will enhance the school and the quality of education offered.
- If the improvement works are not carried out then the school may fall behind others and parents will have to send children to non-fee paying schools putting a higher demand on education infrastructure.

5.3 Following amendments to the scheme on 09/05/2018 and re-consultation, a further 16 letters of objection have been received (N.B. One of these letters represents the views of 32 individuals and one represents the views of 2 individuals, giving a total of 103 in total), objecting on the following grounds:

- The amendments are an improvement but the fact remains

that a big modern hall would be erected adjacent to this iconic Listed Building, which will harm the Conservation Area.

- The pitched roof would appear squat and awkward.
- Overly dominant appearance.
- Given that the school is available only to private pupils reduces any potential public benefit.
- The depth of the extension has increased, creating an adverse visual impact.
- The proposals remain two-storey which is of concern.
- The Conservation Area Character Assessment states that it: *“should be preserved in its current form”* but this would not be the case.
- The intended public benefit is not fully articulated.
- We expect to see a detailed explanation of what the public and educational benefits are in having a two-storey extension over a single storey extension.
- Query whether a two-storey performance hall is necessary for 4 to 8 year olds, or whether it would simply benefit parents watching performances.
- Suggestion that two classrooms be used for performance space in a single storey extension.
- The Transport Statement remains flawed because it wrongly assumes that parking spaces in the Causeway and on West Side Common will be used by parents dropping off or picking up.
- The Council has not secured a guarantee by way of legal agreement that pupil numbers will not increase.
- Proposal would cause substantial harm to the heritage asset which is not justified.
- Overshadowing to Octagon buildings.
- Creeping urbanization.
- Increased air pollution.
- The proposal is not suitable for this rural area.

5.4 Following amendments to the scheme on 09/05/2018 and re-consultation, a further 35 letters of support have been received (58 in total), expressing support for the following reasons:

- The improved facilities will be beneficial to the school.
- The double height performing arts centre will be of particular benefit.
- The plans include tree planting which is positive.
- The existing buildings are outdated.
- Amendments to the scheme are an improvement.

- High quality design which will also be more sustainable.
- Additional natural light in classrooms is a huge benefit.
- Development is long overdue.
- Traffic would not be worsened.
- There would be no adverse impact on neighbours.
- Building works will be inconvenient but there is a need to make improvements.
- Proposal will secure the longevity of the school.

#### 5.5 Wimbledon Society:

The proposed development is in the Wimbledon West Conservation Area, with part of the Wilberforce site being a listed building (as set out in application 17/P4184). According to the applicant, the proposal does not intend to increase the number of students but to improve the conditions for the existing pupils and to improve traffic congestion which occurs at times. These are considered to be eminently suitable proposals. The roads surrounding the school on the Wilberforce site, namely Camp Road, Camp View, North View and West Place, while full of character are mostly impassable to larger vehicles. The traffic study submitted with the application is welcome, and should work well on completion of the project but needs to be extended to consider the demolition and construction phases.

The traffic study suggested a much greater use of the school bus, a 'stop and drop' zone, and imposing an informal anti-clockwise traffic direction in the four roads mentioned. This would make conditions safer for the children as crossing the road would not be required, but the implementation of the traffic direction and policing of the stop and drop' zone to minimise queuing has not been clarified.

A survey in the traffic study indicates that there is no great pressure on parking places, but while the temporary building is in use, the school staff will lose their parking places. It would be useful if the traffic study could make allowance for the demolition and construction phase, when builders lorries and trucks will contribute to an increase in the general traffic, and particularly during school start/finish times.

The realistic route for builder's vehicles would be to have all lorries entering and leaving on the road beside the Cannizzaro wall i.e. the one leading to the golf club. There would need to be a 'Turn Left' notice at the junction with West Side Common for all construction vehicles, with a "banksman" stationed there, and

probably a 'No Parking' section beside the alms-houses. This would all need to be agreed with the highway engineers and enshrined in a planning Condition. The Condition will need to be worded appropriately to avoid construction traffic direction being in direct opposition to the flow of parents delivering children.

We would encourage the applicants to agree a comprehensive traffic strategy with the Council to include the construction phase and also make some allowance for the cars of the operatives to be parked.

#### 5.6 Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators:

I respond to your formal statutory consultation on behalf of Wimbledon and Putney Commons Conservators to register our objection to the above proposed development.

Wimbledon and Putney Commons are identified in your Core Planning Strategy as a Publicly Accessible Open Space, Site of Metropolitan Importance, Metropolitan Open Land, a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Special Area of Conservation.

The Conservators have a statutory duty to maintain the Common and to protect and preserve its amenity and natural aspect for the benefit and enjoyment of the public. Conservation of the Commons is a fundamental concern to the Conservators who are wholly committed to maintaining and protecting and preserving this valued and important public open space.

