

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
15th July 2021

AGENDA ITEM 9

| <u>UPRN</u> | <u>APPLICATION NO.</u> | <u>DATE VALID</u> |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------|
| | 20/P3608 | 29/10/2020 |
| Address/Site: | 67 Clarendon Road Colliers Wood SW19 2DU | |
| Ward: | Colliers Wood | |
| Proposal: | REDEVELOPMENT OF SITE INVOLVING THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OFFICE BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF NEW TWO-STOREY MEDICAL CENTRE AND REPLACEMENT MERTON VISION CHARITY FACILITIES, WITH NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS, CAR AND CYCLE PARKING, DRAINAGE, LANDSCAPING, EXTERNAL STORE AND BIN STORES. | |
| Drawing No.'s: | 909-MP-01 Rev F (Landscape Masterplan); 7831-P107 Rev C (Proposed First Floor Plan); 7831-P109 Rev B (Elevations 01/02); 7831-P110 Rev B (Elevations 02/02); 7831-P118 (Proposed First Floor CCTV & Obscure Glazing Location); 7831-P117 (Proposed Ground Floor CCTV & Obscure Glazing Location); 7831-P106 Rev D (Proposed Ground Floor with Context); 1912049-03 Rev C (Proposed Layout); 7831-P108 Rev D (Proposed Roof Plan); 7831-P113 Rev A (Artistic Impression – Clarendon Road); 7831-P116 Rev A (Artistic Impression – Clarendon Road Access). | |
| Documents: | Arboricultural assessment & method statement (3 rd March 2020) ref 20036-AA-AN by Barrell tree consultancy; Tree protection plan ref 20036-BT1 by Barrell tree consultancy; Update Preliminary Roost Assessment and Phase 2 Emergence Survey Report (July 2020) by Darwin ecology; Design & Access Statement (September 2020) by Simpson Hilder Associates Limited; Design & Access Statement Addendum (June 2021) by Simpson Hilder Associates; Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (October 2020) by ECOSA Ltd; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (July 2020) by ECOSA Ltd; Transport Statement (02/07/2020) by Motion; Highways Repose (17/06/2021) by Motion; Supplementary Landscape Information Rev A (September 2020) by Indigo; Energy and Sustainability Statement (29 th June 2021) by JAW sustainability. | |
| Contact Officer: | Catarina Cheung (020 8545 4747) | |

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Permission Subject to Section 106 Obligation or any other enabling agreement, and relevant conditions.

CHECKLIST INFORMATION

- Is a screening opinion required: No
- Is an Environmental Statement required: No
- Has an Environmental Statement been submitted: No
- Press notice: Yes – Majors press notice
- Design Review Panel consulted: Yes
- Number of neighbours consulted: 108
- Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ): Yes, CPZ CW
- PTAL: 3-4
- Archaeological Zone: No
- Conservation Area: No
- Environment (MOL, open space, SINC): No
- Flood Zone: No
- Listed Building: No

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application is being brought to the Planning Applications Committee for determination due to the nature and number of representations.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The existing buildings on the site accommodate Merton Vision (Merton Voluntary Association for the Blind), a charity providing support services and activities for people with a visual impairment.
- 2.2 Merton Vision has a contract with London Borough of Merton (LBM) Social Services to provide rehabilitation and mobility training for people with a visual impairment in Merton, and a contract with LBM Social Services Children's Division and Special Educational Needs Team to provide mobility and independence training for children in the borough who have a visual impairment.
- 2.3 The premises also hosts a number of community outreach programmes and groups, Merton Sports and Social Club for the Visually Impaired and Merton Talking Newspaper have operated from the site.
- 2.4 The main building 67 Clarendon Road sits at the corner of Clarendon Road and Courtney Road. The principal pedestrian entrance is currently accessed from Clarendon Road and vehicular access to a car park from Courtney Road. Emily Villa, 65 Clarendon Road, is sited north of 67 Clarendon Road. There are low level metal railings surrounding the front of the site, lined with a number of trees.
- 2.5 These are former school, and ancillary, buildings built in the early 20th century. The main Alpheia Middle School building, situated to the east of 67 Clarendon Road, was

demolished in the mid-1980s and its site was developed for new homes (MER585/85). The reuse of 65 and 67 Clarendon Road as a 'Centre for the visually handicapped for educational social and rehabilitation purposes' was also established at this time (MER936/85).

- 2.6 The buildings are constructed in the Arts and Crafts style. 67 Clarendon Road is largely single storey with a two storey element at the far south-western corner (providing 2x offices on the first floor). It is constructed in red brick with a tiled roof. The roof of the building involves a mix of hip and gable treatments that is typical of asymmetric Arts and Crafts themes.
- 2.7 Emily Villa is a two storey detached building with single storey additions to its (northern) side. It is also constructed in red brick with slate roof tiles in the Arts and Crafts Style, as set out in Built Heritage Scoping Report, this building was built as a private residence and may have provided staff accommodation for the school.
- 2.8 The site is not located within a conservation area and the buildings are not statutory or locally listed.
- 2.9 The site is not located in an Archaeological Priority Area.
- 2.10 The site is located in an area with a low probability of flooding, Flood Risk zone 1.
- 2.11 The site has a PTAL rating of 3-4 (measured on a scale of 0 to 6b, 0 being the worst) and is located within a Controlled Parking Zone, CPZ CW.

3. CURRENT PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the redevelopment of the site, involving demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a new two-storey medical centre.
- 3.2 The replacement building shall provide a single purpose built facility for Merton Vision, Colliers Wood Doctors Surgery (currently at 58 High Street, Colliers Wood) and its branch at Lavender Fields (182 Western Road, Mitcham).
- 3.3 The works would involve:
 - The creation of a new vehicular access from Clarendon Road;
 - 13 parking spaces provided on site, which includes three parking spaces for disabled users and one space for an ambulance (with turning head);
 - 4 cycle stands toward Courtney Road (at the Surgery entrance) and 4 sheltered cycle stands toward the rear of the building;
 - Detached single storey Merton Vision activities store at the rear of the site. Elevation toward 2 Courtney Road measuring 5.7m depth and toward Alpea Close 6.9m. Flat roof design with a maximum/eaves height of 2.8m. Externally clad in metal;
 - Merton Vision bin store toward Clarendon Road and Surgery bin store toward Courtney Road.
- 3.4 The building elevation toward Courtney Road would measure 54.7m in width with a maximum depth of 20m (or 17.9m depth along the north-eastern elevation facing toward 2 Courtney Road). The single storey rear element would project 2.5-5.8m from the rear building line. The building elevation toward Clarendon Road would measure 32.8m width and 12.35m depth.

- 3.5 The gabled buildings toward Courtney Road would have a maximum height of 10.4m and eaves height of 7.3m. The single storey element at the rear would have a flat roof with a maximum/eaves height of 3.1m.
- 3.6 The gable buildings toward Clarendon Road would have a maximum height of 12m and eaves height of 7.7m.
- 3.7 The building would be externally finished in red stock brick with reconstituted stone surround to the window openings, aluminium windows, stone copings, slate roof tiles and feature green/teal panels to the windows. The single storey element would be externally finished in metal feature cladding.
- 3.8 Merton Vision will occupy the ground floor of the western part of the building. The spaces comprise an entrance lobby, with activity rooms and a larger multipurpose hall on one side, and offices, administrative and consulting rooms on the other. External garden/sensory spaces (facing toward Clarendon Road) are arranged to directly relate to the activity and social rooms. An assistance-dog garden space is also provided toward the Courtney Road entrance.
- 3.9 The GP surgery shall occupy the eastern part of the ground floor and the entirety of the upper floor. The surgery entrance lobby is on the eastern side of the building, with 2 consulting rooms on the ground floor. The proposed reception and waiting area shall be positioned at the first floor level with consulting and treatment rooms, supporting staff and office accommodation is located beyond the consulting rooms on the western end.
- 3.10 The opening hours of the surgery:
Monday-Friday: 8am - 6.30pm
Monday/Wednesday/Thursday (Extended hours): 6.30pm to 8pm
Saturday: 8am -12pm
- 3.11 The opening hours of Merton Vision (same as existing):
Monday-Friday: 9am - 5pm
Three weekday evening sessions finishing no later than 11.00pm
Saturday (one in every 4 weeks): 6pm – 11pm
- 3.12 24 full time employees are anticipated.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

Pre-applications

- 4.1 18/P0391 and 18/P4465: PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF MERTON VISION (CHARITY) OFFICES AND DI SUPPORT SPACES. PROPOSAL FOR NEW PRIMARY CARE FACILITIES, INCLUDING DOCTOR SURGERY, NHS OUTPATIENTS SPACE AND DISPENSING PHARMACY.

Planning applications

- 4.2 06/T0364: TREES NUMBERED 4-25 ON YOUR PLAN (CONSISTING OF CHERRY, WHITEBEAM, APPLE AND ROWAN), LOCATED AROUND EDGE OF PROPERTY TO BE VERY LIGHTLY CROWN REDUCED, DEADWOODED AND HAVE OLD BRANCH STUBS REMOVED. ROWAN TREES NO'S 1 & 3 (YOUR PLAN) TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED. ROWAN NO 2 TO BE RETAINED AND LIGHTLY PRUNED. – Tree works approved 16/03/2006

- 4.3 99/P1268: DEMOLITION OF EMILY VILLA AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING MAIN HALL, PROVISION OF A NEW COVERED COURTYARD, MAIN ENTRANCE AND ACCESS RAMP. – Granted 14/10/1999
- 4.4 99/P0415: Use of existing car park area for the holding of a car boot sale on Sundays between 9.00am and 2.00pm from 1 April to 31 October Each Year – Refused 11/06/1999
Reason - The proposed use, by virtue of the nature of the activity and its location within a predominantly residential environment, would result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance and increased vehicular movements and on-street parking problems detrimental to residential amenity contrary to Policies EP.2 & M.29 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan, April 1996.
- 4.5 91/P0331: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUILDING WITH TAPING ROOM AND TOILET ROOM – Granted 13/06/1991
- 4.6 90/P0550: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BUILDING FOR TALKING NEWSPAPER TAPING ROOM AND COVERED AREA. – Granted 17/07/1990
- 4.7 MER936/85: CENTRE FOR THE VISUALLY HANDICAPPED FOR EDUCATIONAL SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION PURPOSES PLUS 19 PARKING SPACES AND USE OF TOP FLOOR OF 45 CLARENDON ROAD (NOW 67 CLARENDON ROAD) AS A CARETAKERS FLAT. – Granted 24/10/1985
- 4.8 MER714/84: SITE OF ALPHEA MIDDLE SCHOOL, BOUNDED BY CLARENDON ROAD, AND COURTNEY ROAD, BUT EXCLUDING NO.8 COURTNEY ROAD. OUTLINE APPLICATION TO REDEVELOP SCHOOL SITE FOR PART RESIDENTIAL USE (0.72 HECTARES) AND PART COMMUNITY USE (0.2 HECTARES). – Deemed consent 20/09/1984
- Surrounding housing development
- 4.9 MER585/85: PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING 5 X 1 BED FLATS 5 X 2 BED MAISONNETTES 12 X 2 BED FLATS AND 1 X 1 BED HOUSE 20 X 2 BED HOUSES & 2 X 3 BED HOUSES WITH CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. – Granted 15/08/1985

5. CONSULTATION

External

- 5.1 Public consultation was undertaken by way of letters sent to 108 neighbouring properties.
- 5.2 Letters of support have been received from 10 address points, 11 individuals:

Colliers Wood Community Association

- The developers have listened and consulted with us and made alterations, which will lead to our members benefitting from a new Health Medical Centre and new provisions for Merton Vision.

