Our Ref: CH/CW/14998

(email address: chris.hicks@cgms.co.uk)
Direct dial: 020 7832 1474

Strategic Policy and Research
Future Merton
London Borough of Merton
12th Floor Civic Centre
London Road
Morden
SM4 5DX

21 February 2013

Dear Sir/Madam

DRAFT SITES AND POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (STAGE 3)

F. WIMBLEDON, POTENTIAL SITES AND DRAFT POLICIES MAPS

GRID REFERENCE B1, POLICIES MAP OPEN PACE, LOWER WIMBLEDON COMMON

KINGS COLLEGE SCHOOL (KCS), SOUTHSIDE, WIMBLEDON, SW19 4TT

SITE S002

We act on behalf of Kings College School (KCS). We are writing to object to the proposed Open Space designation affecting the School’s main site at Southside. The boundaries of the Open Space have (in the main) been significantly extended beyond the 2003 UDP areas to include land and buildings that we think do not warrant inclusion, and continues to include land and buildings that we think should be excluded. The areas of concern are identified on the plan in appendix 1 and can be described as follows:

1. A ‘sunken’ area of all-weather tennis courts including floodlights, boundary fencing and pavilion adjacent to the existing Sports Hall. Objection to the inclusion of this area.

2. An area currently the subject of a planning application (ref no. 13/P0090) for new classrooms and multi-use hall adjacent to the existing science block. Objection to the continued inclusion of this area.

3. The existing maintenance building; main school, coach/car park and site manager’s house, adjacent to Ridgeway road. Objection to the continued inclusion of this area.
4. The existing swimming pool. Objection to the inclusion of this building.

This objection is made in the context of the School’s detailed Development Masterplan (see appendix 2) which has been the subject of Pre-Application discussions with Officers of the Council culminating in an advice note from Officers dated 15th August 2012 (see appendix 3). Twelve developments to improve the School’s facilities are programmed to be implemented over the next nine years, the first two of which are the subject of current planning applications. Of particular note are the proposed new sports hall/swimming pool on site 1 which are programmed to be submitted for planning permission in the next seven years i.e. well within the life time of this Development Plan Document. Implementation of the Master Plan, based on the current open space designation, will result in an increase in open space on the site of 385sq.m. This is demonstrated at pages 46 and 47 of the Design and Access Statement to application 13/P0090 which is included at appendix 4.

1. All Weather Tennis Courts

The justification for extending the UDP designation is set out on page 593 of the subject document. Reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and London Plan.

The NPPF was published after the London Plan and its definition is as follows:

‘All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity’.

Site 1 is not of ‘public value’ in the sense that it is not available to the public, but more particularly, cannot be seen from public view. The latter is fact because the site is sunken, enclosed and adjacent to large buildings; the courts are effectively ancillary to the Sports Hall rather than the other way around, and they are perceived as being part of that building.

It was open to the authors of the UDP 2003 Proposals Map to have included this area (which have been all-weather courts for decades), but they chose not to, I believe for the reasons set out above. Relevant photographs are included in appendix 5.

2. New Classrooms and Multi-Use Hall

If the planning application for this development receives permission, (the determination should be made by the Council, before the end of March) then clearly the Open Space designation should be removed. The arguments made by the agent in support of the application in respect of open space can be summarised as follows:

- This is a residual area used by pupils at break-time for informal recreation if the weather permits.
- Its loss would not affect the functionality of the adjacent rugby pitch.
- It will not ‘break up’ an extensive area of open space.
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- The proposed building includes a multi-function hall which will include indoor sports use. This will improve the availability of sports/recreation over the current situation.

3. Maintenance Building, Coach/Car park and Site Manager’s House

The Site Manager’s house is a private residence and should therefore be excluded from the Open Space designation as it does not meet the definition for inclusion set down by Officers.

The maintenance building is large, with a frontage to Ridgway of 35m and a height of some 4m. It forms a strong visual barrier to the open space beyond. It is not ancillary to the open space because it is used as workshops and for storage relating to the whole school estate (not just the open space). For this reason, and by virtue of its scale when considered together with the adjacent house, it does not warrant inclusion as open space.

The car/coach park is regularly occupied with high sided vehicles and thus again forms a visual barrier to open space beyond. It is not ancillary to that open space because it is used for the parking of school minibuses, teacher and visitor vehicles and coaches used for transporting pupils to and from the school, rather than exclusively for sports use on the open space. Appendix 6 contains relevant photographs.

4. The Swimming Pool

This is an indoor swimming pool and is not ancillary to any adjacent open space. It does not therefore meet the Council’s definition of open space and should remain excluded as per the 2003 UDP designation.

5. Summary

King’s College School is currently one of the best in the country being in the top 10 academically. It educates some 1300 pupils every year and employs around 270 staff. It also has a significant outreach programme with local schools which takes place every Friday. The twelve projects identified in the master plan are critical to its future and the open space proposals being put forward, if accepted, would put this development in jeopardy. For the reasons set out the school believes that the four areas described above should not be designated open space.

The school would be happy to meet with relevant officers to discuss the above prior to the plan being finalised.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Chris Hicks
Director
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This report sets out a Masterplan for the physical development of King's College School over the next 10 to 15 years. The Plan is based on a study of the school's activities, and needs, and its sites and buildings.

The school does not envisage major growth in student numbers, but it does need improved facilities in many areas of the school.

The Masterplan describes qualitatively and quantitatively the facilities the school needs, and a plan for a sequence of building projects to meet these needs. The sequence reflects the relative priority of the projects and the need to minimise disruption during development.

The Masterplan is the outcome of a thorough examination of various options for development. The Masterplan is not a design for the new buildings and the precise brief for each project is not yet determined. The plans and drawings are diagrams of developments taken to the level needed to prove the feasibility of the proposals. The Plan aims to preserve and enhance the architectural and landscape quality of the school environment. It preserves the green spaces and the open views of the school's site.

This Masterplan will no doubt be adapted in the future in response to changes in needs but we hope it is a rational plan that helps the school to embark on its priority developments. The extensive consultation and discussion that has gone into its preparation should ensure that the Masterplan reflects and will sustain the ethos of the school.

King's College School - Development Masterplan

Tim Ronalds Architects
The need for a Masterplan.
King’s College School was founded in 1829 and moved to its Wimbledon site in 1897. It is now one of the most successful independent schools in London. The plan on page 20 shows how the school has grown as buildings have been added in successive decades.

None of the school’s facilities are poor but there are shortcomings in many areas, both in the quality and quantity of facilities. The school needs to build to maintain its success, develop its strengths and continue to attract the very best students and staff.

But what or where to build next was not clear. A Masterplan was needed to help the school to appraise its needs, both immediate and future, and look systematically at the options for development.

The school prepared a brief and held a competition to select architects for the task, and appointed Tim Ronalds Architects in November 2011.

The Masterplan objectives
To establish a plan for the physical development of the school to meets its current and anticipated needs for the next 10-15 years and provide information on the sequence of projects and their costs.

The plan should allow the school to embark on a sequence of projects within a rational framework for long term development.
The Masterplan was overseen by a Steering Group which comprised:

Andrew Halls       Head Master
Gerard Silverlock  Junior School Headmaster
Margaret Hunnaball Deputy Head - Academic
Rob Milne          Deputy Head - Pastoral
Ben Driver         Senior Master - Learning Resources
William Brierly    Assistant Head - Head of Sixth Form
Owen Carlstrand    Governor (with Estates responsibilities)
David Armitage     Director of Operations

The Masterplan was prepared by Tim Ronalds and Anna Bardos of Tim Ronalds Architects.

Quantity Surveyors Bristow Johnson produced the cost estimates for the Masterplan.

The team worked closely with the school over 4 months and consulted widely with staff and students. We would like to thank all who helped with advice and information.

Tim Ronalds Architects specialise in education and arts projects and have designed many award-winning buildings, and have devised development masterplans for a number of good schools.
What was involved in preparing the Masterplan?

Our first task was to establish the school’s needs. Our starting point was the school’s masterplan project brief. We then consulted widely to understand the school - its activities, strengths, shortcomings, wishes and ambitions - to ensure that the masterplan was based on a sound picture of the school and enable us to refine and amplify the brief.