The defining characteristic of the Commons is its openness, and its sense of natural landscape and countryside, enclosed within its boundaries with the city beyond. It is an important part of this character that the fringes of the Commons do not disclose imposing built form, but rather allow any glimpsed buildings to recede into the landscape, with historic views towards particular parts of the urban area protected.

The balance between the open and natural aspect of the Commons and the buildings that surround it, but are largely hidden from it or of a scale and massing that does not compromise the openness, is difficult one to achieve in an urban setting, but it is this balance which is critical to its character, and which must be preserved.

This is particularly important within the 'enclave' of buildings that form the Quadrant. The Commons and other open spaces enclose

the built form and provide a particularly important and intimate relationship with the Commons.

The current development proposals, their size and siting are of such a different bulk, scale and massing, from the existing density of buildings, that the intimacy of the fringes of this part of the Commons will forever be altered to its detriment.

The character of the Common's immediate fringes is varied and where there is a strong interplay between the Commons and the adjacent built areas that adds considerable value to the whole of this Conservation Area. This is particularly important in the Quadrant which acts as a major "gateway" onto Wimbledon Common and has retained a rural "village" aspect in terms of the scale and form of the buildings which is important in terms of its proximity and relationship lying between the Common and Cannizaro Park/Royal Wimbledon Golf Club.

The subject property is situated in the most prominent location in terms of views from the Commons and is already larger in terms of massing and height when compared with other buildings. The proposal to extend the massing and height of the building will only exacerbate its already incongruous form.

Overall the proposals are considered to be intrusive and inappropriate, and detrimental to the integrity, appearance and selling, and the public enjoyment of the Commons. The current proposals harm the appearance and character of the area. Concern is expressed, that if permitted, the proposals would contribute to an unnecessary and gradual erosion of the environmental quality and amenity and character of the fringes of the Commons.

It appears to maximise development potential with inappropriate proposals, at the expense of agreed Conservation area planning requirements and its contribution to the neighbourhood and the locality, and further at the expense of the valuable contribution which the Commons affords to this already densely populated urban area.

The Conservators urge that this proposal be rejected.

5.7 Wimbledon Common West Residents' Association:

I object on behalf of the residents' association to the above planning applications. The aim of the Wimbledon Common West

Residents' Association is to help preserve and enhance the rural atmosphere of the area and this development will do the complete opposite.

We live in a conservation area on the edge of Wimbledon common with lots of characterful old buildings and wonderful vistas.

Because of its height, scale and mass the building will dominate the Grade II listed octagonal building ,the skyline will alter views from around the common and in particular coming from Sunset Road and the nature of the design will fundamentally change the atmosphere and setting of Camp Road.

The proposed building is industrial in its scale and is totally unsuited to the area. Its height, mass and position will have a terrible effect on the conservation area in general and in particular.

We are by no means "nimby" in our attitude. We co-exist and even support the golf clubs, The Study, Cannizaro House and the Fox & Grapes in our area. Over many years we have had a lot of problems with the mothers of children at The Study who have parked, and continue to park in an anti-social manner when delivering and collecting children from the school. A few years ago Stephen Hammond MP got involved in the difficulties created and he, together with Paul Atie and me, walked the area and talked to the school about parking control. The increased use of the building once completed will add further traffic problems to an already congested area.

Please do not allow this development on this scale in this location

5.8 Historic England:

This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

5.9 Climate Change Officer:

- The BRUKL output documentation submitted for the proposed development indicates that it should achieve a 35.8% improvement in CO2 emissions on Part L 2013. This meets the 35% improvement over Part L required for major developments under Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015) and is therefore policy compliant.

- Furthermore the energy and sustainability statement submitted for the development indicates that it will achieve a 23% saving in CO2 emissions through fabric performance with the remainder secured through the proposed use of a solar PV. I am satisfied that, in the absence of an existing heat network and due to the distance of the site from identified district heating opportunity areas, this approach is compliant with the Mayor's energy hierarchy approach outlined in Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2015) and Policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy (2011).
- The application includes a robust assessment of examining the risk of overheating and demonstrates compliance with the Mayors cooling hierarchy.
- This application robustly demonstrates compliance with local and regional sustainability policies.

**CONDITION:**

'Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no part of the development hereby approved shall be used or occupied until a Post-Construction Review Certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment or other equivalent assessors confirming that the non-residential development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good', and evidence demonstrating that the development has achieved not less than a 35% improvement in CO2 emissions reduction compared to Part L 2013 regulations, has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'

**INFORMATIVE:**

Carbon emissions evidence requirements for Post Construction stage assessments must provide:

- Detailed documentary evidence confirming the Target Emission Rate (TER), Building Emission Rate (BER) and percentage improvement of BER over TER based on 'As Built' BRUKL model outputs; **AND**
- A copy of the Building Regulations Output Document from the approved software. The output documents must be based on the 'as built' stage of analysis and must account for any changes to the specification during construction.
- A BREEAM post-construction certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good'

**REASON:**

To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.2 of the



London Plan 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

5.10 Biodiversity Officer:

Merton Maps identifies the following:

The land does not have any specific environmental designations, however is adjacent to the following:

- Wimbledon Common SSSI (CM13, DM02)
- Wimbledon Common and Putney Heath and Cannizaro Park SINC's (CS13, DM02)
- Wimbledon Common and Royal Wimbledon Golf Club Open Spaces (CS13, DM01)
- Wimbledon Common MOL (CS13, DM01)
- Wimbledon Common Green Corridor (CS13, DM02)
- Green Chain (CS13, DM01)

The applicant has submitted an Ecology Report which details the results of a Phase 1 habitat survey and protected species walkover survey of the site completed on 21 November 2016. The methodology and findings of this are considered appropriate.