Councillor Caroline Cooper-Marbiah

- Colliers Wood is in desperate need of a Doctor's surgery that is fit for purpose. This development will provide a surgery that will be purpose built and will meet the needs of the growing population.
- Merton Vision is a fantastic charity within my Ward, provides services to some of our vulnerable residents in the Borough. Over the years, the management has advised of the financial difficulties they face due to high maintenance costs as a result of the age of the building.
- The building was built and used as a school for many years. Therefore, the Management of Merton Vision has done brilliantly in adopting the space to somehow meet their needs.
- This development is a great opportunity for Merton Vision to have a facility built according to their needs. This will make it much easier for Service Users to move around the building much more easily, make it easier for staff and volunteers to do their jobs better and whatever funds they have can be used for providing much needed services, rather than on the maintenance of the building.

Others:

- Much improved application since the initial pre planning consultation.
- A new GP surgery is needed and a fit for purpose space for our much treasured local charity Merton Vision which serves the needs of all blind people and those with sight loss across the borough.
- Attractive addition to the area with facilities to serve critical needs in the area.
- Colliers Wood high street surgery is cramped and does not provide staff space to provide the level of service needed, the new facility would clearly meet the needs of the local population so far as GP provision is concerned. Further advantage of improving facilities for Merton Vision.
- The location will be convenient for me.
- Pleasant building and of a scale to match the surrounding housing. Feel it would improve the area as it is superior architecturally to the current, rather old, building.
- The current building is old and outside does not make good use of the space available. I have seen the artist's impression of the proposed site and believe it will be an asset to the community.
- Trees shall be replanted.
- I have lived in Clarendon Road for 11 years and understand that people are afraid of change, 'not in my neighbourhood' stance.
- People have expressed concerns over social events and nuisance/noise at night. However, Merton Vision are extremely strict about the times. They already have a facility providing events so people are clearly not aware of this and have no interest in supporting a very worthy cause.
- The walking distance from the bus/tube is not too long.
- The building has a broken up façade that will blend nicely with the predominately residential surrounds. Looks pleasing and welcoming and by no means domineering, institutional or monolithic.
- Would be keen for the applicant to reconsider how the Colliers Wood Chorus could continue to use the space – have been rehearsing in Merton Vision for a decade.
- As fond as I am of the old school building, I am all too familiar with the antiquated heating, problematic plumbing and general upkeep needed to maintain the old buildings and know just how crippling these must be to the charity's coffers.
- Would be advantageous to provide further PV panels.
- A multi-purpose medical centre will inspire confidence in local NHS facilities and prevent locals from accessing the busy A&E facilities at St Georges.
- Provision of jobs.
- Proposal appears to offer the construction of the building in a very sustainable way.
- Colliers Wood has good transport links and parking facilities nearby.

- The current building in Lavender Fields is not fit for purpose.
- The new surgery will have a sensory garden which is designed to benefit those suffering from dementia.

5.3 Objections have been received from 56 address points (72 individuals). Concerns raised summarised below:

Consultation process, information provided in application

- Residents should be involved in the planning process and be aware of the proposals as they evolve, only heard about this development by chance.
- Never received a letter. This is unacceptable for a development that will impact our lives (during building works and once completed).
- The Planning application and accompanying documents contain misleading information on parking, numbers of staff, opening hours and number of storeys in the building.
- The application is technically invalid as it does not show the intended opening hours of the facility even though these are known.
- No information provided concerning the actual process behind the selection of Clarendon Road as a site for this development.
- The CCG has repeatedly maintained a commitment to hold a public meeting with residents and stakeholders, but no such meeting has taken place therefore our voices have been silenced.
- MP Siobhain McDonagh promised a full public meeting. No such meeting has taken place – the impact of Covid-19 should not be used as an excuse to railroad through this development.
- Council should be contacting residents directly.
- Consultation letters only been sent to a small group of residents on Clarendon, Courtney & Fortescue Road. Not all on these roads and no one on Colwood Gardens.
- The timing of the consultation before Christmas has obviously been strategised.

Design, appearance

- Although the plans have been reduced in scale, the size and impact of the building still appears to be substantially inconsistent with the surrounding residential houses.
- Massing and bulk are inappropriate and out of scale with the surrounding houses. This is obvious from the elevation with Alpea Close.
- The proposed building will be taller than the others in the area, and taller than the existing. This means there'll be a clear view of this from the neighbouring houses.
- Overdevelopment of the site – particularly when compared with the existing single storey nature.
- The design is purportedly 2 storey but the southern elevation shows roof windows in the pitched roof which is indicative of a third storey which is not shown on the plans, may be the reason for the unnecessarily tall gable ends.
- Out of scale floor to ceiling heights of 3m or more.
- Concerns about the floor to ceiling height of the proposed hall/bar/social event room.
- Will look like a modern mess.
- Jarringly inappropriate juxtaposed to the small terraced houses.
- The existing building is an attractive one storey Victorian building with charm and character, the new design is unsympathetic with the surrounding houses and will ruin what is at the moment a charming backwater.
- Destruction of an old school building which is part of local heritage and much more in keeping with surrounding architecture than the proposed development. Had envisioned a similar renovation/extension like that of Singlegate School.
- The Sustainable Design and Construction SPG 2014 indicates a clear preference for the retention and adaption of existing buildings. If the existing building cannot be enhanced, then the argument would run that all Victorian buildings – such as the

terraced houses that line all the roads in the area – would also need to be torn down and rebuilt. Clearly that is not the case.

- Virtually all the properties in Clarendon and Courtney Road are traditional terrace houses with a central ridge and front and back roof slopes. The dominant gable ends with steep pitched sides of the proposals would be out of character.
- Building too big and wrong style for area.
- The apex on the corner is unnecessarily aggressive and will loom large over the roads, no functional reason and shall jar with the architecture of the area.
- Design must bring joy, not be overbearing and uninviting. Design should uplift the area and add beauty to it, not cast a shadow and look disconnected from its surroundings. The current design unfortunately does the latter.
- Colliers Wood has suffered from poor design and connection to its history, this does not need to continue.
- Proposal contravenes Merton Council's Design Policies D5.3.
- Proposed design does not relate positively to the rhythm, scale, density, proportions or height of the surrounding buildings.
- High corner is an unfortunate attempt to create a landmark where it is not wanted.
- Numerous gables create an extremely chaotic street presentation.
- Does not blend with the street or enhance the area.

Trees, landscape

- Retaining trees will help maintain some privacy for residents residing opposite the development, as well as having a wider positive environmental impact.
- The proposal would involve the loss of 15 existing mature trees which is unacceptable, particularly in a location with high levels of air pollution.
- Thought Labour were concerned about air pollution and keen to make greener choices.
- Merton Council declared a climate change emergency but are felling trees at a rate that belies this. Today a verdict was passed of death attributed to air pollution, this should be a wakeup call for Merton.
- Nearly 70% of the existing trees onsite would be removed.
- The proposal depicts significant landscape architecture. I want to know who would incur the costs of maintenance – this cannot be at the expense of local taxpayers to foot the bill. Any increase in council tax for such reason would be repellent.

Accessibility of site, suitability/choice of site location

- No public transport near the site. The closest bus stop is 0.3m away, reflected in the weak PTAL score for the site. Patients, elderly/disabled/sick/partially sighted, will have to walk a substantial distance to the surgery.
- The Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) guidance states that walking distances to bus stops should not exceed 400m. The nearest bus stops to the site are over 450m.
- Plans put the surgery entrance at the furthest reach from the main access point, creating a greater distance for patients to walk and disruption for residents.
- Shame to build a new clinical facility and not fully grasp the opportunity to ensure it needs the highest accessibility standards and be adaptable to new requirements that might come out from this current pandemic.
- Narrow and uneven pavements – could not accommodate a bus route, shuttle service or minibus.
- Site is not suited for the surgery, the location is in a highly residential area. This setting does not suit the expected heavy footfall of workers and visitors to the centre.
- Needs to be at another more centrally located and accessible location, better locations by Colliers Wood station / even in the Tandem centre / Priory park.
- It is lazy planning by the Council not to have worked with developers of recent projects to site the medical centre with a commercial centre.

- 2 parking spaces are to be reserved for ambulances. This is therefore not a GP surgery but a mini hospital which is baffling considering one of the biggest hospitals in Europe is situated just 15mins walk away. It is therefore entirely inappropriate to be placed in this location and arguable unnecessary given medical provision nearby.
- Proposing a development which is intended to be used by 12,000 patients in an area with zero surplus parking is utterly laughable and completely inappropriate.
- Proposal fails to comply with Policy DMC1.
- Hospitals and medical centres are high risk areas for COVID-19 infection. It makes no sense to place this medical centre in the heart of a residential area.
- The D&A's "Site Search" section is dated back to January 2016. Multiple changes have occurred to the area in this time. No recent site searches have been conducted.