We held meetings with Heads of Department and Management and Administration staff, to find out about their activities, the spaces they use, their needs and wishes, and how these are likely to develop. We invited responses to questionnaires from staff and students. Tutor group discussions introduced the masterplan to students.

This consultation has been of great value, and helped us understand the school’s ambitions and ethos, as well as its practical needs. Outcomes of consultation were discussed with the Masterplan Steering Group.

We undertook a detailed analysis of the spaces currently used by each of the school activities, and then quantified the accommodation required and desired for these activities. These space needs were determined through our discussions with staff, comparison with existing spaces, comparison with facilities at other schools, and technical data. We compared the existing school spaces with the required spaces to determine whether activities could be accommodated in existing refurbished buildings, or whether new facilities would be needed.

Whilst establishing the school’s needs, we also worked to understand the school’s buildings and site. We observed, investigated and analysed how the school site and its buildings are used. Study of the timetabled use, questionnaire responses, extra-curricular and informal school use and use of spaces by outside groups showed a great pressure for use of certain spaces.

We studied topographic site surveys and tree survey to understand the school site and its specific development opportunities.

We studied the planning context and environment of the school site, and how this might impact on possible developments.

We appraised the condition of existing buildings, and studied archive drawings and plans, to find out how they were built and have been extended, and to establish their potential for adaptation and reuse. Our appraisal of the buildings and site was discussed with the Masterplan Steering Group.

This work is the foundation of the Masterplan.

Having established the accommodation, either refurbished or new build, required for each of the school’s development objectives, we then explored development options for how the school’s needs could be met.

We investigated possible development locations, phasing of development projects, including decanting of functions to minimise disruption. These were discussed closely with the Masterplan Steering Group, examining a range of options to help clarify priorities and preferences. Five meetings with the Masterplan Steering Group were held from December 2011 to March 2012.

Bristow Johnson developed comparative cost plans for the various options, to help their evaluation.

Once the options were considered and preferences identified, we developed an outline masterplan with the Masterplan Steering Group, and tested its feasibility.

The outline projects set out in the Masterplan have been presented to Governors, 1829 group, SMT, staff and some parents [Friends of King’s].

The outline masterplan will now be discussed with London Borough of Merton and once their views are known and considered the final Masterplan document will be prepared.
Taking the school's brief as a starting point, qualitative and quantitative needs were established in consultation with each department, activity and its students.

As well as confirming the needs expressed in the school's brief, consultation revealed some areas of great consensus and further requirements emerged, as described on the following pages.

Spaces currently used by each activity were analysed, and the spaces required and desired for these activities were quantified, through discussion with staff, the feedback from students, comparison with existing spaces, comparison with facilities at other schools, and technical data. Detailed schedules of accommodation for departments and activities with major accommodation needs were prepared, as included in the following pages.

The existing building accommodation for these activities was appraised alongside investigation into accommodation needs, to evaluate whether the current spaces could be improved and adapted to meet current and future needs, whether other buildings on the school site could meet those needs, or whether new buildings should be built. (The accommodation schedules are not briefs for the design of the new buildings, but a comprehensive estimate of the size and character of spaces and overall area required to house the various activities, to establish how these needs can be met on the school site).

The conclusions of this work are summarised on the following pages.
### Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Entrance and Porters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current space</th>
<th>Proposed area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reception hall &amp; reception</td>
<td>South Hayes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>[60] indicating lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reception office</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waiting room</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in entrance area, or main inside room, with sensor unit, &amp; not visible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medical office/consultation room</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medical room</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>medical ancillary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net area of rooms and stair &amp; plant</td>
<td>estimate 25% of room area</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allow 25% of total net area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total net floor area</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area of internal walls &amp; structure area contingency</td>
<td>estimate 3% of net floor area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allow 3% of total net area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Gross Internal Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>approximate 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>additional 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establishing Needs

**Entrance**

A problem identified by many people during our consultation is that, at present, visitors to the school are not sure where to go. The school's main entrance in South Hayes is uninviting and unimpressive, with the space and grandeur of the school not made apparent at the outset.

The gateway between Great Hall and Q block is more identifiable as an entrance, but the porters here are housed in a cramped semi-basement position, with difficult supervision of arrivals. Significant numbers approach the school from the south via Glencairn, so this entrance is also manned, making inefficient use of manpower. The multiple entrances and difficult vehicular access to the north side of the school create difficulty in isolating contractors and deliveries from students and visitors.

A clear, smart, welcoming entrance is needed, to give a great first impression of the school, with a reception located and arranged such that visitors can be easily directed to other parts of the school. A clearer division of 'entrance' and 'porter' functions is needed (at present there is significant overlap and confusion), and ideally a separation of 'student' and 'trade' entrances would be desirable.

The Steering Group identified that the main entrance should continue to face the Common, but that the porters should move to a different location, in more spacious accommodation, to cover another of the natural entrances to the school. The need for an improved entrance is pressing, as many people mentioned during consultation that the effect of the quality of welcome should not be underestimated.
Establishing Needs
Classrooms

The school has a great variety of classrooms dispersed around the school site, in buildings dating from 19th-21st centuries. The school has a lack of classrooms big enough for large groups - full classes are crammed into small classrooms, as no larger classrooms are available. In places a lack of flexibility has resulted from staff 'colonising' classrooms [sometimes due to a lack of suitable office to work in].

There is also a lack in the quality of classrooms - some have been described as 'dark, hot, airless and stultifying'. A great number of comments were received on the stuffiness of rooms; in some buildings this can be remedied by a more responsive and better controllable heating system, which has been discussed with the school separately.

Large, airy, uplifting new classrooms are needed. An immediate use for 6 such classrooms was identified, and the Steering Group agreed that the masterplan should allow for 10 new classrooms, to allow flexibility, and expansion of 6th Form teaching. Adjoining but separately-accessed offices would offer best flexibility.

The new classrooms could either be dispersed through the school site [giving an additional classroom in many different areas and departments], or could be grouped in new classroom block - in which case some reorganisation of departmental distribution would be needed.

Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed additional area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>large classrooms for full sets, with space for teaching areas on benches at side of room. Charm is the name of 20, 07 language rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>consider, some may be joined by movable walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage to classrooms</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; workrooms</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>between &amp; alongside classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker &amp; top areas</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

- max area of rooms: 620 m²
- circulation & plant: 161 m²
- total net floor area: 984 m²
- area of internal walls and structure: 79 m²
- at 20%  

Total Gross Internal Area: 10882 m² additional 0.04 m²

Some classrooms have low ceilings, cramped desks
A modern classroom with high ceiling and large windows
Establishing Needs
Senior Science

Senior Science is housed in a string of adjoining buildings, with the original 1913 building extended several times, most recently in 2007. The department has a particular problem in that most labs are accessed from staircases and there is no connecting horizontal circulation. Many of the labs are fine spaces, but the lack of independent circulation causes disruption, and means there is little sense of a unified science department. Some prep areas are inadequate, and their dispersal throughout a building with many different levels and lack of direct access makes the lab technicians’ servicing inefficient - technicians have suggested prep areas should be visible to students rather than tucked away. Lack of a shared departmental office prevents ideas ‘bouncing around’, and keeps an old-fashioned division between the disciplines.

Senior Science needs independent circulation, a sense of entrance to the department, lifts for trolley access, a shared department office, ideally a central shared prep area and one extra lab.

Phase 2 of the recent extension to science was intended to address some of these needs but being made up chiefly of circulation spaces, with relatively little additional new accommodation, it was expensive, and the school has no immediate plans to implement this scheme.
Establishing Needs
Multi-use Spaces

The school has some fine multi-use spaces, and pressure on their use is high. However
several spaces are not used to their full potential for reasons of location, access, lack
of ancillary service spaces and visitor facilities, or because the atmosphere within the
space itself is not right. Great Hall lacks daylight, lift access and support spaces for large
gatherings, the school has outgrown the Collyer Hall Theatre as an assembly space, the
dining hall atmosphere is not right for public functions, and events held in the Memorial
Library disrupt pupils’ access. Medium-sized spaces for drama, karate, and meetings are
lacking. Staff have mentioned “a good atmosphere can be created, but the buildings do
not assist in this”.