Please note the following recommendations from the report. Should you be minded to recommend approval for this application, suitably worded conditions should be included to ensure these are incorporated:

*“4.4 Any vegetation clearance required to enable development should be completed outside of the bird breeding period in the months of September to February, or immediately following confirmation by an ecologist that breeding birds are absent from the area at other times.*

*4.5 The following enhancements should be considered to enhance the long-term ecological value of the site.*

- *Incorporate bird boxes into the scheme, including house sparrow terrace boxes.*
- *Incorporate wildlife friendly planting in to future landscaping proposals.”*

I would also recommend adding Informative 14:

*Demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use, or who kills, injures or disturbs bats, obstructs access to bat roosts or damages or disturbs bat roosts, even when unoccupied by bats, is guilty of an offence*

*under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Buildings and trees should be inspected for bird nests and bat roosts prior to demolition or felling by an appropriately qualified person. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice.*

5.11 Local Education Authority (LBM):

This application proposes the expansion of an existing education facility, which is supported by London Plan policy 3.18, Merton Core Strategy policy CS11, and Merton Sites and Policies plan policy DMC2.

5.12 Highways:

Highways comments are

H1, H2, H4, H5, H10, H13, INF8, INF9 and INF12

Highways must be contacted for CDM plan and licences for construction works

5.13 Transport Planning:

The site is within an area with a PTAL of 0, just outside of the 1a (very poor) area. A PTAL 1a rating suggests that only a few journeys could be conveniently made by public transport.

The Study is split over two sites, Wilberforce House and Spencer House. Wilberforce House accommodates Reception to Year 3 and Years 4 to 6 -attends Spencer House. This application refers to Wilberforce House only.

It is proposed that part of the existing one-storey building is to be demolished. A new 2-storey extension will be built in its place. The extension will provide 6 classrooms, a library, a 212 seat hall, a new entrance and staff offices.

The proposed development will have the same number of children and staff as there is at present. There is however a proposed performance area which will increase the traffic at certain times.

The applicant proposes to develop a stop and drop strategy to overcome an illegal, clockwise, one-way system currently utilised during school AM and PM peak hours.

The submitted drawing illustrates the highway changes that would

be required due to re-location of the pedestrian entrance. If the 'stop and drop' strategy were brought into place it would affect a CPZ space.

#### Car Parking

The car parking provision on site will not be changing and no additional spaces introduced as the number of staff is remaining the same.

#### Cycle parking

The proposal includes 3 Sheffield stands which give 6 cycle spaces (2 spaces per stand) and an additional 25 cycle spaces which satisfies the London Plan.

#### Travel Plan

A Travel Plan is submitted by The Study as part of the planning application.

#### Parking Concessions

Parking concession to parents with young children (not permits) only applies for a maximum of 10 minutes either side of the start and finishing times. (Refer to: Paul Atie's letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 2017.)

Parking permits are not issued for the Parents or Staff at the school.

**Summary:** With the proposed mitigation works the development can be accommodated without detriment to vehicle flows and road safety on the surrounding highway network.

**Recommendation:** Raise no objection subject to:

- There is a high demand for parking in this area. The parking bay can only be removed subject to statutory consultation and cabinet member approval.
- The details of the travel plan should be subject to detailed agreement and monitoring over a five year period. A sum of £2,000 (two thousand pounds) is sought to meet the costs of monitoring the travel plan over five years, secured via the Section106 process.
- A demolition / Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management Plan compliant with Chapter 8 of the Road Signs Manual for temporary Works) should be submitted for approval before commencement of work.
- Car parking and cycle parking maintained.

#### 5.14 Environmental Health:

Further to your consultation in relation to the above planning application I have considered the information submitted available on planning explorer.

Should you be minded to approve the application then I would recommend the following planning conditions:-

- 1) Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (10 minutes), from any new plant/machinery from residential/commercial use associated with the development shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with the closest residential property.
- 2) Any external lighting shall be positioned and angled to prevent any light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary.
- 3) A construction management plan shall be submitted, agreed and implemented throughout the duration of the development.

Reason: To protect the amenities of future occupiers and those in the local vicinity.