Traffic, parking, visitor numbers and air pollution

- Onsite parking will not be available to patients and there are possible plans to reduce the amount of parking spaces available to local residents on the surrounding streets. Transport survey states: 'ample parking availability, immediately surrounding the site meaning that residents would be forced to park elsewhere'. This is inaccurate.
- The 'snapshot' survey carried out gives an inaccurate picture of the parking situation, the surrounding roads cannot cope with the increased parking requirements.
- Transport survey carried out on a single day and is not representative of parking capacity throughout the year which could indicate a higher or lower capacity, it is therefore unreliable.
- Parking survey is flawed. It covers the period of 09.00 to 17.00 when many residents will be at work. The doctor's surgery will be open 8.00-20.00 three days a week, 08.00-18.30 two days and 08.00 to 12.00 on Saturdays. These crucial 21 hours a week, not covered by the survey, are precisely when there is likely to be conflict over parking.
- Survey conducted at the start of the global pandemic, now outdated as many people are working from home.
- Parking bays are needed. As the survey shows there are many public transport options available nearby which means people do not have to drive.
- Limited parking in Colliers Wood, blocking existing parking bays will make the current situation worse.
- Roads are already busy with traffic and cars travel down the roads too fast. The increased volume of traffic would increase the risk of road accidents. Proposals do not comply with Policy CS250.
- Proposal will affect the safety and convenience of local residents, and on-street parking and traffic management.
- Increased traffic will be disruptive and dangerous, particularly to children.
- Reducing the number of proposed pay & display parking spaces will help reduce traffic.
- Residents will be unable to find parking if occupied by visitors of the medical centre during opening hours
- Bus stop is 0.3m away, likely resulting in increased traffic on the roads due to car/taxi drop offs.
- Increase in traffic will increase the air pollution on our road.
- 12 parking spaces on site, inadequate for the anticipated number of staff and /visitors.
- Inadequate car parking around the site for the staff and visitors.
- The CPZ was introduced to the road because there is evidently too much pressure to find parking in the area. Resident permits doubled to £120pa last year, additional pressure on parking locally will inevitably result in residents paying but still unable to park/the stress of fighting for a space.
- Inevitable months of disruption and reduced parking whilst the site is being levelled and then building work, following by complete change in environment with patients trying to park causing noise, stress and general traffic increase and pollution.
- The plans should not include removal of the bollards between Courtney and Cavendish Road – barrier has been there for the last 25 years.

- Should not remove bollards that separate the two sections of Devonshire Road.
- Neighbourhood currently has a nurse, local park and residential homes with no through traffic allowed.
- Need for adequate public transport to ensure ease of travel for less mobile patients. A regular hopper bus would be a credible solution, Merton Council, CCG and TfL should work together to provide this.
- Children's nursery and primary school nearby, efforts should be made to minimise air pollution not develop projects to increase it.
- Consulting and treatment rooms could easily generate 40-50 client visits per hour, or 360 in a normal day. (The TA suggests 534 daily trips and vastly underestimates the number of arrivals/departures by the 21 consulting rooms). There are 53 seats shown on the plans for waiting clients so large numbers are obviously expected.
- Combining a building with large numbers expected, in terms of patients, personnel and deliveries, with a charity dealing with people that have vision impairment issues does not seem a very good idea. Increased traffic would lead to safety concerns for the Merton Vision visitors.
- The speeding on this road is awful. I would encourage the Council, whether the planning is approved or not, to introduce full speed bumps.
- Drop offs should be made on site.
- What restrictions will be in place for deliveries, working times, days working etc.

Neighbouring amenity

- The proposals include a large social area and bar, which means the buildings will be used in the evenings. This is unsuitable in the quiet, residential, family location.
- The new site will need to recoup costs so is likely to hire out the social area as much as possible to generate revenue. Unacceptable in terms of noise through late night revelling.
- The proposed height of this building would likely lead to loss of light and overshadowing of the communal gardens behind the block of flats 2-13 Alpheia Close.
- Impact on light and neighbouring privacy.
- Plans do not indicate obscure windows, would overlooking into neighbouring property and garden.
- Separate storage unit will stand above fence height and infringe neighbouring light.
- Cause tension and ill feeling between neighbours and also towards the centre staff.
- Drunken behaviour of people attending parties, events and bar in the hall which may lead to fights, shouting, vandalism, urination outside doors, break ins and so on. Past events at the hall have had excessive noise levels you can hear from the garden.

Others

- What would happen to the site if the application was not successful. The opportunity to use a better-connected location in the Britannia Point/Watercress area.
- Feel dismayed that yet another lazy and sloppy development proposal that will probably be passed because Labour Councillors tend to vote as a block. As a lifelong Labour voter, I am so disappointed at how hopeless and impotent we feel as a community in the face of these awful developments.
- Is the facility deemed necessary given there are several medical facilities in the area including Colliers Wood surgery, Merton Medical Practice, Lavender Fields Surgery, Trevleyan Road Surgery, Nelson Medical Practice, Tooting Health Centre, Morden Medical Centre and of course St George's Hospital.
- Contest the fundamental assumption that a new double GP practice is required given the fact that the existing Colliers Wood and Lavender Fields surgeries are both considered 'good' in all domains less than 3 years ago (Merton CCG General Purpose – Integrated Primary Care Commissioning Paper 2017).
- Lavender Fields surgery patients remain unaware of their practice being moved to this inaccessible location.

- As we saw from the construction of Fortescue Gardens, large construction equipment can impact the foundation of these 125 year old properties. A reduction in the structural integrity of any properties must be at the cost and responsibility of the construction form, the architects and the CCG/surgery.
- What happens if the foundation work causes damage to the neighbouring houses? House and car premiums will rocket as the residents' houses and vehicles will be placed into a higher risk insurance category.
- Flooding as a result of burst pipes during construction.
- I believe the Councillors, Merton Vision and Merton Council want this to happen. No one I have spoken to that resides in Colliers Wood or uses either surgery want this redevelopment to happen. A completely disjointed action from the Council and involved parties towards the local residents and wider community.
- Due to Covid-19 more consultations are being done by phone or online, therefore less reason to visit the medical centre. This building could be obsolete before a brick has been laid.
- These roads are no-through roads, we have limited facilities regarding street cleaning. The increase in footfall and traffic of visitors will need increased supportive facilities such as street cleaning. This has not been addressed.
- Overdevelopment for the purposes of increased profit.
- Dave Ward should rescue himself from being part of the decision-making process of this application, he represents people who are both for and against the proposal. It would be highly inappropriate for him to vote on this issue.
- We are in the midst of a pandemic. It is unforgivable that you even intend to have a new development and start this wasteful development in the New Year. Nobody knows what is going to happen. The dust particles, pollutants and even asbestos, which could be in the current Merton Vision building will cause undue illnesses especially lung problems, asthma amongst children and the elderly and probably death.
- Will not be able to open windows during construction due to dust particles and pollution.
- Merton Vision is currently using Wilson hospital's facilities, can this not be a long-term solution?
- The documents available in the public domain present no financial information about the cost and the financing of the project.
- In these tough financial times, myself and other residents are relying on the equity we are trying to build up in our homes in case of job losses and salary cuts as a back up measure. No doubt this project will put us in negative equity.
- Affect our house price.
- Security, waste management, potential hazardous materials and site drainage not been addressed.
- Increase in crime driven by surgery/chemist.
- Will cameras be installed on the surrounding roads or within the complex?

5.4 Following revisions to the scheme, a 14 day re-consult was carried out 18/06/2021. Objections received from 27 address points (32 individuals) – 11 new address points. The concerns raised mostly echo those in the original objection letters (above), additional comments:

- Vehemently opposed to this development. This type of building should not be placed in a quiet residential area.
- Design of building not in-keeping with the area and frankly an eye sore.
- Having to view this building is simply unfair to residents who chose to live away from hustle and bustle.
- Why not get rid of "Kiss Me Hardy" and use that as a medical practice. Nobody would be opposed to that.

- There are very few other non-residential buildings in the vicinity and certainly none of this size.
- Location not suitable for daily delivery vans to the medical centre.
- Roads too narrow for ambulance to pass.
- Families live here and use the streets to walk to the park access from Clarendon Road.
- Have alternative uses of the Merton Vision site been investigated? (a smaller GP, family houses, extension to Singlegate Primary school, another charity).
- Should not be taller than the 2 storeys, same as adjacent houses.
- Loss of existing views from neighbouring properties.
- Proposal appears to include additions not previously mentioned, residents are being notified with impossibly short deadlines.
- What is the growth projection over the next 5 or 10 years on patient numbers? This has not been stated in any publications.
- Colliers Wood already has a number of construction projects ongoing. Infrastructure unable to cope before all this work started.
- Why are 7 street parking spaces needed for staff when public transport can be used.
- I would like an agreed detailed contract with the criteria for all events/parties in Merton Vision (i.e. hours, noise levels etc).
- I would like to see a drop off zone onsite.
- Will Council reimburse costs for any damage to neighbour's properties and vehicles?
- Large windows to the floor, facing properties will feel overlooked and adversely affect privacy and freedom in our homes.
- How many patients have agreed to move to the new site?
- The development seems to contradict the work the Mayor of London is trying to do in terms of building a greener, less congested environment.

5.5 Designing out Crime officer (Metropolitan Police) – During the initial consultation of the application, the Designing out Crime officer raised a number of initial concerns in relation to uncontrolled access, the need to increase natural surveillance and remove concealment opportunities, improved signage, alarms/locks, CCTV and lighting.

Following amendments to the scheme, the Designing out Crime officer was re-consulted and considers the changes to the proposal would be of benefit to the site and its future use.

5.6 Historic England, Archaeology – Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, I conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on the heritage assets of archaeological interest. No further assessment or considerations are necessary.

5.7 Thames Water –

- With regard to Waste Water Network and Sewage Treatment works infrastructure capacity, no objections are raised.
- With regard to Surface Water drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water then there would be no objection. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required.
- On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the planning application.
- Informatives advised.

- 5.8 Design Review Panel (DRP) – The pre-application proposals have been reviewed by the DRP twice. The initial scheme (18/P0391) was presented to the Panel 27/03/2018 and received an AMBER rating.

The newer scheme (18/P4465) was presented to the Panel 25/03/2020 and also received an AMBER rating. The layout, design, scale, massing of the current proposal is largely the same as that in the latest pre-application proposal, so the DRP's comments are considered valid:

Height/Scale/Massing

- Two storeys is an under-development of the site, notably with the extensive roof spaces, that are not utilised. The building already has lifts.
- The proposed scheme, sitting within a predominantly 2-storey residential area, sits comfortably within the site.
- Well thought out simple plan with sensitive massing.

Building Design & Context

- The building design relates well to the local vernacular whilst being well-articulated and contemporary in appearance.
- Like the scheme, good document exploring options and with a good rationale for the preferred scheme.
- The corner treatment doesn't work. Taller windows would make more sense. A bit of textured brickwork is clichéd and weak.
- Indecision about how the building holds the corner. On the one hand it's dynamic, but is it too much? On Clarendon Road elevation the corner pitch is different, which is odd and the way it turns the corner needs reviewing. Has the applicant considered opening up the corner?
- Support the new building continuing the frontage development along the street to complement the adjacent terraces.
- Quite like this scheme – sensitive to neighbours and not over-development.
- The use of brick ties in with the local area and the gable ends work as a counterpoint to the roofs of neighbouring buildings.
- The building stands out sufficiently from the houses, creating a landmark for the area, rightly so, given its use.
- What is the infill material (non-brick elements)? In terms of quality it is important – timber would be a shame as it ages badly and metal panels would not be desirable.