In our consultation a great many requests for further multi-use spaces were received,
from a variety of departments and activities. A number of different types of spaces, of
different size and qualities, are needed to meet these needs. Although multi-use spaces
are shared spaces used occasionally for a variety of activities - rather than ‘belonging’
to a particular department or activity - many of them would naturally sit within a certain
department or development, as indicated on the outline schedule of accommodation.
Most of the multi-use space needs would be addressed by rooms included in the
development proposals for particular departments, or by adaptation and refurbishment of
existing shared spaces.

As for social spaces - the middle school lacks a common room, and the middle school
Tuck room is hidden. The Steering Group agreed that provision for middle school pupils
should be addressed by improvements and increase in outdoor spaces, rather than
creation of a dedicated middle school common room. The recently-updated 6th Form
common areas are well-used and successful. The staff common room is remote and
underused - many staff reported the resulting lack of ‘collegiate’ atmosphere as a
weakness of the school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current space</th>
<th>Current area m²</th>
<th>Proposed area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; practice rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 practice rooms, 2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Music room</td>
<td>M02 hot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion, piano, rehearsal rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piano room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehearsal room</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 grand piano, 10 people/groups, 10 music desks, 10 music chairs, 10 music stands, 10 music desks, 10 music chairs, 10 music stands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom 1</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom 2</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom 3</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom 4</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal, rehearsal rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rehearsal room</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3 grand piano, 10 people/groups, 10 music desks, 10 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices / study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>director of music</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head of department, school</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housemaster / headmaster</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music administration</td>
<td>M04</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs, full class, 14 music desks, 14 music chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foyer to recital room / entrance to department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic store cupboard</td>
<td>M02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 practice rooms, 2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument storage</td>
<td>M02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td>M02</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>net area of rooms and site (including ancillary spaces)</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net set floor area</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area of internal walls and windows area contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total floors internal area</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing Needs
Music School

The school's standard of music is high, despite its facilities. The purpose-built but now outdated music building of the late 1970s is described by staff and students as 'dingy and tired'.

The main rehearsal space is too small for the full orchestra, and has too loud an acoustic for the orchestra to play in. Visiting professionals have said they cannot teach here. There are no other large spaces at school that the music department has 'first call' on for use. Smaller music rooms are fully occupied by teaching, with generally no rooms free to allow for students' practice.

Performances take place in the Great Hall, which has a very 'dead' acoustic once occupied, and does not allow good views of the orchestra. The Collyer Hall Theatre is used for chamber, small group and solo performances quite successfully.

The music department needs considerable expansion and improvement in its facilities, with spaces of the correct acoustic for music-making, and soundproofing between. Two large rehearsal & recital rooms would allow one exclusively for the music department, and another as a multi-purpose recital/lecture/function room. More small rooms are needed, to allow students to practise.

The need is pressing – music provision is not what might be expected at a leading school.
Establishing Needs
Junior School Library

The Junior School Library is too small, inflexible, with very little natural light and inadequate ventilation – not an inspiring space.

The Junior School boys have a thirst for reading which should be better rewarded, with an inspiring, fresh environment. A replacement library should be large enough for 50-60 boys at once, allow for talks and events, and must also function as a classroom.

### Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Junior School Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current space</th>
<th>Current area m²</th>
<th>Proposed area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Pitney Junior School library</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Space for 50-60 boys, or for a class, and enough space for special events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>storage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Storage in addition to that at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>office</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- Net area of rooms: 94 m²
- Circulation & plant: 14 m² (10% of net area)
- Total net floor area: 108 m²
- Area of internal walls and structure: 17 m² (8% of total net floor area)
- Area contingency: 0 m² (0%)
- Total Gross Internal Area: 113 m²
- Total Gross Internal Area: 127 (3%)
### Establishing Needs

#### Drama

The two main drama spaces are Collyer Hall Theatre and the Q2 studio. The theatre is very popular with pupils and the drama department find it flexible, and suited to young actors. However, as this is a shared space, in use for many other events and activities than drama, access is limited and complicated.

Extra-curricular drama is very popular, and the scope of this is limited by the lack of facilities.

The department's most pressing need is for an extra studio space, exclusively for drama. A larger capacity theatre is not needed, but the space would benefit from refurbishment, and new seating. The theatre has limited backstage facilities.

Drama would also benefit from extra multi-purpose spaces in the school, which would ease pressure on the theatre, and give alternative suitable spaces for occasional drama use.

---

### Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Current space</th>
<th>Proposed area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theatre</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>Collyer Hall Theatre</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>to seat around 200, no more capacity than CHT, flexible, to be split into different ways, bench seating for flexibility in assembly use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bkgd/atrium</td>
<td>CHT gallery</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moated</td>
<td>CHT bridge</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGM position</td>
<td>CHT control room</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>may be within room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scene dock</td>
<td>CHT rig stage</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minst</td>
<td>CHT wing one side only</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theatre storage</td>
<td>small stores of battery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>props</td>
<td>CHT spotters off layer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Studios                  |               |                  |       |
| studio 1                 | Q2 foyer | 62 | double height |
| studio 2                 |         | 33 | may be within room |
| studio control           | within room | 12 | for seating/seating |
| studio storage           | store off Q2 | 3 |       |

| Backstage                |               |                  |       |
| dressing room 1          | CHT spotters | 14 | up to 8 at once |
| dressing room 2          | music rooms used | 24 |       |
| green room               | music rooms used | 24 |       |
| player's box            | CHT spotters | 24 |       |
| stage lights             | CHT spotters | 7 | 2 double units |
| wardrobe                 | CHT spotters | 1 | 1 double seat, 1 single use |
|化妆间                    | CHT spotters | 1 |       |

| Offices / study / staff  |               |                  |       |
| office by Q2             | office by Q2 | 11 | all to be discussed |
| board of department      | Q2 board | 9 |       |
| dept office              | Q2 director | 24 |       |
| teacher's spaces         | Q2 director | 8 |       |
| box office               | Q2 director | 5 |       |
| dept storage             | offices of CHT flyer | 10 |       |
| cleaners / costume       |       | 5 | requirement (5), whether cleaning material (inorganics) & cleaning in use |
| library                  |       | 4 |       |

| Front of house           |               |                  |       |
| foyer, inc bar           | ground floor 110, first floor 110 total area - hall circulation, open foyer space | 165 |       |
| foyer, inc bar           |         | 20 |       |
| foyer, inc bar           |         | 24 |       |
| foyer, inc bar           |         | 20 |       |
| foyer, inc bar           |         | 9 | 25% perhaps store room with mobile bar |

| Summary                  |               |                  |       |
| net area of rooms excl/C & plant | 759 | 1154 |
| plant, inc dimmer rooms  |               |                  |       |
| circulation              |               |                  |       |
| Total net floor area     |               |                  |       |
| area of internal walls and structure | 963 | 1540 |
| area of external walls and structure | 90 | 106 |
| Total Gross External Area|               |                  |       |
| area measured from plans | 1030 | 1740 |
| area measured from plans | 681 | additional 0% |
Establishing Needs

Q Block

The school’s dining and catering spaces were designed to provide around 1100 meals a day, but now provide on average 1500. There is a lack of space in all areas - kitchen, servery, dining, queuing, and staff facilities. Diners are rushed through to allow for 3 sittings, which makes for an unenjoyable lunchtime for staff and students in an already hectic day.

During consultation with the school, the appearance of Q Block’s 1960s wings have been consistently described as unattractive, bleak, and ‘letting the school down’. The concrete cladding panels around the windows also have problems of spalling, which is currently kept in check by patch repair. Longer-term, a proposal which deals with both the physical and aesthetic problems of this building is needed.
## Establishing Needs

### Sports

The sports department offers a wide range of activities, in a complex schedule of periods and locations, both at the main school site and off-site sports grounds. The quality of existing sports facilities is good, but the school needs more and larger sports spaces.