#### 6. **POLICY CONTEXT**

6.1 The key policies of most relevance to this proposal are as follows:

##### NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2012):

Relevant sections:

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 4  | Promoting Sustainable Transport                   |
| 7  | Requiring Good Design                             |
| 8  | Promoting healthy communities                     |
| 12 | Conserving and enhancing the historic environment |

##### London Plan (2016)

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 3.16 | Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure    |
| 3.18 | Education facilities                                   |
| 5.1  | Climate change mitigation                              |
| 5.2  | Minimising carbon dioxide emissions                    |
| 5.3  | Sustainable design and construction                    |
| 5.7  | Renewable energy                                       |
| 6.3  | Assessing effects of development on transport capacity |
| 6.9  | Cycling  |
| 6.10 | Walking  |

6.13	Parking
7.2	An inclusive environment
7.3	Designing out crime
7.4	Local character
7.6	Architecture
7.14	Improving air quality
7.15	Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate landscapes
7.17	Metropolitan open land
7.19	Biodiversity and access to nature
7.21	Trees and woodlands

#### Adopted Merton Core Planning Strategy (July 2011)

CS11	Infrastructure
CS13	Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture
CS14	Design
CS15	Climate Change
CS18	Active Transport
CS19	Public Transport
CS20	Parking, Servicing and Delivery

#### Adopted Merton Sites and Policies Plan and Policies Map (July 2014)

DM C1	Community facilities
DM C2	Education for children and young people
DM O1	Open Space
DM O2	Nature Conservation, Trees, hedges and landscape features
DM D1	Urban design and the public realm
DM D2	Design considerations in all developments
DM D4	Managing heritage assets
DM EP2	Reducing and mitigating noise
DM T1	Support for sustainable transport and active travel
DM T2	Transport impacts of development
DM T3	Car parking and servicing standards
DM T5	Access to the Road Network

#### Other guidance:

National Planning Policy Guidance (2014)

Noise Policy Statement for England - DEFRA 2010

Wimbledon West Conservation Area Character Assessment 2004

## 7. **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### 7.1 The key planning considerations are:

- Principle of development
- Provision of education facilities
- Impact upon the character and appearance of the West Wimbledon Conservation area, visual amenity, the impact on the historic character and fabric of the Grade II Listed Building and the impact on the setting of other heritage assets
- Impact on trees
- Impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Transport and highways issues
- Sustainability
- Flooding and site drainage
- Biodiversity
- Temporary educational facilities

### 7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 Paragraph 72 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the Government attaches great importance to ensuring that there is a sufficient choice of school places to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local Planning Authorities should take a proactive approach to meeting this requirement and should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.

7.2.2 London Plan Policy 3.18 sets out that development proposals which enhance education and skills provision will be supported. Including new build, expansion of existing or change of use to educational purposes. The policy goes on to set out that development proposals which maximise the extended or multiple use of educational facilities for community or recreational use should be encouraged. The policy also supports development proposals that encourage co-location of services between schools, in order to maximise land use, reduce costs and develop the extended school's offer.

7.2.3 Core Planning Strategy Policy CS 11 and Policy DM C2 of the Sites and Policies Plan 2014 states that development proposals for new schools and/or improved education facilities for young people will be supported, particularly where new facilities are required to provide additional school places in an area to meet an identified shortfall in supply.

7.2.4 Therefore, in general terms the provision of education facilities are supported in policy terms.

7.2.5 This benefit must be weighed against the impact on the character of the Conservation Area and this historic character and fabric of the Grade II Listed Building.

### 7.3 Provision of education facilities

7.3.1 As set out above the expansion of educational facilities is supported in policy terms.

7.3.2 The school has identified a need for additional accommodation to provide an enhanced quality of education.

7.3.3 The provision of a double height hall and additional classrooms is considered to be a reasonable, proportionate requirement to improve the facilities at the school. Officers consider that there is a clear public benefit to improving the facilities at the school, including the double height performance space. The fact that the school is fee paying does not negate this public benefit, as it still provides an education role within the borough.

7.3.4 However, this benefit must be balanced against the other aspects of the scheme.

### 7.4 Impact upon the character and appearance of the West Wimbledon Conservation area, the impact on the historic character and fabric of the Grade II Listed Building and the impact on the setting of other heritage assets

7.4.1 London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Core Strategy policy CS14 and SPP Policies DMD2 and DMD3 require well designed proposals that will respect the appearance, materials, scale, bulk, proportions and character of the original building and their surroundings. Policy 7.6 sets out a number of key objectives for the design of new buildings including that they should be of the highest architectural quality, they should be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm, and buildings should have details that complement, but not necessarily replicate the local architectural character. Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy states that all development needs to be designed to respect, reinforce and enhance local character and contribute to Merton's sense of place and identity. This will be achieved in various ways including by

promoting high quality design and providing functional spaces and buildings.

#### 7.4.2 Layout

7.4.3 The extensions are focused to the southern part of the site in the position of existing single storey accommodation.