Site Layout & Landscaping

- The landscape and building do not interrelate well. Landscaping is treated as a separate exercise, using up the gaps left over by the architecture.
- There is a generous buffer between the site boundary and the building façade, which should enable a final landscape scheme to soften the streetscape.
- Planting and landscaping is well-considered, simple and suits the neighbourhood.
- The landscape scheme is ambitious but a limited budget may mean a number of features may not survive value-engineering.
- There is a loss of a significant number of trees, but this is not due to the building footprint.
- Not convinced about the number of trees being lost. Although they may have limited lifespan, they add instant maturity, and continuity given the loss of the school buildings.
- The prominence of the dog garden is unconvincing, and it would be better used as a more welcoming entrance to both facilities.
- The sensory and herb garden, and children's play area are squeezed between the building and the road, as such it is debateable as to how much they would be used, due to their public nature. What are the access arrangements like from the building?

This area may be better utilised as the dog garden, and thus have a more welcoming boundary treatment.

Access & Servicing

- Unclear where the bin stores are, which will be needed for the bar and clinical waste. Is this the 'clinical store' and 'Merton store' at No.17 on the landscape plan?
- How, where and when to deliveries take place, including for cooking, hall and bar?
- There appears only to be 4 cycle stands, uncovered. Is this the staff cycle parking?
- There is an almost complete lack of cycle parking for staff or visitors.
- Do not see any need to provide on or off-street parking for health staff given the highly accessible location and trend for car-free development. The users of the surgery will be local residents.
- The health centre should lead by example by taking health issues seriously. Instead of providing a car park, a much larger and better garden can be provided at the rear and potential future building expansion at the front on Clarendon Road.
- For those requiring access by car, a length of yellow line parking can be provided on-street outside the Merton Vision building.

Building Layout

- Landlocked consulting rooms appear to have rooflights/lay lights – how do they achieve good natural light?
- The spaces and clinic rooms have natural daylight.
- There is a hall and play activities mentioned. Is there storage for the related play equipment etc?

Sustainability

- Good to see a life-cycle carbon assessment and existing buildings survey.
- Good to see the assessment of whether retention was appropriate, but a new building is supported rather than piecemeal addition to the existing building.

Internal

5.9 Urban Design –

- The height and 'fitting in' with the surroundings works well. Roof space could be utilised further which will create interesting spaces and could provide more flexibility on the ground floor for improvements. This will probably require some variation in the roof form in places, but the gabled appearance works well and should not be sacrificed.
- The architecture is restrained and generally fine, fitting in well with the surroundings.
- Further thought to the corner, though the roof form is a good start.
- Most people are likely to access the building from the Colliers Wood direction – i.e from Clarendon Road (via Colwood Gardens). Thus, most (or a large proportion) of visitors will use the rear entrances via the car park. This entrance needs to better emphasise itself in terms of wayfinding.
- Large car park, could be reduced to provide increased landscaped areas and remove gap in the frontage.
- The ambulance drop-off is positioned away from the medical centre and disabled space 11 will be difficult to manoeuvre out of despite there being a hatched area for 3-point turning.
- The 'store' areas are ambiguous and not very accessible around the parked car. The rear building columns directly abuts the car park manoeuvring space and could be liable to collision and vehicle damage.
- Specifically the landscaping – the space between the building and the street is defensible space and semi-public. Putting high enclosures here is anti-social and does

not provide an attractive street scene nor set off the building well. It is a semi-public use and needs to be welcoming.

- Existing trees should be retained where possible despite their life expectancy.
- Cycle parking appears to be wholly deficient and there is a general lack of a sustainable transport approach to the proposals.
- The surgery lobby is on the first floor, and the waiting room on the upper floor and this would appear to be reasonably legible from the outside.
- Some improvements could be carried out in the layout of the waiting area/reception area, and ensuring there is adequate space in the corridor to allow a wheelchair to turn into the disabled WC.

- 5.10 Policy – Social and Community Infrastructure: The provision of a health centre is supported in line with Merton's policies CS11 and DMC1, as the NHS South West London CCG has identified the need for increased GP capacity and primary care transformation in Colliers Wood. This is also identified as a priority health project in the draft Merton Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2020).

The proposal will result in the re-provision of space for Merton Vision who currently reside on the site, in addition to providing a new GP surgery, resulting in a net addition of 853sqm of social and community space. This is supported in line with the policies, through the co-location of services.

Should any part of the ground floor of the proposed building be made available to the wider public for other community uses, this would be encouraged in line with Merton policies.

- 5.11 Ecology – The site does not have any environmental designations on the Sites and Policies Map 2014. It is located within 50m of the Myrna Close Valley SINC (MeBII10), Myrna Close Open Space and Local Nature Reserve.

The applicant has submitted the following reports: a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (July 2020); An Update Preliminary Roost Assessment and Phase 2 Emergency Survey Report (July 2020); and an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (October 2020).

A Preliminary Roost Assessment was undertaken by ECOSA in March 2020, identifying some of the buildings on site as offering high and moderate potential for roosting bats. Further work was recommended to ensure a full assessment of potential impacts on protected species. Between May and July 2020, further Phase 2 surveys were undertaken on site. These surveys identified that a day roost for a single common pipistrelle was present in the brickwork structure of Building 1. In addition, low levels of bat activity (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule) were recorded on site during the surveys.

The Merton Core Strategy Policy CS13 states that any development that has a significant adverse effect on the population or conservation status of protected or priority species and priority habitats should be refused. New development should avoid causing ecological damage and propose full mitigation and compensation measures for ecological impacts that do occur. Where appropriate, new development should include new and or enhanced habitat or design and landscaping which promotes biodiversity.

The proposal identifies that a Bat Mitigation Class License (BMCL) will be required from Natural England, should planning permission be granted, in order to permit the

demolition of building 1. I would recommend that, if you were to approve this proposal, a condition be placed on the decision notice requiring the applicant to apply for and obtain the required license before work commences on site.

In line with Policy CS13, the measures and recommendations set out in the three reports listed above should also be conditioned, to ensure the proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement works are carried out on site for the ecological impacts that are due to be caused by the proposed development.

5.12 Transport officer –

Proposed access arrangements: The proposals will require amendments to current parking bays fronting the site on Clarendon Road to enable the construction of the new access to onsite parking area. The proposals include the removal of the current vehicular access on Courtney Road, which will result in an additional on street parking space.

Internal Layout: The proposals include the provision of 12 parking spaces, which includes 3 parking spaces for disabled users and 1 space for an ambulance. Swept path analysis demonstrates all vehicles are able to turn within the site and approach the highway in a forward manner. The layout as shown is satisfactory.

Parking Strategy:

- Bays converted to pay and display – 5 bays converted to shared use on Courtney Road for the public up to 2 hours (max) subject to installation of a Pay and Display machine. The total cost would be in the region of £9K. However, this will be subject to statutory consultation with residents and Cabinet Member approval to be secured through s106 agreement.
- Each disabled bay should be accompanied by EVCPs (Electric Vehicle charging Points)
- Future occupiers will not be eligible to apply for parking permits.
- Maximum of 2 Business Permits will be allowed.
- Alterations to the parking bays will be carried out via a Traffic Management Order (TMO) once planning consent has been granted.

Refuse: The proposal provides two dropped kerbs on Clarendon Road and Courtney Road to facilitate the refuse collection.

Raise no objections subject to:

- Parking as shown maintained.
- Cycle parking provision for the staff and visitors maintained as shown.
- The turning area within the car park to be kept free at all times.
- Reinstatement of the existing access on Courtney Road.
- Parking Strategy as above.
- Demolition/Construction Logistic Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) should be submitted to LPA for approval before commencement of work.
- Pedestrian visibility splays at the new access on to Clarendon Road shall be provided.

5.13 Highways officer – Conditions and informatives recommended. Further reminder to the applicant that Highways must be contacted prior to any works starting to ensure all relevant highway licenses are in place.

- 5.14 Tree officer – Of the trees listed for retention, the trees marked T12 and T17 are within the site and both have been given a 'B' rating by the arboricultural expert. Both trees are capable of being retained, provided a few specified precautions are followed. The plans should be amended to show their retention.
- 5.15 Climate Change – The applicant has maximised PV coverage in the updated roof plan and assessment which should be commended.

However, the energy statement indicates that 151sqm of solar PV is proposed on a north-east facing roof where solar PV will generally tend to have lower efficiencies than south facing roofs.

The amended energy statement indicates that the applicant will carry out a detailed assessment of the efficiency of the solar PV on the north-east facing roof at the next stage of design when they confirm the specification of the ASHPs which could mean that the current assessment is overestimating the potential carbon savings from solar PV and heat pumps at this stage. If officers are to progress the application without this information using a pre-commencement condition, a mechanism is recommended to revisit the carbon offset contributions at the pre-commencement stage once the efficiency of the ASHP and solar PV have been confirmed.

In line with the new London Plan, the carbon shortfall should be offset at a cost of £95/tonne. Subject to the comment above regarding the solar PV, the offset contributions for the current shortfall of 0.84tCO₂/ year would equate to a carbon offset payment of £2,393 – as set out in the GLA's carbon reporting spreadsheet provided.

- 5.16 Environmental Health Noise – conditions recommended in relation to external lighting and request for a Demolition and Construction Method statement prior to the commencement of development.

6. POLICY CONTEXT

6.1 NPPF - National Planning Policy Framework (2019):

Part 2 Achieving sustainable development
 Part 8 Building a strong, competitive economy
 Part 9 Promoting sustainable transport
 Part 12 Achieving well-designed places
 Part 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
 Part 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

6.2 London Plan 2021:

Relevant policies include:

D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
 D2 Infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities
 D3 Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
 D4 Delivering good design
 D5 Inclusive design
 D8 Public realm
 D11 Safety, security and resilience to emergency
 D12 Fire safety
 D13 Agent of Change
 D14 Noise
 S1 Developing London's social infrastructure
 S2 Health and social care facilities
 G6 Biodiversity and access to nature

G7 Trees and woodlands
SI 1 Improving air quality
SI 2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
SI 3 Energy infrastructure
SI 4 Managing heat risk
SI 5 Water infrastructure
SI 7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy
SI 8 Waste capacity and net waste self-sufficiency
SI 12 Flood risk management
SI 13 Sustainable drainage
T2 Healthy streets
T4 Assessing and mitigating transport impacts
T5 Cycling
T6 Car parking
T6.5 Non-residential disabled persons parking
T7 Deliveries, servicing and construction

6.3 Merton Sites and Policies Plan (SPP) July 2014 policies:

Relevant policies include:

DM C1 Community facilities
DM D1 Urban design and the public realm
DM D2 Design considerations in all developments
EM EP2 Reducing and mitigating noise
DM EP4 Pollutants
DM F2 Sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and; Wastewater and Water Infrastructure
DM O2 Nature conservation, trees, hedges and landscape features
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 road network

6.4 Merton Core Strategy 2011 policy:

Relevant policies include:

CS 11 Infrastructure
CS 13 Open space, nature conservation, leisure and culture
CS 14 Design
CS 15 Climate change
CS 16 Flood risk management
CS 17 Waste management
CS 18 Transport
CS 19 Public Transport
CS 20 Parking servicing and delivery

7. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7.1 The key planning considerations of the proposal are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Design and impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Impact on neighbouring amenity
- Transport, parking and cycle
- Refuse
- Sustainability
- Others

7.2 Principle of development

Provision of healthcare facilities

- 7.2.1 Merton Core Strategy Policy CS 11 seeks to support the provision and improvement of infrastructure of the borough for those living, working and visiting Merton and to accommodate population growth by supporting the provision of improved health services.
- 7.2.2 Merton Sites and Policies Plan Policy DM C1 seeks to ensure the provision of sufficient, accessible, well-designed community facilities. Proposals for new development and improvements (including expansion) to existing community facilities, health and places of worship will be supported where all the following criteria are met:
- i. services are co-located where possible;
 - ii. facilities are provided in accessible locations with good links to public transport;
 - iii. the size of the development proposed is in relation to its context;
 - iv. appropriate access and parking facilities are provided, relative to the nature and scale of the development;
 - v. the proposed facilities are designed to be adaptable and suitable to accommodate a range of services; and
 - vi. the use(s) do not have an undue adverse impact on the amenities of nearby residents and businesses.
- 7.2.3 The Planning statement provides the following background: “The new building will enable the delivery of NHS healthcare services for the 12,000 local patients served by the surgery and for local people who are supported by Merton Vision. The proposals have been developed with the full support of the Partners at Colliers Wood Surgery (including Lavender Fields branch), the Board of Trustees of Merton Vision and the NHS South West London Clinical Commissioning Group”.
- 7.2.4 Colliers Wood Doctors’ Surgery is seeking to amalgamate its 2 existing premises to a central location to provide NHS services for the local community, the existing surgeries are located in Colliers Wood High Street and a second branch, Lavender Fields Surgery, in Mitcham. The Design and Access (D&A) statement helps to explain that the “buildings at both of these locations fail to meet the current guidance and technical requirement for a modern doctors’ surgery in a number of critical elements, including basic disabled access. As a result, alongside operational efficiencies, the practices have decided to amalgamate its two existing premises to a central location”.
- 7.2.5 The search to find a suitable building/site to accommodate the amalgamation of Colliers Wood and Lavender Fields Medical Centre began in 2016. A number of sites were considered prior to 67 Clarendon Road. The review of the sites is set out in pages 5-6 of the D&A Statement, concluding: “The search found a limited number of options at the time with none of the sites meeting all aspects of the criteria. 67 Clarendon Road offered the best opportunity set against the criteria”.
- 7.2.6 The provision of a new health centre is supported in line with Merton's policies CS11 and DMC1 as the NHS South West London Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) has identified the need for increased GP capacity and primary care transformation in Colliers Wood.
- 7.2.7 The proposal will also result in the re-provision of space for Merton Vision. So in the addition with the new GP surgery, there would be a total net addition of 853sqm of

community, healthcare and social space. This is supported in line with the policies, through the co-location of services.

- 7.2.8 Policy DMC1 criteria ii & iv (public transport and parking), iii (size) and vi (neighbouring amenity) shall be discussed in detail further within this report – Sections 7.5, 7.3 and 7.4 respectively.

Demolition of existing building

- 7.2.9 Whilst the buildings on site present attractive Victorian school buildings that add interest to the streetscene, there is no heritage designation which protects them. Therefore, officers are not able resist their demolition given no prescribed policies to protect a non-designated building. However, as part of the overall assessment of the proposals officers would be required to apply adopted policies in assessing the suitability of a replacement buildings and its impact on the Clarendon and Courtney Road streetscenes.
- 7.2.10 Assessment of the design is set out in Section 7.3 within this report.

7.3 Design and impact on character and appearance of the surrounding area

- 7.3.1 The NPPF states that developments should function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Developments should ensure that they are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
- 7.3.2 Policies CS14, DMD1 & DMD2 require that new development reflect the best elements of the character of the surrounding area, or have sufficient distinctive merit so that the development would contribute positively to the character and appearance of the built environment. Policy DM D2 of Merton's SPP 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 and to use appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting.
- 7.3.3 London Plan Policy D3 requires development proposals to enhance the local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape. Developments should be of a high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail, and gives thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan through appropriate construction methods and the use of attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well.
- 7.3.4 As noted in para 5.8, the latest proposals reviewed by the Design Review Panel are largely the same as this current scheme in relation to its layout, design, scale and massing. The comments are still considered relevant for this application. The applicants have also been provided with comprehensive pre-application feedback and comments by the Urban Design officer.
- 7.3.5 During the cycle of this application, revisions to the scheme have been carried out. Notable design alterations include:

- The surgery entrance doors have been brought forward to better increase its visibility from the Clarendon Road entrance path.
- The building mass adjacent to 2 Courtney Road has been pulled back on the first floor, this volume re-provided within the Clarendon Road frontage building (infilling the previously proposed recessed balcony area).
- Louvres removed in the corner window to emphasise feature.
- Car park space better defined.

7.3.6 Following these revisions, it may reasonably be concluded that the amended proposals have sought to address comments raised by officers:

Height, scale and massing

7.3.7 The proposed 2 storey building height with gable roof is considered fitting in its context and works well with the immediate 2-storey residential dwellings. The DRP considered that this height and scale sat comfortably within the site and displayed a sensitive massing.

7.3.8 Though it is noted the overall ridge height of the building would sit taller than the neighbouring properties, this increase is not viewed as harmful from the street elevations. With reasonable setbacks from the boundary and neighbouring dwellings, the building height would not appear dominant nor loom over its neighbours.

Building design and materials

7.3.9 The gable shapes of the proposed building are greatly inspired by the roofscape of those locally, but most notably the gables of the former school building. The repeated gable pattern emphasises this distinct design but in a contemporary manner so as not to uncomfortably challenge the streetscene with a new alien form.

7.3.10 The D&A Addendum explains the conception of the corner design: “The punctuation and expression of the corner is created from the acute angle between the roads cutting the gable end resulting in the rising mono gable.” The building gradually increases in height, at its corner apex is around 0.9m taller than the ridge of the gables on Courtney Road. This increase subtly helps to heighten the edge contributing to its emphasis as a feature, and further emphasised with the removal of the louvres to the corner windows providing some glimpse of the internal ceiling and volume of space.

7.3.11 A brickwork external finish is proposed which reflects the predominant facing materials within the locality and would blend successfully with the character and appearance of the area.

7.3.12 The design also provides multiple depth changes and shadows within the elevations that help define and add interest to the building. Some of these details include: deep window reveals, stone surrounds that project forward of the brick face, setbacks in the elevation and recesses in the brick walls to frame downpipes and feature hoppers.

7.3.13 The proposed building design has adopted and evolved architectural features which are prevalent to the streetscene. Officers consider the design would deliver a satisfactory solution for the site and that this represents a significant improvement from the proposals presented at the initial pre-application stages in 2018.

Safety and security

7.3.14 Merton SPP Policy DM D2 requires development proposals to provide layouts that are safe, secure and take account of crime prevention and are developed in accordance with Secured by Design principles. London Plan Policy D11 states boroughs should work with their local Metropolitan Police Service ‘Design Out Crime’ officers and

planning teams, whilst also working with other agencies such as the London Fire Commissioner, the City of London Police and the British Transport Police to identify the community safety needs, policies and sites required for their area to support provision of necessary infrastructure to maintain a safe and secure environment and reduce the fear of crime.

- 7.3.15 The Designing out Crime officer (Metropolitan Police) has been consulted on this application and put forward a number of initial concerns in relation to uncontrolled access, the need to increase natural surveillance and remove concealment opportunities, improved signage, alarms/locks, CCTV and lighting.
- 7.3.16 The plans were amended to address the issues raised, changes include:
- Installation of a gate in the side alleyway to the Surgery bin store preventing uncontrolled access.
 - Cycle stands at the rear of the building have been relocated allowing greater natural surveillance and shall be open for improved visibility.
 - Seating spaces are located in areas with good natural surveillance at the front and rear.
 - The long narrow recessed entrance to the Surgery has been pulled forward reducing the opportunity to create a hiding place.
 - Amended plans show location of CCTV cameras on the ground and first floors.
 - Pergola removed to allow increased visibility of the Clarendon Road entrances.
- 7.3.17 The Designing out Crime officer has been re-consulted and they consider the changes to the proposal would be of benefit to the site and its future use.

Garden areas/Landscaping

- 7.3.18 With a generous set back provided between the front building elevations and the footpath, this offers areas for landscaping and trees to deliver an attractive green foreground (trees discussed in paras 7.3.21-7.3.25).
- 7.3.19 Gardens are provided along the Clarendon Road frontage, connected to the use of Merton Vision's activity and social rooms. The positioning of the garden areas expose them as "semi-public" spaces. Therefore, the boundary treatment needs to ensure there is a balance struck between delivering an active and soft frontage, yet offers the necessary seclusion and security for those sitting. The solution sought is a scheme for a mixture of boundaries, with brick walls (1.3m), open metal railings (1.2m) and hedge planting, at varying heights and textures.
- 7.3.20 The D&A Addendum states: "Generally, seclusion in the garden is provided in key areas to those sat down, whilst there is still some linkage for those walking on the adjacent footpath. This is understood by Merton Vision, and is considered an opportunity for passers-by understand the work and opportunities they offer. Located within London, on this site, there is an acceptance that there will be some background noise etc".

Trees

- 7.3.21 Policy DM O2 seeks to protect trees, hedges and other landscape features of amenity value and to secure suitable replacements in instances where their loss is justified. 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. However, development may be permitted when:
- i. the removal of the tree is necessary in the interest of good arboricultural practice; or,
 - ii. the benefits of the development outweighs the tree's amenity value.

7.3.22 The Arboricultural assessment and method statement has assessed the existing trees on site and categorised them as B and C. Category B trees are considered of moderate quality and Category C as low quality. The proposal seeks to fell the Category C trees. The D&A Addendum offers further justification on this:

“the existing trees are in poor condition, having been neglected and grown within tarmac / hard surfacing. As a result the trees are low quality and in poor health with very little potential to contribute to the longer term local character due to their small size and relatively short lifespans and will be under constant pressure to be cut back due to their proximity to the proposed building. Replacing the existing trees with new semi-mature trees will provide genuine and significant long term benefits, allowing high quality ground preparation and for the selection of ideal tree species and cultivars for the proposed locations. This will ensure longer lived trees that are better suited to their setting and have a more sustainable relationship with the new building. To offset the loss of the existing trees, the proposal includes planting of semi-mature trees which would have an immediate ‘green’ presence in the neighbourhood, providing landscape structure, habitat, and over their longer healthier life spans, additional CO2 sequestering. On the whole, we believe this approach provides the most beneficial outcome”.