At present the lack of indoor activity studios suitable for dance, karate, yoga, fencing, etc., means that these activities take place in the main sports hall, preventing its use for team sports - an inefficient use of space.

The sports hall itself has wasted space in inefficient circulation, and the entrance, staff offices and changing areas are poor.

Additional all-weather games areas would be useful, to increase games provision on the main school site. The addition of girls to the 6th form means further netball courts will be needed.

The school swimming pool was constructed as an external pool in 1910, and covered in a simple building 80 years later. In the longer term the school wish to replace this with a modern pool of correct standard size.

### Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed additional external area m²</th>
<th>Proposed additional internal area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal sports spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dance/multi-purpose studio</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>max width 10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all-cause hall</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34.6 x 36m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hall storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff office</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrance</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puff changing</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>some external by pitch/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net area of rooms</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td></td>
<td>100% of total net floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total net floor area</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>allow 5% of total net floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area of internal masts and structure</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>allow 5% of total net floor area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area of changing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>allow 5% of total net floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Internal Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>allow 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total External Sports Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed additional external area m²</th>
<th>Proposed additional internal area m²</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>netball courts</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>2 courts instead of present 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff games area</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB: Schedule quantifies additional sports space requirements only.**

Long-term development proposals would also include for replacement of the pool with new 6-lane 25m pool and changing.
### Establishing Needs Summary

The consultation with staff, students and parents generally revealed a well-loved school, with many popular spaces and buildings. The need for improved facilities is most keenly expressed by staff who are frustrated that the lack of suitable spaces prevent the school in offering more. In some areas facilities don't keep pace with their pupils' enthusiasm, or allow them to reach their potential.

This summary schedule of accommodation needs shows that significant areas of development are required to meet the school's needs over the next decade.

#### Outline Schedule of Accommodation - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present Area m²</th>
<th>Required Area m²</th>
<th>Additional Required Area m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porters</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>only additional quantified</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>only additional quantified</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Library</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multipurpose Spaces</td>
<td>only additional quantified</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>only additional quantified</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>1405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil wcs, lockers</td>
<td>only additional quantified</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The school has a wonderful site, with some fine buildings and landscaped areas, and the advantage of sports fields on the main site.

The school layout is compact, with a friendly scale, yet the grounds feel spacious.
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities
History of the school buildings

Plan illustrating the historical development of the school

When buildings were built, by decade
- pre 1891
- 1891-1910
- 1911-1920
- 1921-1930
- 1931-1940
- 1941-1950
- 1951-1960
- 1961-1970
- 1971-1980
- 1981-1990
- 1991-2000
- 2001-present
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities
Existing Accommodation
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Existing Accommodation
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Existing Accommodation
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities
Form of the school

A spatial pattern can be seen in the way the school has developed - with buildings arranged to form smaller courtyards around the central space.

This is a good site plan principle. It gives the school a strong sense of cohesion and it could be successfully maintained in a plan for future growth.

The open outlook to the fields from the central space gives spaciousness to the compact building arrangement.
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities
Pedestrian Circulation

The site is crossed by many pedestrian routes between buildings.

In places these routes are rather circuitous - the route from the Junior areas or Reeve building to the sports hall detours around fields and down to the pavilion, this being the school's only crossing point across Wright's Alley.

The playground in the middle of the school grounds is also an area which is circulated around, rather than traversed.
Vehicular circulation is kept to the edge of the school site - cars are prevented from encroaching on the main pupil areas more successfully than in many schools, but this means the school has very little parking to offer staff and visitors.

Essential vehicular access routes across the site for maintenance and emergency must be maintained in development proposals.
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities

Development Principles

We established, with the Masterplan Steering Group, some principles for the form of development.

For new developments to reinforce the form of the school of courtyards opening to a central open space, and to keep the wonderful open prospect to and from the fields.

To improve outdoor play space, with a greater variety of outdoor spaces for socialising, relaxation.

To improve Q Block's unpopular appearance.

To bring Great Hall & South Hayes to life, with more activity in these fine buildings at the face of the school.

To improve circulation routes around the school - between the linked buildings from Q Block to Science, and the east-west route through the grounds.

To avoid the need for temporary accommodation.
Site Analysis & Development Possibilities
Option studies

Many development options were considered as we explored how the school's needs could be met.

Alternative locations and phasing for each activity were investigated, to see how developments might be interlinked to best meet the school's priorities, whilst minimising disruption.

Consideration was given to exploiting the development potential of the school's few sites where substantial new development is possible. Options involving refurbishment and extension works to existing buildings were carefully evaluated so that investment would make sense financially and result in improvement of the quality of accommodation. The agreed development principles also guided evaluation of various development options.

The development options were discussed closely with the Masterplan Steering Group at a series of meetings, between which further options were investigated, to reach a compatible set of preferred options for each area of need.

These preferred options were then developed into an outline Masterplan.
The Masterplan

1. Entrance
2. Classrooms
3. Hard play
4. Quad
5. Music
6. Drama
7. Junior library
8. South Hayes
9. Dining, Q-block
10. Sports - All weather courts
11. Sports - Hall
12. Sports - Pool, studios & courts

King's College School - Development Masterplan
Tim Ronalds Architects
Projects

Entrance

A new clear, smart, welcoming entrance is needed, to give a great first impression of the school.

Three options were studied - improving the present entrance in South Hayes, opening up an entrance to the Great Hall building (beneath the hall), and creating an entrance as part of a replacement development to Q Block.

The preferred option agreed was to create a new entrance and reception in the Great Hall building. This would reinforce the school's identity by welcoming people to its original and defining building, and bring life to the deserted front court of the Great Hall.

This option is achievable with much less disturbance and investment than the redevelopment of Q block, and the 'domestic' feel of South Hayes detracts from its suitability as the main entrance to a busy, successful and ambitious school.
An engraved stone sign marks the new entrance to the Great Hall building. Stone paving and planting make an impressive new approach to the school.

A spacious, fresh and welcoming new reception and waiting area.

These images show ideas of how the entrance and reception could be transformed - but these are not decided proposals.
A new open reception desk and waiting area are created, in a spacious entrance hall.

The stairs to Great Hall and the Head Master’s waiting room are directly off the reception area, and visitors can be readily directed to other areas of the school from this central point.

A new lift gives disabled access to the Great Hall, and allows easier servicing of functions here.

New visitor WCs are also provided.
Projects
Classrooms & Science

Several options for providing new classrooms were considered, and the one of attaching a new classroom building to the science block was considered the best. It provides all the additional space required, has least impact on open space, and at the same time provides a solution for the circulation improvements and extra space needed for science.

The need is for new teaching and multipurpose spaces, which could function as classrooms, labs, meeting, office or common spaces. This provision will allow space for departments to expand, improve the quality of classrooms and make space for multi-use rooms - room to move.
Projects
Classrooms & Science

The proposal is for a new 3-storey classroom block, with circulation area linking the science block's south 'phase 1' extension and the Cavan-Taylor wing, with access to all labs in between.

The new building would have floor levels aligned with the science extension, giving generous floor-to-ceiling heights for the new rooms.

The proposal shown is a very efficient and economic structure. The new building is constructed independently of the science block, and cantilevers over to provide access to the existing labs. Lightwells bring daylight down through the circulation areas.

The stairs, lift, WCs, and locker/bag areas are grouped, with the classroom accommodation in a single block which can be subdivided in a number of ways, giving flexibility in the size and use of spaces.

This proposed 1900 sqm development addresses the need for extra classrooms and science accommodation, and also the school's need for pupil WCs and bag areas in more locations around the school.
The new classrooms should be a handsome addition to the school grounds, in keeping with the scale of surrounding buildings.
How can you extend the Science Building without disruption?

Site Access -
The contractor has access from the Ridgeway on a fenced road to an enclosed site compound.

- Quiet, clean construction techniques
- Noisy operations at weekends and in holidays

Student Access to Science Labs -
Temporary stair to access from the back

Windows & Soundproofing -
Existing windows are secondary glazed to provide soundproofing
Projects
South Hayes

South Hayes contains a number of fine rooms which are suitable for a variety of functions.