7.4.4 Critically, the extensions are set back from the Octagon building, ensuring that this element of the building remains prominent and the proposed extensions do not compete for dominance.

7.4.5 The southern building line has been pulled in following officer comments and a greater separation to the boundary. This revised layout is considered to respect the spacious character of the surroundings to a reasonable degree.

7.4.6 In terms of layout, the design approach is considered to be appropriate.

#### 7.4.7 Design and massing

7.4.8 The design and massing has been carefully formulated in order to respect the character of the existing Grade II Listed Building, by creating a subordinate extension, with contrasting materials and form which ensure that the new build does not appear as a contrived pastiche but instead highlights the historic aspect of the building by creating a contrast between the new and the old.

7.4.9 This contemporary form is considered to both respect the character of the existing building and surrounding area but also to provide high quality accommodation for the school.

7.4.10 The use of pitched roofs sloping away from the boundaries minimises the external visual impact of the building. The south elevation is fairly plain, however, this assists in ensuring that the Octagon building remains the prominent element of built form on the site and some visual break up of the flank walls is provided through four sets of windows.

7.4.11 An important factor in the assessment is the impact on views from the nearby common land, which is also classified as Metropolitan Open Land (MOL). Policy DM O1 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 reason of siting materials or design. From the common land, to the



west of the site, there are views into the site. The Octagon would remain the prominent element in this view but would be against the backdrop of the proposed extension. This would change the view from the common land, as currently, the Octagon has space around it and in the proposed scenario the space to the side of the Octagon would be infilled. However, the existing built form to the edges of the common is varied, with significantly taller buildings abutting the common land in the vicinity. Whilst there would be some change to the views from the common, it is considered that this would not cause material harm to the views from the common land or MOL.

7.4.12 It is noted that many objectors are concerned that the proposed extension is two-storeys in height. This increased mass will have an impact on visual amenity but it is considered that this impact would be justified (see section below on 'heritage issues').

#### 7.4.13 Hard and soft landscaping

7.4.14 The proposal would involve building over some of the existing green space around the existing school buildings. However, the proposed layout would retain a reasonable amount of space to the site boundaries and would incorporate tree planting to the southern boundary which would soften the visual impact of the development.

7.4.15 The hard landscaping to the frontage of the proposed extension would assist in creating a legible scheme and would assist in unifying the built form across the site.

7.4.16 A line of tree planting to the boundaries is proposed which will assist in softening the visual impact of the proposed extensions to some degree.

#### 7.4.17 Heritage issues

7.4.18 The NPPF advises local authorities to take into account the following points when drawing up strategies for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. The following considerations should be taken into account when determining planning applications.

- The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and preserving them in a viable use consistent with their conservation; the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that the conservation of the historic environment can bring;

- The desirability of new development in making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness;
- Opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.

7.4.19 LPAs should also identify and assess the significance of a heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal and should take this assessment into account when considering the impact upon the heritage asset. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

7.4.20 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out at section 66 that In considering whether to grant planning permission [or permission in principle] for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

7.4.20 Sites and policies plan policy DM D4 requires:

b) All development proposals associated with the borough's heritage assets or their setting will be expected to demonstrate, within a Heritage Statement, how the proposal conserves and where appropriate enhances the significance of the asset in terms of its individual architectural or historic interest and its setting.

7.4.21 It is noted that neighbours have raised concern with the detail of the submitted Heritage Statement. However, officers consider that sufficient information is available to inform a decision.

7.4.22 The existing heritage asset (the Grade II Listed Building and Conservation Area) represent heritage assets of significant weight.

7.4.23 The proposed extensions would be set back behind the main listed building and would not encroach physically onto the Octagon building. It is noted that the extensions would be two-storey but they would be set down lower than the Octagon building with a subordinate ridge height.

7.4.24 The proposal would result in a significant addition of built form across the site. However, the design and layout of the proposal is such that the Octagon would be retained as the most prominent element of built form on the site.

7.4.25 The additional bulk and massing proposed, whilst being set back and subordinate in height to the Octagon, would have an impact on the heritage assets (the existing Grade II Listed Building, the wider Conservation Area and, to some degree, the setting of Cannizaro Park).

7.4.26 In terms of the impact on the setting of Cannizaro Park, there are currently views of part of the roof of the Octagon from the park, these would be largely obscured by the proposed development. However, this visual impact is not considered to cause material harm to the setting of the Listed Park as the impact would be marginal.

7.4.27 The NPPG sets out guidance as to how to assess if substantial harm is caused to a heritage asset:

“What matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset. As the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear, significance derives not only from a heritage asset’s physical presence, but also from its setting.

Whether a proposal causes substantial harm will be a judgment for the decision taker, having regard to the circumstances of the case and the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset’s significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting.

While the impact of total destruction is obvious, partial destruction is likely to have a considerable impact but, depending on the circumstances, it may still be less than substantial harm or conceivably not harmful at all, for example, when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. Similarly, works that are moderate or minor in scale are likely to cause less than substantial harm or no harm at all. However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm.”