7.3.23 It is noted that the existing trees are not protected by Tree preservation orders. Whilst the existing variety and quantity of trees is a positive aspect, they are categorised of low quality (C) and in poor condition. Replacement tree planting offers the potential to improve the visual amenity of the site and to plant trees of long term health to the advantage of the environment and residents. It may be concluded that a new planting scheme of semi-mature trees, following the removal of the existing trees and required by condition, could mitigate against the loss of the existing trees.

7.3.24 The Council’s Tree officer has reviewed the Arboricultural assessment and Tree Protection Plan, and with amendments to the landscaping scheme retaining the Category B trees (in line with the Arboricultural report), it is considered the proposals would better accord with Policy DMO2. A condition shall be recommended to ensure tree protection works are carried out in accordance with the submitted report.

7.4 Impact on neighbouring amenity

7.4.1 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.

2 Courtney Road – east

7.4.2 The proposals have been amended to reduce the depth of the eastern end of the building, adjacent to 2 Courtney Road. The overall reduction would be 1.5m in depth but the main two storey building would be pulled back by 4m. The single storey rear element would project 2.5m from the two storeys, with a flat roof design of 3.1m height.

7.4.3 Toward 2 Courtney Road, the two storey building would display a reduced 1.1m projection from their rear building line. Including the single storey element, the total projection from 2 Courtney Road’s rear would be 3.7m.

7.4.4 The single storey activities store at the north-eastern corner of the site would display a height of 2.8m and 5.7m depth toward the shared boundary.

7.4.5 A 3.6m separation gap is proposed between the new building and 2 Courtney Road – the elevation drawings have been amended to confirm this. Amended drawings also help to confirm that the 2 first floor windows on the side (eastern) elevation of the new building shall be obscure glazed.

7.4.6 The proposed building would undeniably be viewable from the rear of the adjacent property. However, the considerable setback proposed to the main massing of the building would ensure that there is a reduced flank elevation projecting from the rear of 2 Courtney Road, this is accompanied with an ample separation gap along the shared boundary. Both these design considerations help to alleviate a potentially overbearing impact toward neighbouring amenity. Whilst there will be some increased shading of light experienced and a change in outlook from the neighbour's rear garden and windows/doors, it would not be to such a harmful degree which to warrant refusal of the proposals.

49-63 (odd) Clarendon Road – north

7.4.7 Replacing the demolished Emily Villa building at the northern end of the site would be a car park area. So, there would be a separation of around 19m between the new building and 63 Clarendon Road.

7.4.8 There is one first floor window on the side elevation of 63 Clarendon Road. From reviewing plans of the original development (MER585/85) and neighbouring application at 59 Clarendon Road (00/P2370), this first floor window looks to serve a bathroom or stairwell, so is not a habitable room. Nonetheless, given the separation distance provided, it is not considered the proposed building would inappropriately overshadowing or overlook the neighbouring property and garden.

Alphea Close – north-east

7.4.9 Along the northern boundary between Alphea Close and the application site is a thick screen of trees which currently restricts views into the neighbouring garden. These trees shall require some pruning and as described in the Arboricultural report: “these works fall within the bounds of normal garden management”. So, there will be little change in terms of screening.

7.4.10 As set out above in para 7.4.7, toward the rear of the site would be the proposed car parking area, and in the north-eastern corner a single storey activities store erected for Merton Vision.

7.4.11 The proposed two storey gables facing Courtney Road would be set back some 14m from the side (southern) elevation of Alphea Close or around 30m from the rear of the gable buildings facing Clarendon Road.

7.4.12 The proposed development is not considered to negatively impact the amenity of Alphea Close. The activities store would likely be predominantly screened from view by the existing trees and there is adequate separation from the new building such that impact in terms of light and outlook would not be considered adversely affected.

Courtney Road – south

7.4.13 The new building would sit 2.5m forward of the existing, but a separation distance of around 19m would be retained between this and the dwellings on Courtney Road. Whilst the new building would present a taller height, the separation gap of the road would be sufficient to ensure there is no undue harm in terms of light and outlook. Further, the first floor southern windows (serving the consulting rooms, waiting room and stairwell) shall be wholly obscure glazed or covered with a 1.8m high film.

Clarendon Road – west

- 7.4.14 The dwellings along Clarendon Road would be sited around 20m from the new building. Whilst the windows on the first floor level shall not be obscured, like those facing Courtney Road, the separation gap provided would suitably safeguard neighbouring occupiers' privacy, light and outlook.
- 7.4.15 Some concern has been raised in the representations regarding the loss of a view from the opposite dwellings. There is not strictly a protection to the 'right of a view' in planning terms, unless it is a Protected view or vista which is not in the case at this site. Whilst the views from the neighbouring windows cannot be strictly protected, the impact of the proposals toward neighbouring outlook can. Loss of outlook is difficult to measure and will be different for all cases and contexts. Officers consider a fair suggested definition for the loss of outlook would be where development would have an adverse overbearing impact that would result in an unduly oppressive environment or increased sense of enclosure for the neighbouring occupiers. The opposite dwellings along Courtney and Clarendon Road shall be suitably distanced from the new building; separated by the road, footpaths and additional setback of the building from the boundary line. The proposed layout shall largely be the same as its existing situation. The increase of an additional storey to the site would not result in neighbouring occupiers feeling further oppressed in their homes or result in an increased sense of enclosure when viewing the development from their front windows.
- 7.4.16 Overall, it is not considered the proposals would have an undue detrimental impact toward neighbouring amenity.

7.5 Transport, parking and cycle storage

- 7.5.1 Merton SPP Policy DM T2 seeks to ensure that development is sustainable and has minimal impact on the existing transport infrastructure and local environment. Policy DM T3 seeks to ensure that the level of residential and non-residential parking and servicing provided is suitable for its location and managed to minimise its impact on local amenity and the road network.
- 7.5.2 Core Strategy Policy CS20 and SPP Policy DM T5 requires that development would not adversely affect pedestrian or cycle movements, safety, the convenience of local residents, street parking or traffic management, that that they minimise any impacts on the safe movement of people or goods, are appropriately located and connected to the road hierarchy; respect the streets character and environment.
- 7.5.3 London Plan Policy T2 seeks to promote and demonstrate the application of the Mayor's Healthy Streets Approach to: improve health and reduce health inequalities; reduce car dominance, ownership and use, road danger, severance, vehicle emissions and noise; increase walking, cycling and public transport use; improve street safety, comfort, convenience and amenity; and support these outcomes through sensitively designed freight facilities.
- 7.5.4 London Plan Policy T6 considers that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking ('car-lite'). Car-free development has no general parking but should still provide disabled persons parking.
- 7.5.5 The site has a PTAL of 3-4 which is considered good to very good. The site is also located in a Controlled Parking zone, Zone CW.

- 7.5.6 Following extensive conversation with the Council's Transport and Highways officers, the scheme for parking has been reviewed and amended.
- 7.5.7 The original proposals sought to alter 10 on-street parking bays to pay and display for visitors to the medical centre. The removal of resident parking bays was considered unacceptable and was not supported by officers. An alternate solution has been negotiated proposing 5 shared bays along Courtney Road, these can be used by Permit holders and visitors (pay and display, max. stay of 2 hours). The dual function of the shared bays shall ensure there will be no loss to the local residents. The alterations to the parking bays and road markings will be carried out via a Traffic Management Order (TMO) once planning consent has been granted – this shall be subject to statutory consultation with residents and cabinet member approval, the full cost shall also be met by the applicant.
- 7.5.8 The development shall be secured as permit free with the maximum provision of 2 business permits.
- 7.5.9 Table 10.6 of the London Plan requires non-residential developments to provide 6% designated bays (Per cent of total parking provision). The provision of 3 disabled parking pays onsite is considered to comfortably accord with the London Plan's requirement.
- 7.5.10 4 electric charging points shall be installed onsite, 2 for the accessible bays and 2 for the standard car spaces. The D&A Addendum also confirms: "All parking spaces shall have 'passive' EVCP with ducting with draw wires installed to allow simple future installation as demand requires".
- 7.5.11 Amended swept path analysis demonstrates that all vehicle types are able to turn within the site and approach the highway in a forward manner. Given this, the Transport officer raises no further concerns in relation to the car park layout.

Cycle parking

- 7.5.12 Core Strategy Policy CS18 seeks to promote active transport by requiring new development to provide cycle parking, it encourages design that provides, attractive, safe, covered cycle storage, cycle parking and other facilities (such as showers, bike cages and lockers).
- 7.5.13 London Plan Policy T5 requires developments to provide appropriate levels of cycle parking which should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located. Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2. In accordance with Table 10.2, health centres (D1 use class) should provide for long-stay 1 space per 5 FTE (full-time employment) staff, and for short-stay
- 7.5.14 The Transport Assessment confirms that 3 long-stay cycle spaces and 5 short-stay cycle spaces shall be provided for the GP surgery, and whilst Merton Vision does not currently have any dedicated cycle storage facilities, it is proposed to include 1 further short stay stand for visitors, alongside 1 long-stay stand for staff. This shall further encourage sustainable travel to the site.
- 7.5.15 The Transport officer has raised no objections to the cycle provision proposed. A suitably worded condition shall be attached requiring details of the cycle storage.

Accessibility of site

- 7.5.16 The majority of the objections drew attention to the topic of the site's accessibility, with the lack of public transport and walking distance to the bus stops.
- 7.5.17 Objectors quoted from the Planning for Walking guidance published by the Chartered Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) (2015). The full text: "The power of a destination determines how far people will walk to get to it. For bus stops in residential areas, 400 metres has traditionally been regarded as a cut-off point and in town centres, 200 metres. People will walk up to 800 metres to get to a railway station, which reflects the greater perceived quality or importance of rail services". (Under the 'Traditional compact town layouts' heading, p.31). The Transport statement has also highlighted this text.
- 7.5.18 The Transport statement later sets out in the report that the bus stops are located approximately 450m to the west of the site. This figure has been heavily criticised by objectors.
- 7.5.19 Officers have sought to verify this and measure some of the distances from the proposed building to the bus shelters along Christchurch Road (using ordnance survey maps):
- Bus shelter K (Christchurch Road, adjacent to Christchurch Close), via Fortescue Road to the Courtney Road entrance would be around 400m.
 - Bus shelter B (Colliers Wood underground station), via Colwood Gardens to the Clarendon Road entrance would be around 450m.
 - Bus shelter K, via Colwood Gardens to the Clarendon Road entrance would be around 430m.
- 7.5.20 As seen from the measurements above, there is a varying distance between 400-450m dependent on the route of travel and chosen entrance. These are not viewed as excessive distances to travel by foot. It should be noted that the guidance set out by the CIHT is advice rather than adopted policy. Whilst this does provide helpful guidelines for officers, this distance cannot be slavishly applied as the only criteria for walking.
- 7.5.21 This area of Colliers Wood well-connected and conveniently accessed by public transport, this is reflected in the site's PTAL of 3-4, which is considered a good to very good rating.
- 7.5.22 One of the factors for the selection of 67 Clarendon Road is its accessibility. With good transport links locally, this will enable patients to attend their appointments by other means than the car. Understandably, there will be a proportion with limited mobility so a number of bays shall be available on Courtney Road with a limit to stay a maximum of 2 hours.
- 7.5.23 For the majority of Merton Vision visitors, the D&A explains that a door-to-door transport solution shall be required due to their complex physical and visual challenges. This is often provided by a Dial a Ride system and suitable collection and drop-off spaces will be provided within the site.
- 7.5.24 With the development overall being secured as permit free, with the exception of 2x business permits, this shall be in line with local and London plan policies seeking to promote active travel, to reduce car dominance and increase walking and public transport use. These encouraged choices of travel will help to alleviate congestion,

contribute towards climate change and air quality targets. Further, the introduction of cycle spaces (which is currently absent on site) seeks to encourage health and wellbeing through increased levels of physical activity.