The large south-facing rooms could continue to be used as classrooms, or could become meeting, function, or staff common areas. The choice will depend on future decisions, needs, and developments elsewhere in the school. These rooms could open out to the school grounds to the south.

The school’s lack of multi-purpose rooms for functions and meetings could be addressed by creating a suite of handsome and flexible rooms, close to the school entrance. This location is more convenient for catering provision than the present Dalziel Room.

A small private meeting room close to the school entrance would also allow parents to meet staff confidentially, without their children or children’s friends in the school grounds being aware of their presence.

The Chapel might benefit from relocation to an area of greater pupil footfall, to encourage its natural use.

The Great Hall will be able to host a greater variety of events and functions, when supported by the new school entrance, lift, and nearby flexible multi-purpose spaces.

Great Hall itself could improved by new rooflights to bring in natural light.
Games, Play Areas, Quad

The school has a lack in variety of outdoor spaces for recreation, relaxing, and play, and a lack of space for informal games at break and lunchtimes. The current hard play area south of Great Hall is heavily-used, but is unwelcoming for those not paying, who must skirt around the area.

The masterplan proposes that this key central area, linking many of the school’s buildings and courtyards, should become an informal landscaped area, with trees, benches, paving and planting: a beautiful space welcoming to sit out and linger in, and which can be traversed to give more direct links between buildings and courtyards around the Quad.

A new all-weather hard play area is proposed south of the Quad, taking up part of the school playing fields. This gives a larger area for informal games, accessible all-year, with a location still central but less disruptive. 3 netball courts would fit here, addressing the lack of courts for girls’ formal games. Care should be taken for any enclosure of the play area to be as minimal and transparent as possible, to keep the open views between the Quad and fields.

The First XV pitch remains as a present, further south.

The new hard play area would also replace the Junior School hard play area, allowing the cage site to be developed. This large area, at the edge of the school site, would allow a significant new development to be created relatively unobtrusively for the school.

The proposal gives an increase in area of play space:
New hard play area 1490sqm, previously 1110sqm
New Juniors’ play area 870sqm, previously 700sqm.
Facilities for Music at King’s are not good, and more and better facilities are one of the school’s highest priorities.

We have considered a number of options for how they might be improved
- alterations and expansion of the present building
- rebuilding on the existing site
- a new building on the west side of the field,
- a new building to the south side of the field

Eventually the idea of building on the site of the Junior School hard play area was suggested, and agreed to be far the best solution. It allows a good sized new music school to be built with minimal disruption and without need for temporary accommodation.

Drama and others could then expand into the present music space.
Projects
Music School

This is a good site for Music.

The building can be planned with the two large spaces - the rehearsal room and recital room - room facing east and west, giving impressive views into and out of the spaces. The smaller teaching spaces are on either side of these. A basement storey would contain secondary functions.

The new building can incorporate a new Porters' Lodge and Porter's flat on the south-west corner, to supervise the Glencairn school entrance.

This development would have a total internal area around 2200sqm.
Projects
Music School

The drawings show the possible disposition of spaces on the three floors.

The building will of course be highly soundproofed.

The drawings illustrate one idea of how the music school might be arranged, but are not decided proposals.
Projects

Music School

The new music school would overlook the playing fields.
The development shown has a similar scale to the Reeve Art School.
Projects
Music School

Can a sizeable building be built in this location with minimal disruption?

The diagram shows a compact contractor's area, maintaining school circulation to the north. The Glencairn gate would give access directly into the contractor's compound, and a temporary gate and vehicular access would need to be created to the west, allowing independent school access for the duration of works. Construction logistics similar to those used on tight urban sites would be utilised, with delivery of materials controlled to account for lack of storage space on site.

In order to plan the music building to minimise its bulk, and in order to maintain pedestrian school access from Clifton Road into the school site, the single-storey bag room at the south end of Priory might be lost - but this function can be replaced elsewhere.
Projects
Drama

The Collyer Hall Theatre is a well-loved, flexible and successful space, which would benefit greatly from refurbishment. The adjacent current music spaces, once vacated, provide the room needed to improve Drama, and consolidate its activities in one building.

The large, tall room behind the stage can become a new studio, much larger than the present studio in Q block. The adjoining control room can serve the studio and adjacent classroom. Small rooms provide space for offices, technicians' spaces, and changing rooms.

Only limited alteration is required to create a new drama department, and some classroom and office space for other uses will also be provided.

Learning Enrichment require a room with adjoining office, which could be provided here, and the Junior School's longer term need for extra classrooms and offices could be met here, giving Junior School spaces encircling their entrance courtyard, linked to their new library.
Projects

Junior School Library

Of the various options explored for improvements to the Junior School and creating a larger Library, the idea of building above the music practice rooms proved the best.

The flat roof provides space for a 200m² new library, without disrupting Junior School or encroaching on outdoor space. This in turns allows space for other improvements to the Junior School.

The first-floor library, looking over the Juniors’ entrance courtyard, would make a prominent and welcoming library space, encouraging its use.
Projects
Q Block

Much thought has been given to how the 1960’s parts of Q Block can be improved.

There are three main problems:
- the inadequacy of dining and kitchen space
- the decayed condition of the fabric, in particular windows, concrete and brickwork
- the general appearance of the building, particularly the view from the Common.

The building is certainly not liked.
To make more space for dining, a new glazed extension to the dining hall which in fills the cloister is proposed. This provides space for queuing and tables, which in turn allows the servery areas to expand.

The present Porters Lodge moves to the Glencairn gate and this space can become toilets and lockers and space for bag storage.
Projects
Q Block

Q Block is a sound structure which merits refurbishment rather than demolition.

The elevations need repair, and that to the Common is generally thought to detract from the school.

The proposal is to reface the building, redesign and replace windows and, on the north elevation, possibly to use stucco rather than brick to better balance South Hayes and the neighbouring buildings.

These improvements will not only deal with the decaying elements but also allow the building to be upgraded environmentally.

The second storey could also be extended on the common side of the building to provide two new classrooms.

Existing Woodhayes Road Elevation

Proposed Woodhayes Road Elevation
*The drawing illustrates one idea of how Q Block could be transformed, but is not a decided proposal.*
Projects
Q Block

- Decant 7 classrooms
- Gain 4 additional classrooms: two newly constructed on the second floor, two converted from the previous porter’s flat on the mezzanine

The work to Q Block needs to be done with minimal disruption.

The work will be undertaken once the new classroom building has been built, so the new classrooms can provide the space needed for decanting Q Block.

The contractor establishes the site and takes occupation of the spaces shown on the drawings with access only from the exterior. The work can be undertaken in a number of phases, to minimise disruption.

The work in the courtyard and construction of the new glass and steel extensions to the dining hall are constructed in the summer holidays.

Dining facilities, toilets and most classrooms can continue unaffected by the building works.

Scale 1:400
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facade works and alterations

courtyard works
Projects

Sports

3 phases of development are envisaged.

Phase 1
A new multi-use sports area on the site of the present cricket nets. The cricket nets will be relocated to Colman's Field. This area is large enough for 4 tennis courts. These will be 'replacement' courts for those lost in Phase 2, and in the interim provide an immediate increase in sports spaces available.

Phase 2
The construction of a new addition to the sports centre: a new 4-court sports hall built to current standards (which are larger than the school's existing hall), and storage space.

Phase 3
A new swimming pool is added to the sports centre; a 6-lane 25m pool with spectator seating and changing facilities. Space is also provided for judo and dance, and department offices. The existing pool is demolished and the all-weather courts completed, to provide 6 tennis courts. A new circulation spine will rationalise the sports centre's current complicated circulation, and make it fully accessible.
Projects
Sports

The phasing plan creates a sports centre that will by 2020 provide the appropriate range of facilities for a school of the size of King’s.

All the facilities are arranged around a glazed circulation spine with school entrance from the south, public entrance from the north, with the Lodge garden lawn providing an outdoor focus.

Such a centre would also considerably increase the appeal and uptake of King’s Club membership, and the benefits this brings to the school.

The Lodge could be used for school staff accommodation, or a variety of other functions.
Projects

Roads & Parking

Parking
The school has limited parking space, mostly along the common frontage and south of the fields, by Ridgway.