7.4.28 The existing building would not be demolished but its setting would be affected by the additional built form. Although the design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable its scale is such that the impact is considered to amount to less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building.

7.4.29 Therefore, it is necessary for there to be public benefits which are of sufficient value to outweigh the harm caused.

7.4.30 Public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework. Public benefits should flow from the proposed development. They should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and should not just be a private benefit. However, benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.

7.4.31 Public Benefits:

- The provision of large, better lit, better ventilated classrooms is a clear benefit to the education services that the school provides.
- A double height performance space will improve the offering of the school and has the potential to inspire the pupils. The fact that the pupils are only aged 4-8 is not considered to negate this benefit as suggested by objectors.
- The proposal will ensure that the existing school hall no longer is required to serve a multitude of purposes, thus improving the functioning of the school.
- The school is a private, fee paying school but is open to the general public and therefore, this does not negate the public benefit created by the proposal.

7.4.32 These public benefits are considered to be sufficiently articulated and justified within the application and are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm caused to the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

7.4.33 The proposal is, therefore, considered to be acceptable in terms of its visual impact and impact on heritage assets, in terms of both the planning application (17/P4202) and the Listed Building Consent application (17/P4184).

## 7.5 Impact on trees

- 7.5.1 The site is within a Conservation Area wherein trees are protected. The proposal would result in the loss of three mature trees and one small cherry tree. Whilst the loss of trees is regrettable, the scheme proposes replacement planting which would mitigate for this loss and as such no objection is raised. Conditions are recommended to ensure that retained trees are protected throughout the construction process.

## 7.6 Impact upon neighbouring amenity

- 7.6.1 London Plan policies 7.14 and 7.15 seek to improve air quality or be at least air quality neutral and reduce and manage the noise environment. SPP policy DM D2 states that proposals must be designed to ensure that they would not have an undue negative impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, quality of living conditions, privacy, visual intrusion and noise.

### 7.6.2 Built form and massing

- 7.6.3 The separation distances from the site boundaries are such that there would be no material harm caused to neighbouring amenity.

- 7.6.4 There is potential for disruption throughout the construction process. However, conditions are recommended to minimise this impact as far as reasonably practicable.

### 7.6.5 Noise

- 7.6.6 There is no indication that noise levels emanating within the building would be increased as a result of the proposal. External areas would generate a similar level of noise to that currently. Notwithstanding this, a condition is recommended to ensure that plant noise is minimised. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of noise generation.

### 7.6.7 Lighting

- 7.6.8 Lighting across the site has the potential to adversely affect the character of the area and the impact on residential amenity and as such a condition is recommended to ensure that details of lighting are provided (which can then be assessed by officers).

#### 7.6.9 Air quality

7.6.10 The NPFF recognises reducing pollution as being one of its core planning principles. It further indicates that LPA's should focus on whether the development is an acceptable use of land, and the impact of the use.

7.6.11 London Plan Policy 7.14 provides strategic guidance specific to air quality. It seeks to minimise exposure to existing poor air quality and make provision to address local problems. This is reflected by local policy, whereby the Core Strategy identifies the strategy to reduce air pollution through Policies CS18-20. The entire borough has been declared as an Air Quality Management Area.

7.6.12 The day to day operation of the school results in traffic movements which have an impact on air quality. However, no additional pupils are proposed and subject to a Travel Plan, there would be sustainable methods of travel. Therefore, the impact on air quality would be controlled and would be acceptable.

7.6.13 The construction process has the potential to adversely impact on air quality and a condition to secure a Construction Management Plan is recommended to minimise these impacts.

#### 7.7 Transport and highways issues

7.7.1 London Plan policy 6.3 requires that development proposals ensure that impacts on transport capacity and the transport network at both corridor and local level are fully assessed. Development should not adversely affect safety on the transport network. Similarly Core Strategy policy CS20 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, on street parking or traffic management.

7.7.2 London Plan policies 6.9 and 6.10 seek to ensure that developments provide integrated and accessible cycle facilities and high quality pedestrian environments while policy 6.13 sets out maximum parking standards. The policies provide an overarching framework for decision making.

7.7.3 The site is located in a low PTAL area, accessed by relatively narrow roads. There are currently issues of congestion at peak times.