7.6 Refuse

7.6.1 Merton Core Strategy Policy CS17 requires new developments to demonstrate integrated, well-designed waste storage facilities that will include recycling facilities.

7.6.2 London Plan Policies SI 7 and SI 8 identifies that in order to manage London's waste sustainably, the waste management capacity of existing sites should be optimised and developments should be designed with adequate, flexible, and easily accessible storage space and collection systems that support, as a minimum, the separate collection of dry recyclables (at least card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, glass) and food.

7.6.3 Merton Vision's refuse store would be located toward and collected from Clarendon Road, and the Surgery's refuse from Courtney Road:

Surgery

- General waste – proposed 770L unit
- Waste paper is shredded and securely disposed of by private contractor fortnightly.
- Clinical waste – proposed 770L unit, disposed of by private contractor fortnightly.
- General recycling – proposed 240L wheelie bin.

Merton Vision

- General waste – proposed 770l unit
- Food waste – external container
- General recycling – proposed 770l unit
- Garden waste – private maintenance contractor

7.6.4 The bin stores shall be no greater than 10m from the highway for collection and a small area of dropped kerb shall be constructed for ease of collection – as advised by the Transport officers, crossovers shall be constructed by the Council.

7.6.5 A suitably worded condition shall be attached requesting details of the refuse enclosures.

7.7 Sustainability

7.7.1 London Plan Policies SI 2 and SI 5 expects a minimum on-site reduction of CO2 emissions at least 35 per cent beyond Building Regulations for major developments. Residential development should achieve 10 per cent, and non-residential development should achieve 15 per cent through energy efficiency measures. Where it is clearly demonstrated that the zero-carbon target cannot be fully achieved on-site, any shortfall should be provided, in agreement with the borough, either: 1) through a cash in lieu contribution to the borough's carbon offset fund, or 2) off-site provided that an alternative proposal is identified and delivery is certain. Development proposals should also achieve mains water consumption of 105 litres or less per head per day.

- 7.7.2 London Plan Policies SI 2 and Merton Core Strategy Policy CS15 seeks to maximise opportunities for on-site renewable energy, this includes the use of solar photovoltaics, heat pumps and solar thermal.
- 7.7.3 Recognising the contribution the existing building make to the streetscene, and the embodied carbon within those buildings, officers have, throughout discussions with the applicant, invited consideration of the adaptation and reuse of parts of the existing building. The scheme has however evolved on the basis of a wholly new build scheme. While London Plan policy SI 2 requires that development proposals should calculate whole life-cycle carbon emissions through a nationally recognised Whole Life-Cycle Carbon Assessment and demonstrate actions taken to reduce life-cycle carbon emissions, this only applies to applications referable to the Mayor..
- 7.7.4 To further support the demolition proposals, a Life Cycle Carbon Assessment was carried out. This report concludes that the energy emissions from the construction and running of a new proposed development will be less than emissions from the continued running of the building in its current state in 15 years. Additionally, a Structural Condition Report and Geotechnical Investigation conclude that extensive structural works would be required should the buildings be retained, with the foundation requiring strengthening to prevent further movement. This altogether is helpful information to understand the motivation of pursuing a new build scheme.
- 7.7.5 The PV coverage on the roof plan has been amended to maximise its coverage in accordance with policies seeking to maximum on-site renewable energy.
- 7.7.6 The amended energy statement indicates that 151sqm of solar PV is proposed on a north-east facing roof where solar PV will generally tend to have lower efficiencies than south facing roofs. However, the energy statement indicates that the applicant will need to carry out a detailed assessment of the efficiency of the solar PV on the north-east facing roof at the next stage of design (the Technical design stage/ RIBA stage 4) when the specification of the Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHPs) are confirmed. Therefore, the potential carbon savings from solar PV and heat pumps may alter at this later stage as the current assessment may be overestimating the efficiency of the north-east facing PVs and ASHPs.
- 7.7.7 In line with the new London Plan, the carbon shortfall should be offset at a cost of £95/tonne. The offset contributions for the current estimated shortfall of 0.84tCO₂/ year would equate to a carbon offset payment of £2,393.
- 7.7.8 However, officers consider that the carbon savings shall require recalculation at the technical design stage. A review mechanism of the carbon-offset contributions shall be required through a S106 agreement. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall fully submit an amended energy statement detailing the efficiency information of the solar PV and ASHPs and their carbon savings. Officers shall review this and re-confirm the off-set carbon contributions if necessary.

7.8 Other matters

Biodiversity

- 7.8.1 Policy CS 13 states that developments that have a significant adverse effect on the population or conservation status of protected or priority species and priority habitats should be refused. New developments should integrate new or enhanced habitat or design and landscaping which encourages biodiversity and where possible avoid

causing ecological damage. Developers must propose full mitigation and compensation measures for any ecological damage that is caused.

- 7.8.2 The Council's Ecology officer has confirmed that the site does not have any environmental designations on the Sites and Policies Map 2014. It is located within 50m of the Myrna Close Valley SINC, Myrna Close Open Space and Local Nature Reserve.
- 7.8.3 However, a Preliminary Roost Assessment was undertaken by ECOSA in March 2020, identifying some of the buildings on site as offering high and moderate potential for roosting bats. Further work was recommended to ensure a full assessment of potential impacts on protected species. Between May and July 2020, further Phase 2 surveys were undertaken on site. These surveys identified that a day roost for a single common pipistrelle was present in the brickwork structure of building 1 (67 Clarendon Road). In addition, low levels of bat activity (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and noctule) were recorded on site during the surveys. As bats were observed to be roosting within the building, the proposal to demolish the existing buildings will result in an offence under the European Habitats Directive.
- 7.8.4 The Report explains that as the species identified utilising the building for the purposes of roosting are low in number and are of common species, the proposal works will need to be undertaken in compliance with a Bat Mitigation Class Licence (BMCL). Therefore, a Bat Mitigation Class Licence will be required if this building were to be demolished.
- 7.8.5 As per the Ecology officer's recommendation, a condition shall be attached to any grant of permission requiring the applicant to apply for and obtain the required license before works are commenced on site. Further, the measures and recommendations set out in the three reports (a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (July 2020); An Update Preliminary Roost Assessment and Phase 2 Emergency Survey Report (July 2020); and an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (October 2020)) shall be conditioned, to ensure the proposed mitigation, compensation and enhancement works are carried out on site for the ecological impacts that are due to be caused by the proposed development.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 The redevelopment of the Clarendon Road site shall allow for a new replacement building providing a purpose built facility for the amalgamation of the Colliers Wood Doctors Surgeries and re-provision of a modernised space for the Merton Vision charity. These services shall be co-located in the building with an overall net addition of 853sqm of community, healthcare and social space. The chief objectives of the proposal are in line with Merton's policies CS11 and DMC1, and responds to an identified need by the NHS South West London Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).
- 8.2 The delivery of the replacement building would entail wholesale demolition. The existing buildings lack heritage designation, i.e. statutory or local listing or being sited in a Conservation area, so are not safeguarded from demolition. Though the replacement building proposals put forward should not be of a lesser or substandard quality so as to negatively impact the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider area.
- 8.3 To further support the demolition proposals, a Life Cycle Carbon Assessment was carried out. This report concludes that the energy emissions from the construction and running of a new proposed development will be less than emissions from the continued

running of the building in its current state in 15 years. Additionally, a Structural Condition Report and Geotechnical Investigation conclude that extensive structural works would be required should the buildings be retained, with the foundation requiring strengthening to prevent further movement. This altogether is helpful information to understand the motivation of pursuing a new build scheme.

- 8.4 Turning to the design, it is considered that the scheme has greatly evolved from its pre-application stages to its current form and the applicant has entered into discussions with officers throughout. The proposed building height and gable patterns are considered appropriate. The architectural approach pursued by the applicant is considered satisfactory and does not seek to disrupt the streetscene but blend with its neighbouring dwellings and would be softened by tree planting. The landscaping schemes seek to reinforce the green frontage to the building, offering semi-public spaces to invite the interest of those passing yet provide an adequate level of privacy for users.
- 8.5 The scheme has also given due consideration to reducing its impact toward neighbouring amenity, improving safety and security, protection and enhancement of biodiversity and suitable servicing, parking and travel arrangements.
- 8.6 The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions, and S106 agreement requiring:
- Permit free development with the exception of 2x business permits.
 - Alteration to the parking bays and road markings via a Traffic Management Order (TMO) – subject to statutory consultation with residents and cabinet member approval.
 - Provision of Pay and display machine (£9k)
 - Carbon-offset contributions – £2,393, with a review mechanism of the carbon-offset contributions required. Prior to the commencement of development, the applicant shall fully submit an amended energy statement detailing the efficiency information of the solar PV and ASHPs and their carbon savings. Officers shall review this and re-confirm the off-set carbon contributions if necessary.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the attachment of conditions and completion of a S106 agreement to provide:

- Permit free development with the exception of 2x business permits
- Alteration to the parking bays and road markings via a Traffic Management Order (TMO) – subject to statutory consultation with residents and cabinet member approval.
- Provision of a pay and display machine (£9k)
- Carbon-offset contributions – £2,393, but a review mechanism of the carbon-offset contributions shall be required.