If Controlled Parking is introduced in the locality by Merton Council on-street parking will be more limited.

The school will continue to encourage staff, parents and students to use alternative means of transport.

Pupil Collection and Drop-off
King’s pupils come to school by various means and from various directions and the problem of congestion caused by parents’ cars is not severe. There would appear to be no need for new arrangements.
Masterplan
Sequence of Development

A number of sequences are possible for the development projects. Considerations include priority, need for ‘decanting’ space, and disruption. Redevelopment projects can be undertaken only once their use is freed up by earlier developments, whereas the entrance, all-weather courts, classrooms, and music school could be undertaken first. Some projects can be simultaneous, whilst others must be finished sequentially. Several sequences were discussed with the school, and the following sequence agreed:

1. Entrance - a new welcoming public face,
2. Classrooms & science - space to expand into, allowing redevelopment of existing buildings.
3. All-weather play - follow classrooms, to then allow redevelopment of the quad and current Juniors' play area,
4. Landscaped Quad - the new heart of the school.
5. Music - can follow once the Juniors' play site is free,
6. Drama - expands into vacated music rooms.
7. Junior School Library - developed alongside the drama refurbishment works.
9. All-weather courts - increased outdoors sports use.
10. Q Block - follows the higher-priority music and classroom developments.
12. Pool - replaces the pool, and new studios spaces, and consolidates the sports activities into a centre.
Masterplan
Indicative development programme

An indicative construction programme is shown, giving periods for project design and planning stages and the construction phase. Projects are generally planned with construction phases commencing in the school holidays, so that the construction area, contractor's facilities and access arrangements are set up and operational by term time.

Alternative construction sequences are also possible. The projects form a number of independent sequences, as shown in the diagram to the right.

Any of the Entrance, Classrooms, Music, or Sports Courts sequences could be commenced first, but South Hayes and Dining/Q Block must follow either the Classrooms or Music development, to allow decanting space.

Sequences could also be commenced simultaneously, if funding and arrangements to minimise disruption allow.

King's College School - Development Masterplan
Tim Ronalds Architects
Cost Estimates for each of the 12 projects have been prepared by Quantity Surveyors Bristow Johnson & Partners.

These are quite detailed estimates but for masterplanning purposes what is given here are single figure all-inclusive order of cost estimates. They include for:

- construction  
- fees  
- fitting out  
- furniture  
- equipment  
- VAT  
- inflation (based on indicative programme)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-weather Play</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quad</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music School</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior School Library</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Use Spaces</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Block</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-weather Courts</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total £31.1M
Masterplan
Cash Flow

Funding considerations will determine the development programme. The annual expenditure required for the indicative programme is given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex. O</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ex. O: Expenditure on operating costs
Masterplan
Environment & Sustainability

A responsible masterplan has to consider the issues of the environment and sustainability. What measures can and will be taken to reduce the carbon footprint of the school over the next 10-15 years?

The development programme provides the opportunity to incrementally improve the performance of the school's buildings. Existing buildings like Q Block and the Collyer Hall will be retrofitted which will radically improve their energy performance. New buildings will be designed to the highest environmental standards (BREEAM excellent for example). In parallel, the school's ongoing maintenance operation will continue to update systems, make improvements to reduce heat loss and energy consumption, and improve control systems.

At present some of the school spaces have poor environmental control, so rooms are under-ventilated and overheated. More modern control systems will make better educational environments and reduce CO₂.

Devising an environmental strategy may be a useful first step - to look at and benchmark current energy consumption and establish policies for reducing CO₂ emissions and developing renewable energy sources.

These considerations will influence the design of the new buildings.
Masterplan
Planning Consultation

These masterplan development proposals take into account the London Borough of Merton’s planning policies summarised on page 21 and will be discussed during April with London Borough of Merton in formal pre-application consultations.

We hope the local authority will welcome the production of a long-term development plan, and the fact that proposals respond to relevant planning policy, demonstrate research and consultation into the school’s needs, and are based on a thorough exploration of development options.

Consultation will we hope gain LB Merton support for the masterplan proposals, clarify any planning constraints, and identify where further work might be necessary to satisfy the Planning Department that the individual proposals and the overall masterplan are appropriate.

The aim is to gain LB Merton’s support in principle for the whole masterplan proposal.
How robust is this Masterplan? There are three risks to consider:

Funding
The development programme is dependent on the availability of capital funding. What would be the effect if funding were not available to enable development to proceed as the programme indicates? If development stopped at any particular stage, would the school be left in an unsatisfactory state? In practice development tends to happen much more slowly than planned for.

The plan has been devised so that the school remains operational at each phase of development. Each stage of development leaves the school in an improved state, without relying on the swift completion of 'follow-on' projects. The plan is devised to avoid the need for temporary accommodation during or between construction phases – this precludes the situation sometimes seen at schools, in which pauses in an ambitious development programme leave departments in temporary accommodation for many years.

Changing Needs
What would be the effects on the plan of unforeseen changes? What if the school needs or priorities change significantly? Changes over a 10-15 year period are likely.

Needs are likely to change and the masterplan will be adapted and revised as they do. Each completed building project changes the situation. The plan envisages the new classrooms (which are suitable for a variety of uses) being the first major development, giving an early significant improvement and increase in school accommodation. This gives the school the space to move into, to allow other existing buildings to be improved or redeveloped. Incremental development makes it possible to respond to changing needs or circumstances as development proceeds. Flexibility and adaptability are important considerations for the brief for all future buildings.

Planning
What are the risks of not being able to get planning permission for the developments the Masterplan describes?

There are constraints - the school is in a conservation area, has nearby neighbours, and some loss of field space and mature trees is unavoidable to meet the school’s accommodation needs - but developments are sited and planned so that their form responds best to the planning constraints. Early discussion with LB Merton on the entire masterplan proposal is needed, and Local Authorities can be more receptive to individual proposals which are seen to be part of an overall considered long-term plan.
The Masterplan provides a plan for the development of the school buildings and site which enables departments and activities progressively to have new or improved facilities.

These are planned in a sequence which takes into account their priority, and so that development can take place with least disruption and without the need for temporary accommodation. A better disposition of departments and facilities results.

New buildings are proposed where appropriate, and economic adaptation, reuse and extension of existing buildings where possible. The Masterplan enhances the quality of the school by planning developments sympathetically, allowing increased and more varied use of open spaces and improves circulation routes around the school site. The school's defining Great Hall building is brought into more prominent use, and the school's wonderful open vista across the fields from and to the Great Hall is kept.
We suggest that the following work now needs to be done to progress the development plan:

**LB Merton**
1. Consultation with Planning Department to gain their support for the masterplan, and clarify any planning constraints. Further work might be necessary in certain areas to satisfy the Planning Department that the individual proposals are appropriate. The aim is to gain LB Merton’s support in principle for the whole masterplan proposal.

**First Building Developments - Entrance, Classrooms, Music**
2. For development projects that are envisaged to begin design or construction in the next 3 years, accommodation briefs should be developed in more detail. The initial briefs established for the Masterplan will need further work in close collaboration with the school, and if appropriate, precedents researched. This will also allow the costs of the building proposals to be estimated with greater certainty.

3. Further work is required on the plan area and form of the proposed new Classrooms and Music buildings, in response to the developed briefs and any planning constraints — to develop how these projects might fit in the most appropriate form on their sites.

4. Further work is required on the Classrooms proposal, to establish in more detail how the new building should be constructed whilst use of the existing science building continues. This work will also allow the costs of this proposal to be estimated with greater certainty.

5. A landscape plan for the proposed new hard play and quad should be developed. Further detail on landscape/planting proposed as part of new developments (and to replace lost trees), may assist in gaining LB Merton support for the masterplan.

**Design Team appointments**
6. For construction of the entrance proposals and new classrooms to commence in summer 2013, design teams should be appointed as soon as possible to develop the building proposals for these projects.

7. For the all-weather pitches to be constructed during the 2012-13 school year, so that this is in use by the September 2013, when the construction compound for the classrooms will occupy part of the current school pitches, consultants should be appointed by the summer holiday 2012, to develop proposals. Liaison with LB Merton and the Highways department will be needed, regarding the possible new road exit to Ridgway, and floodlighting.