- 7.7.4 The overall number of pupils would not increase and this is recommended to be controlled by way of condition, meaning that the school would need to apply for planning permission for a future increase in pupil numbers. However, there would be increased activity due to the proposed performance area which would increase the traffic at certain times.
- 7.7.5 There is currently an informal and unenforceable one way system around the surrounding roads, associated with the school. The scheme proposes to develop a stop and drop strategy to overcome this one-way system currently utilised during school AM and PM peak hours.
- 7.7.6 The submitted drawing illustrates the highway changes that would be required due to re-location of the pedestrian entrance. If the 'stop and drop' strategy were brought into place it would affect a CPZ space.
- 7.7.7 The car parking provision on site will not be changing and no additional spaces introduced as the number of staff is remaining the same. Therefore, no objection is raised.
- 7.7.8 The proposal includes 3 Sheffield stands which give 6 cycle spaces (2 spaces per stand) and an additional 25 cycle spaces which satisfies the London Plan. Therefore, no objection is raised.
- 7.7.9 A Travel Plan is submitted by the school as part of the planning application, the details of which are recommended to be controlled by condition. It is noted that the Transport Planner has suggested a legal agreement. However, in this instance a condition would provide sufficient assurance.
- 7.7.10 Cycle parking would be provided in line with London Plan guidance and is recommended to be controlled by way of condition.
- 7.7.11 The Council's Transport Planner concludes that with the proposed mitigation works the development can be accommodated without detriment to vehicle flows and road safety on the surrounding highway network.

## 7.8 Sustainability

- 7.8.1 Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of London Plan requires that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Merton's Core Planning

Strategy Policy CS15 Climate Change (parts a-d) requires new developments to make effective use of resources and materials, minimise water use and CO2 emissions.

- 7.8.2 An energy statement has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the scheme has been designed to achieve a 35.8% improvement on Part L 2013, in accordance with London and Local Plan policy requirements (the requirement is for a 35% reduction).
- 7.8.3 Evidence has been submitted to confirm that the scheme has been designed to achieve BREEAM 'Very Good' level.
- 7.8.4 The proposal would meet the relevant sustainability targets, subject to condition and the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of climate change and sustainability, in accordance with Policy CS15 of the Core Planning Strategy 2011.

#### 7.9 Flooding and site drainage

- 7.9.1 Policies DM F1 and DM F2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan and policy CS.16 of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that development will not have an adverse impact on flooding and that there would be no adverse impacts on essential community infrastructure. The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at low risk of flooding from fluvial flooding.
- 7.9.2 Notwithstanding the fact that the site is not in an area prone to flooding, it is necessary for the development to include details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System and demonstrate a sustainable approach to the management of surface water on site.
- 7.9.3 There would be an increase in impermeable area across the site. The application is accompanied by a Drainage Statement, incorporating a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme which demonstrates that runoff rates would be reduced and is considered to be a reasonable approach to minimizing surface water runoff at the site. This matter is recommended to be controlled by way of condition.

#### 7.10 Biodiversity

- 7.10.1 The site itself has some biodiversity potential due to the existing built form, potentially suitable for bats, and the nearby common land. The applicant has submitted an Ecology Report, which concludes that there would be no adverse impacts to biodiversity



subject to suitable mitigation measures, which can be controlled by way of condition.

- 7.10.2 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on biodiversity and would comply with Policy 7.19 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS13 of the Core Planning Strategy 2011 and Policy DM O2 of the Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

#### 7.11 Temporary educational facilities

- 7.11.1 During construction, the existing extension will not be available for educational activities, and as such temporary educational facilities will need to be provided to ensure the continued education of the pupils during construction works. Without these facilities, the construction cannot be undertaken as the continuous provision of education is a necessary requirement. Schedule 2, Part 4, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) confirms that the following can be considered permitted development and therefore does not require the benefit of planning permission:

***“The provision on land of buildings, moveable structures, works, plant or machinery required temporarily in connection with and for the duration of operations being or to be carried out on, in, under or over that land or on land adjoining that land”.***

- 7.11.2 As the temporary educational facilities are required in connection with the construction of the new wing, their installation constitutes permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 4, Class A of the GPDO and therefore does not require planning permission.

### 8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 The application site is 0.47 hectares and therefore does not require consideration under Schedule 2 development under the The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.
- 8.1.2 The need for Environmental Impact Assessment as part of the proposed development has been assessed using the criteria in the above regulations. This assessment has concluded that there is no requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment as part of this planning application.

## **9. LOCAL FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **9.1 Community Infrastructure Levy**

- 9.1.2 The scheme is not liable to pay CIL as it is a health and education use, which is CIL exempt.

## **10. Conclusion**

- 10.1 The proposed development would improve education facilities at the school, which is a public benefit and supported in principle.
- 10.2 The additional built form would have an impact on the character of the Conservation Area and Listed Building but this impact is considered to be justified and acceptable.
- 10.3 The impact on residential amenity would be acceptable.
- 10.4 Subject to conditions the impact on traffic would be acceptable.
- 10.5 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in planning terms and in terms of the concurrent Listed Building Consent application.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Grant planning permission and Listed Building Consent subject to the following conditions:

### **Conditions:**

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be commenced not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 702-WH-PL-001 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-002 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-003 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-004 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-010 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-011 Rev 04, 702-WH-PL-012 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-050 Rev 00, 702-WH-PL-100 Rev 06, 702-WH-PL-101 Rev 05, 702-WH-PL-201 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-300 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-301 Rev 03, 702-WH-PL-305 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-306 Rev 01, 702-WH-PL-307 Rev 02, 702-WH-PL-400 Rev 02, W-L01 Rev Q, W-L03 Rev H, W-