1. A1 Commencement of Development
2. A7 Approved Plans
3. B1 External Materials to be Approved – No development, other than demolition, shall take place until details of particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external faces of the development hereby permitted, including window frames and doors (notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the approved drawings), have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. No works which are the subject of this condition shall be

carried out until the details are approved, and the development shall be carried out in full accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

4. Obscured glazing – Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the windows marked in the approved plans 7831-P117 and 7831-P118 shall be glazed with obscure glass; the first floor side (eastern) windows facing toward 2 Courtney Road shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut. These windows shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

5. C06 Refuse & Recycling – No development shall be occupied until details of the storage enclosure for refuse and recycling bins and a scheme for their collection have been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the provision of satisfactory facilities for the storage of refuse and recycling material and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies SI 7 and D6 of the London Plan 2016, policy CS17 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM D2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

6. C08 No use of Flat roof – Access to the flat roof of the development hereby permitted shall be for maintenance or emergency purposes only, and the flat roof shall not be used as a roof garden, terrace, patio or similar amenity area.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

7. Non-standard condition (Lighting scheme) – Prior to the occupation of the development, an external lighting shall submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The proposed lighting scheme must be submitted for written approval with confirmation that the lighting plan has been approved and signed off by a licensed Bat Ecologist prior to its finalisation to ensure the scheme is suitable for bats.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area, the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the wildlife/biodiversity and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy G6 of the London Plan 2021, policies DM D2 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

8. D10 External Lighting – Any external lighting shall be positioned and angled to prevent any light spillage or glare beyond the site boundary.

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

properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies DM D2 and DM EP4 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. Hours of use - Surgery – The use hereby permitted shall operate only between the hours of: 8am-6.30pm Monday to Friday; 6.30pm-8pm Monday/Wednesday/Thursday (Extended evening hours); 8am-12pm Saturday.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of surrounding area and to ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D4 and D14 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS7 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

10. Hours of use - Merton Vision – The use hereby permitted shall operate only between the hours of: 9am-5pm Monday to Friday; 3x weekday evening sessions finishing no later than 11pm; 1x Saturday (one every 4 weeks) 6pm-11pm.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of surrounding area and to ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D4 and D14 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS7 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

11. D11 Construction Times – No demolition or construction work or ancillary activities such as deliveries shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays - Fridays inclusive, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays or at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the area and the occupiers of neighbouring properties and ensure compliance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 and policy DM EP2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

12. H01 New Vehicle Access – No development shall commence until details of the proposed vehicular access to serve the development have been submitted in writing for approval to the Local Planning Authority. No works that are subject of this condition shall be carried out until those details have been approved, and the development shall not be occupied until those details have been approved and completed in full.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies CS18 and CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3, T4 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

13. H02 Vehicle Access to be provided – The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the proposed vehicle access has been sited and laid out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies CS18 and CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3, T4 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

14. H03 Redundant Crossovers – The development shall not be occupied until the existing redundant crossover/s have been removed by raising the kerb and reinstating the footway in accordance with the requirements of the Highway

Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies CS18 and CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3, T4 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

15. H04 Provision of Vehicle parking – The vehicle parking area shown on the approved plan 1912049-03 Rev C (Proposed Layout), shall be provided before the commencement of the use of buildings hereby permitted and shall be retained for parking purposes for occupiers and users of the development and for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory level of parking and comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy T6 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

16. H05 Visibility splays – Prior to the occupation of the development 2 metre x 2 metre pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided either side of the vehicular access to the site. Any objects within the visibility splays shall not exceed a height of 0.6 metres.

Reason: In the interests of the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies CS18 and CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM T2, T3, T4 and T5 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

17. H09 Construction Vehicles – The development shall not commence until details of the provision to accommodate all site workers', visitors' and construction vehicles and loading /unloading arrangements during the construction process have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details must be implemented and complied with for the duration of the construction process.

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies T4 and T7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

18. Non-standard condition (Demolition and Construction Method Statement) – No development shall take place until a Demolition and Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition and construction period.

The Statement shall provide for:

- hours of operation
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative - displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate
- wheel washing facilities
- measures to control the emission of noise and vibration during construction.

- measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction/demolition
- a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies T4 and T7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

19. H13 Construction Logistics Plan to be submitted – Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Demolition/Construction Logistics Plan (including a Construction Management plan in accordance with TfL guidance) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period unless the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority is first obtained to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the safety of pedestrians and vehicles and the amenities of the surrounding area and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies T4 and T7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS20 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

20. Non-standard condition (Tree Protection): The details and measures for the protection of the existing trees as specified in the approved document 'BS 5837:2012 Arboricultural assessment & method statement (3rd March 2020) ref 20036-AA-AN' shall be fully complied with. The methods for the protection of the existing and retained trees shall fully accord with all of the measures specified in the report and shall be installed prior to the commencement of any site works and shall remain in place until the conclusion of all site works.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

21. Site Supervision (trees) – The details of the approved document 'BS 5837:2012 Arboricultural assessment & method statement (3rd March 2020) ref 20036-AA-AN' shall include the retention of an arboricultural expert to supervise, monitor and report to the LPA not less than monthly the status of all tree works and tree protection measures throughout the course of the demolition and site works. At the conclusion of the construction period the arboricultural expert shall submit to the LPA a satisfactory completion statement to demonstrate compliance with the approved protection measures.

Reason: To protect and safeguard the existing retained trees in accordance with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS13 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DMO2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

22. Non-standard condition (landscape) – Prior to occupation, full details of a landscaping and planting scheme, incorporating any recommendations set out in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (July 2020); An Update Preliminary Roost Assessment and Phase 2 Emergency Survey Report (July 2020); and an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (October 2020), shall be submitted to

and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, these works shall be carried out as approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to occupation of the site. The details shall include on a plan, full details of the size, species, spacing, quantities and location of proposed plants, together with any hard surfacing, means of enclosure, and indications of all existing trees, hedges and any other features to be retained, and measures for their protection during the course of development.

Reason: To enhance the appearance of the development in the interest of the amenities of the area, to ensure the provision of sustainable drainage surfaces and ecological enhancements, to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies G1, G6, G7 and D8 of the London Plan 2021, policies CS13 and CS16 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011, policies DM D2, DM F2 and DM O2 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014 and Section 15 of the NPPF 2019.

23. Non-standard condition (bats, protected species) –

Part A: No development shall commence until a Bat License has been applied for and granted by Natural England.

Part B: Following approval of the Bat License by Natural England, development is permitted to commence. The development shall be carried out in full accordance with the measures and recommendations set out in approved reports: Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (July 2020); An Update Preliminary Roost Assessment and Phase 2 Emergency Survey Report (July 2020); and an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan (October 2020).

Reason: To ensure there is no adverse impact on priority or protected species and biodiversity in accordance with Merton Core Strategy policy CS13 and London Plan policy G6.

24. H06 Cycle Parking – No development shall not be occupied until details of the secure cycle parking facilities for the occupants of, and visitors to, the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved facilities shall be fully implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development and thereafter retained for use at all times.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory facilities for cycle parking are provided and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policy T5 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS18 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policy DM T1 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

25. Non-standard condition (sustainability - renewable technologies) – No development shall commence until the applicant submits to, and has secured written approval from, the Local Planning Authority further information regarding the proposed ASHPs and solar PV in accordance with the GLA's Guidance on Preparing Energy Statements (2020).

Reason: To demonstrate that the proposed development has maximised renewable energy generation and the efficiency of renewable energy systems on site in accordance with Policy SI2 of the London Plan 2021.

26. Non-standard condition (sustainability - district heating) – No development shall commence until the applicant submits to, and has secured written approval from,

the Local Planning Authority on evidence demonstrating that the development has been designed to enable connection of the site to an existing or future district heating network, in accordance with the Technical Standards of the London Heat Network Manual (2014).

Reason: To demonstrate that the site heat network has been designed to link all building uses on site (domestic and non-domestic) and to demonstrate that sufficient space has been allocated in the plant room for future connection to wider district heating in accordance with London Plan (2021) policy SI2.

27. Non-standard condition (sustainability - carbon reduction & BREEAM) – 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 CO2 reductions in accordance with those outlined in the approved Energy & Sustainability Statement dated 29th June 2021 (carbon emissions subject to change following submission and approval of additional details as required by Condition 25), 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 SI2 of the London Plan 2021 and policy CS15 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011.

Informatives

1. INF 01 Party Walls Act
2. INF 08 Construction of Accesses – It is Council policy for the Council's contractor to construct new vehicular accesses. The applicant should contact the Council's Highways Team on 020 8545 3829 prior to any work starting to arrange for this work to be done. If the applicant wishes to undertake this work the Council will require a deposit and the applicant will need to cover all the Council's costs (including supervision of the works). If the works are of a significant nature, a Section 278 Agreement (Highways Act 1980) will be required and the works must be carried out to the Council's specification.
3. INF Traffic Management Order – Alterations to the parking bays and road markings will be carried out via a Traffic Management Order (TMO) once planning consent has been granted. The full cost of amending both shall be met by an applicant. Applicants must be aware that there could be objections to amending TMO.
4. INF 09 Works on the Public Highway – 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.

5. INF 12 Works affecting the public highway - Any works/events carried out either by, or at the behest of, the developer, whether they are located on, or affecting a prospectively maintainable highway, as defined under Section 87 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991, or on or affecting the public highway, shall be co-ordinated under the requirements of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 and the Traffic management Act 2004 and licensed accordingly in order to secure the expeditious movement of traffic by minimising disruption to users of the highway network in Merton. Any such works or events commissioned by the developer and particularly those involving the connection of any utility to the site, shall be co-ordinated by them in liaison with the London Borough of Merton, Network Coordinator, (telephone 020 8545 3976). This must take place at least one month in advance of the works and particularly to ensure that statutory undertaker connections/supplies to the site are co-ordinated to take place wherever possible at the same time.
6. INF 13 – The applicant is advised to contact Merton Council's Waste Services Team on 020 8274 4902 for detailed design guidance on waste and recycling storage facilities.
7. INF 15 Discharge conditions prior to commencement of work
8. INF Sustainability – 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 outputs and bespoke model outputs; **AND**
 - A copy of the Building Regulations Output Document from the approved software and the bespoke modelling outputs based on the agreed bespoke modelling methodology. 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'
9. INF Thames Water – Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website: <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/>
10. INF Thames Water – There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimise risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes: <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-your-development/working-near-our-pipes>.
11. INF Thames Water – Thames Water would recommend that petrol/oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol/oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourses.
12. INF Thames Water – The applicant is advised that their development boundary falls within a Source Protection Zone for groundwater abstraction. These zones

may be at particular risk from polluting activities on or below the land surface. To prevent pollution, the Environment Agency and Thames Water (or other local water undertaker) will use a tiered, risk-based approach to regulate activities that may impact groundwater resources. The applicant is encouraged to read the Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection and may wish to discuss the implications for their development with a suitably qualified environmental consultant.

13. INF Thames Water – Thames Water will aim to provide customers within a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
14. INF Thames Water – If you are planning on using mains water for construction purposes, it's important you let Thames Water know before you start using it, to avoid potential fines for improper usage. More information and how to apply can be found online at [thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater](https://www.thameswater.co.uk/buildingwater).
15. INF Thames Water – There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide to working near or diverting our pipes: <https://www.thameswater.co.uk/developers/larger-scale-developments/planning-your-development/working-near-our-pipes>.
16. NPPF Informative – approved schemes

This page is intentionally left blank