**Further surveys**
8. The implications of site services and surface water drainage need to be explored. Some precautionary geotechnical investigations may also be advisable, to the classrooms and music development sites.

**Presentation Material**
9. Presentation material depicting the concept and principles of developments may be needed to assist the Development Office’s early fundraising.
Mr D Armitage  
King’s College School  
Southside Common  
Wimbledon  
London  
SW19 4TT  

Dear Mr Armitage

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AMENDED)

Location – King’s College School, Southside Common, Wimbledon, SW19 4TT  
Proposal – King’s College School Development Masterplan

Further to your pre-application inquiry, I attach a copy of the Council’s advice.

Please note that although the pre-application advice that has been given will be taken into account if a subsequent planning application is made, this advice given is not legally binding upon the Local Planning Authority and does not constitute a formal decision.

Should you wish to discuss the report further please do not hesitate to contact the case officer David Gardener (020 8454 3115). Please note that further meetings and consideration of revised drawings would be subject to the Council’s published charging regime as set out on the Council’s web site: http://www.merton.gov.uk/living/planning/planningapplications/dcpreappadvice.htm

Yours Sincerely

David Gardener  
Planning Officer
NOTES OF PRE APPLICATION:

King's College School, Southside Common, Wimbledon, London, SW19 4TT

King's College School Development Masterplan

Site and Surroundings:
1) Character of Area: Kings College School site extends between Southside Common to the north, and Ridgway to the south, and between the rear of properties in Peregrine Way to the west, and Clifton Road to the east. The bulk of the school buildings are located to the north and northeast of the site, with the sports fields sited to the south, fronting Ridgway. The school has a variety of buildings dating from the 19th to the 21st Centuries, including some that are either statutory or locally listed.
2) Conservation Area: Yes (Wimbledon West)
3) Area at risk of flooding (1 in 100 - year flood zone): No
4) UDP site proposal designation: Open Space, Archaeological Priority Zone
5) Within an Archaeological Priority Zone: No
6) Within a Controlled Parking Zone: No
7) Public Transport Accessibility Level: 2
8) Trees: There are a number of trees located within the site that are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (TPO). As the site is also within a conservation area other controls will also apply.

Proposal
The Masterplan sets out the physical development of King's College School over the next 10 to 15 years, and describes the facilities the school needs, and a plan for a sequence of building projects to meet these needs. These are as follows:

- New entrance
- New three-storey classroom building to be attached to the existing science block.
- Internal remodeling of South Hayes to create multi function spaces.
- Replacement of existing hard play area to the south of the Great Hall with a new Quad, which would become an informal landscaped area. A new all-weather hard play area is proposed south of the Quad, taking up part of the school playing fields. The new play area would also replace the Junior School hard play area.
- New Music School to be built on the site of the Junior School hard play area.
- Refurbishment of the Collyer Hall Theatre with consolidation of Drama activities in one building
- Erection of an additional storey above existing music practice rooms to provide new library.
- Improvements to Q Block, including a new glazed extension to the dining hall, reface of building to include new windows, and possible extension at second storey level to provide new classrooms.
- Expansion and reorganisation of existing sports facilities, including the construction of a new sports hall addition to the existing sports centre, swimming pool and tennis courts.

Policy context
The relevant policies are:

Adopted Merton Unitary Development Plan (October 2003):
BE.1 (Conservation Areas, New Development, Change of Use, Alterations and Extensions)
BE.2 (Conservation Areas, Demolition)
BE.7 (Listed Buildings; Alterations and Extensions)
BE.8 (Setting of Listed Buildings, Ancient Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens and the Wider Historic Landscape)
BE.11 (Local List; Rehabilitation and Maintenance)
BE.15 (New Buildings and Extensions; Daylight, Sunlight, Privacy, Visual Intrusion and Noise)
BE.16 (Urban Design)
BE.22 (Design of New Development)
BE.23 (Alterations and Extensions to Buildings)
E.2 (Access for Disabled People)
C.14 (Non-Council Schools/Other Educational Facilities)
L.7 (Recreational Open Space)
NE.11 (Trees-Protection)

Adopted Core Strategy (July 2011):
CS.11 (Infrastructure)
CS.13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture)
CS.14 (Design)
CS.15 (Climate Change)
CS.20 (Parking, Servicing and Delivery)

Adopted London Plan (July 2011):
3.18 (Education Facilities)
5.13 (Sustainable Drainage)
5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction)
5.4 (Retrofitting)
7.18 (Protecting Local Open Space and Addressing Local Deficiency)
7.19 (Biodiversity and Access to Nature)
7.2 (An Inclusive Environment)
7.4 (Local Character)
7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology)

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Wimbledon West Conservation Area Character Assessment (Sub Area 13 –
King’s College School) (2004)

Planning history
The school has a lengthy planning history but the following applications are
relevant:
1960s and 1970s:
MER492/65 - Erection of buildings for Music Rooms. Refused, 7th October 1965,
Amendments approved 4th November 1965.
MER771/74 - Demolition of Junior School Hall, Cottage and Music Hall.
Approved, 30th January 1975.
MER585/74(D) Approval of detailed drawings for Stage 3 of Redevelopment of

1980s:
87/P0013 - Erection of a part single/part three-storey building to provide 6th form
87/P0021 - Listed building consent to demolish "L" block containing 5 classrooms and an assembly hall known as Little Hall in connection with the proposed construction of a new 6th form centre. Approved, 5th March 1987.
87/P0840 - Erection of single storey building enclosing existing swimming pool. Approved, 3rd September 1987.
89/P0823 - Two-storey prefabricated building for use as a Craft Design and Technology Dept attached to the Art Dept. Approved, 14th August 1989.

1990s:
90/P0277 - Listed building consent for alterations and refurbishment of great hall including formation of new gallery at southeast end of Great Hall and alterations to up-grade means of escape from South Hayes, which is linked to Great Hall. Approved, 10th May 1990.
93/P0279 - Listed building consent to alter existing entrance way and modern link bridge between senior school building and Great Hall including formation of new porters lodge. Approved, 4th November 1993.
94/P0214 - Alterations to and extension of existing sports hall to form new squash courts, erection of new rifle range on site of existing sub-standard range, and repositioning of existing timber framed junior school cricket pavilion in south west corner of Colman's field, together with related improvements including new fencing. Approved, 21st July 1994.
97/P1010 - Erection of a two-storey art & design technology building with additional accommodation within the roof, situated near the Clifton Road frontage, involving demolition of existing art school building and pottery building. Erection of new brick piers and iron railings, with related landscaping, adjacent to Clifton Road, involving demolition of existing boundary wall on road frontage. Refacing existing two-storey flat roofed prefabricated junior school science & technology building, and addition of a new pitched lightweight colour coated steel roof with alterations to entrance and access. Approved, 13th November 1997.
99/P0212 - Listed building consent for the erection of a two-storey extension to provide entrance lobby to school and additional classroom space above. Approved, 17th May 1999.

2000s:
01/P1971 - Erection of a four-storey extension to the existing school library. Granted, 12th February 2002.
03/P2445 - Erection of an extension to the existing school dining hall into kitchen yard (adjoining wrights alley). Including provision of new windows on Woodhayes Road frontage with new railings and landscaping. Approved, 20th February 2004.


06/P1981 - Extension and improvements to school science building providing 6 new laboratories, ancillary spaces and circulation. Approved, 16th November 2006.

10/P1437 - Erection of a single storey building for use as classrooms with 1 small ensemble and 1 large music/practice room. Approved, 3rd August 2010.

Consultation

Urban Design Officer (Paul Garrett)

General Points

Generally supportive of the overall approach, recognising the need for a masterplan for a range of enhancements to be delivered over a number of years.

It is important that such a plan is robust, coherent and deliverable. Issues relating to arrangement of buildings, changes to open space and effect on trees need to be well thought out and justified. Opportunities should also be taken to effect other smaller, ancillary changes, for example, relating to boundaries, landscaping, parking etc.