L12 Rev B, W-L20 Rev G and 25719-100 Version 2.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. Material samples.
4. D10 External Lighting
5. Landscaping Implementation
6. A Demolition / Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management Plan compliant with Chapter 8 of the Road Signs Manual for temporary Works) should be submitted for approval before commencement of work.
7. Car parking and cycle parking maintained.
8. Any vegetation clearance required to enable development shall be completed outside of the bird breeding period in the months of September to February, or immediately following confirmation by an ecologist that breeding birds are absent from the area at other times.
9. H1 – New Vehicular Access
10. H2 – Vehicle Access
11. H4 – Provision of cycle parking.
12. H5 – Visibility splays
13. H10 – Construction vehicles – washdown.
14. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, no part of the development hereby approved shall be used or occupied until a Post-Construction Review Certificate issued by the Building Research Establishment or other equivalent assessors confirming that the non-residential development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good', and evidence demonstrating that the development has achieved not less than a 35% improvement in CO2 emissions reduction compared to Part L 2013 regulations, has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high standard of sustainability and makes efficient use of resources and to comply the

following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2011 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

15. Noise levels, (expressed as the equivalent continuous sound level) LAeq (10 minutes), from any new plant/machinery from residential/commercial use associated with the development shall not exceed LA90-10dB at the boundary with the closest residential property.

Reason: Having regard to the impact on neighbouring amenity and to accord with Policies DM D2, DM EP2 and DM EP4 of the Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Policy 7.15 of the London Plan 2015.

16. No development approved by this permission, other than demolition works, shall be commenced until a detailed 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 local planning authority and in consultation with Thames Water. The drainage scheme will dispose of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) in accordance with drainage hierarchy contained within the London Plan Policy (5.12, 5.13 and SPG) 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 and the method employed to attenuate flows to sewer or main river. Appropriate measures must be taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
- ii. Include a timetable for its implementation;
- iii. Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime;

Reason: To reduce the risk of surface and foul water flooding to the proposed development and future users, and ensure surface water and foul flood risk does not increase offsite in accordance with Merton's policies CS16, DMF2 and the London Plan policy 5.13.

17. H08 Travel Plan.
18. Tree Protection
19. Restriction on increasing pupil numbers

## INFORMATIVES

### 1. INFORMATIVE

Carbon emissions evidence requirements for Post Construction stage assessments must provide:

- Detailed documentary evidence confirming the Target Emission Rate (TER), Building Emission Rate (BER) and percentage improvement of BER over TER based on 'As Built' BRUKL model outputs; **AND**
- A copy of the Building Regulations Output Document from the approved software. The output documents must be based on the 'as built' stage of analysis and must account for any changes to the specification during construction.
- A BREEAM post-construction certificate demonstrating that the development has achieved a BREEAM rating of not less than the standards equivalent to 'Very Good'

### 2. INFORMATIVE

Demolition of buildings and tree felling should avoid the bird nesting and bat roosting seasons. Anyone who takes, damages or destroys the nest of any wild bird whilst that nest is in use, or who kills, injures or disturbs bats, obstructs access to bat roosts or damages or disturbs bat roosts, even when unoccupied by bats, is guilty of an offence under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Buildings and trees should be inspected for bird nests and bat roosts prior to demolition or felling by an appropriately qualified person. If bats are found, Natural England should be contacted for advice.

3. INF8 – Construction of Accesses.
4. INF9 – Works on the Public Highway.
5. INF12 – Works affecting the public highway.
6. INFORMATIVE  
The parking bay can only be removed subject to statutory consultation and cabinet member approval.
7. INFORMATIVE

The following enhancements should be considered to enhance the long-term ecological value of the site.

- Incorporate bird boxes into the scheme, including house sparrow terrace boxes.
- Incorporate wildlife friendly planting in to future landscaping proposals.

8. INFORMATIVE

Highways must be contacted for CDM plan and licences for construction works

9. INFORMATIVE

You are advised to contact the Council's Highways team on 020 8545 3700 before undertaking any works within the Public Highway to obtain the necessary approvals and/or licences. Please be advised that there is a further charge for this work. If your application falls within a Controlled Parking Zone this has further costs involved and can delay the application by 6 to 12 months.

10. INFORMATIVE

No surface water runoff should discharge onto the public highway including the public footway or highway. When it is proposed to connect to a public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required (contact no. 0845 850 2777).

11. INFORMATIVE

This planning permission contains certain conditions precedent that state 'before development commences' or 'prior to commencement of any development' (or similar). As a result these must be discharged prior to ANY development activity taking place on site. Commencement of development without having complied with these conditions will make any development unauthorised and possibly subject to enforcement action such as a Stop Notice.

---

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

And for Listed Building Consent [Click Here](#)

Please note these web pages may be slow to load