Where major changes are planned, particularly around the sports halls and new music building, it is important to ensure the new buildings take the opportunity to make best use of land and do not add to a feel of piecemeal development – i.e. they should attempt to create coherence and identity where it may be currently lacking.

As it is not going to be possible to have a universal architectural theme across the whole site, this needs to be done by other means, such as scale and materials. This also holds true for the science block and dining hall areas as well.

There are a number of pleasant and intimate spaces/courtyards created by the current buildings and the new proposals present an opportunity to improve some of these and possibly create new ones. This is particularly important if the school wishes to encroach onto designated open space in some areas.
A long term view needs to be taken when designing new buildings, where the easiest approach in terms of cost and disruption may not be the best long-term approach for the school. This is particularly so for the sports and music areas.

Specific Points
1. Trees are an important characteristic of parts of the site. Opportunity should be taken to plant new trees in other parts of the site as part of a long term strategy.
2. The right species of trees are assets to courtyards, providing a balance of shade in summer and not blocking too much light in winter. They should be encouraged.
3. The new main quad is welcomed as a significant improvement. Unfortunately this, and the view from the great hall, is potentially compromised by the placing of hard surfaced netball courts immediately in front (both their surface and netting will detract from the view). An alternative location should be considered for these.
4. It is suggested that these courts could either go adjacent to the car park on the Ridgway, or in the enlarged playing area west of the footpath.
5. The removal of the swimming pool and rifle range creates a larger, flexible space. It does not seem that opportunity has been taken to reconfigure this in a more fundamental way, to use the space more efficiently, and thus to allow the netball courts to be located here – closer to the pavilion and footbridge.
6. Moving the all-weather tennis courts to a similar location could then bring all the hard-surface facilities to the centre of the site, with reasonable access from all parts of the school.
7. The development of the sports area for a range of key sports buildings is sensible, but runs the risk of creating a set of piecemeal buildings that won't relate well to each other. They are also space intensive, large, bulky buildings that will be difficult to provide with active or attractive frontages.
8. These buildings also remove the long views from The Lodge. Although a new space is created, it may be difficult to provide the space with active or attractive frontages.
9. Given that the rifle range will be demolished, it is suggested that it is investigated whether the new sports hall and swimming pool can be combined in a single new building to the south of the current squash courts.
10. This could be achieved by sinking the swimming pool (the existing tennis courts are on a slightly lower level already) and putting the sports hall above. This leaves the squash courts building free to be developed at a later stage, or to accommodate upper level changing facilities for the sports hall – creating a ‘service hub’ between the two main buildings.

11. The reasons for, and approach adopted, for the science block extension seem logical. However, this has two negative effects, it encroaches onto open space (as shown in the UDP) and it compromises the visual integrity of the new Taylor wing building.

12. The existing southern extension to the science block is not attractive and poorly finished with a cheap looking skin. It is suggested that (given that sufficient open space can be gained elsewhere) the extension to the science block be positioned further south.

13. This will provide the opportunity to mask the unattractive southern extension, protect the views of the Taylor Wing and allow retained exposure of part of the more attractive pre-WW1 façade.

14. This may impact on the width available for the playing pitch shown on the plans, though rugby & football pitches tend to have flexibility in their dimensions.

15. The new music building has a large footprint, is a large building and would require the loss of at least one important tree, as well as the demolition of part of the Priory building. It would also have some impact on the listed building to the south and come very close (even under the canopy) of other significant trees on the site.

16. There are other buildings in the vicinity, particularly the existing music buildings around the Collyer Hall, that are single storey, do not make efficient use of land and present a poor, inactive frontage to the main open space to the west, and also do not provide much enclosure to it.

17. There areas should be considered for redevelopment first, before a large and overpowering building is considered. A more subtle and thoughtful approach to development in this area is needed, that protects trees, makes best use of land and helps enclose the main vista, as well as creating or reinforcing other smaller spaces in the junior school area.

18. The proposals for the dining hall extension would generally appear to be sensible and appropriate, but the resultant courtyard needs to be of high quality and it is recommended a new, lighter foliage tree is planted in this space.
19. Any new development in this area, particularly the new roof for the dining hall extension, needs to respect the good quality architecture (notably the arched colonnade) of the early 20thC (southern) part of the Q block building.

20. This area will also become an important route from the entrance into the rest of the school, so it would seem important to ensure this space works really well to showcase the school.

21. The proposals to enhance the street façade of Q block are welcomed, and address the issue of the ugly building in an appropriate manner, by adding vertical emphasis through the introduction of windows.

22. The additional storey adjacent to the Great Hall, does not seem to undermine its presence, and fits well with the adjacent 2nd floor.

23. The frontage at ground floor and boundary treatment needs to be carefully designed to be welcoming, and a continuation of the low wall and railings in front of the Great Hall, along the property boundary is recommended as the most appropriate approach.

Design and Review Panel
The Panel wholeheartedly welcomed and supported the applicant’s approach in developing a clear and coherent masterplan for the future development of the school. They also noted the thorough manner in which this had been done, which was evident in the well thought out and developed content of the plan. The Panel clearly supported the majority of the proposals in the plan. The Panel noted that the plans were based on a need to improve the quality of the existing facilities, rather than to expand pupil numbers, and in this respect, traffic and parking demands were not anticipated to increase to any significant extent.

The decision to retain the form of the school, grouped around a central space and southerly vista was welcomed, and the new quadrangle was an important part in this – although one suggestion was to fully enclose this by relocation the new music school. It was therefore important that this was well designed as a ‘place’ and not just a route across the site. Some concern was expressed about the siting of the netball courts and their effect on the open green vista, and the possible interruption of this view, though it was noted that full height netting would not be necessary.

It was noted that the masterplan was mostly about site planning and the location of new facilities. It was felt that there was opportunity for it to include some broad
guidance on design and architecture, possibly in the form of design codes, to clearly express the school's aims and needs and help ensure design quality and a degree of consistency. This setting down of qualitative markers was important to do, especially as it was envisaged various architects could be engaged for different buildings over time — which the Panel was not averse to. The plans should not be afraid of including some guidance on details and the 'grain' of the buildings and spaces in order to express their aspirations for the feel of new development. The Panel felt that a consistent landscaping approach was needed to tie together the different elements of the plan, particularly at the front of the building.

In this respect it was felt important that new buildings should seek to positively add to the character of the conservation area and setting of listed buildings, rather than simply preserving the existing character by the development of 'twee' or 'safe' buildings. It was also felt that the masterplan could better consider some of the urban design issues relating to the proposals, such as relationship to surrounding development and the quality and design of the spaces around the buildings. It was felt that this could help to better resolve the proposals for the parts of the plan the Panel were less convinced about — namely the music school and swimming pool.

There was some concern expressed by the Panel that the school has dismissed the possibility of temporary accommodation too early. Although it understood there were a number of potential disbenefits to this, this could be managed, and be worthwhile if it addressed once and for all some more fundamental design and accommodation issues the school faces. Thus a better longer term, solution could be achieved, and avoid the possibility of building-in a long-term compromise.

It was felt the music school design, location and siting would benefit from further development, and that the swimming pool would be dominant from the adjacent Southside House and also close another fine southerly aspect. The Panel also noted that although the physical front of the school faced the common, the operational front — where the parking was and where the pupils accessed the school and caught buses from — faced the Ridgway. This was perhaps the one significant thing missing from the masterplan, particularly as the school had an unattractive public face to its surroundings here, and was not visually integrating itself into the community (as it does with some of its facilities and activities).
was therefore strongly recommended that the masterplan address this, particularly with respect to the quality and openness of the boundary treatment.

The Panel were clear in their encouragement that the school should engage with the local community in consultation on the plans and that the masterplan needed to be flexible to accommodate change over the long period of implementation. Overall, the Panel was impressed with a thorough and well considered plan on which to base the future development of the school.

VERDICT: GREEN

Design and Conservation Officer (Jill Tyndale)

Kings College School falls within the Wimbledon West Conservation Area. It has one Grade II listed building being the Great Hall designed by Bannister Fletcher and a number of locally listed buildings facing South Side Common. There are two Grade II listed buildings and one Grade II* listed building adjacent to the school site which will impact on any proposed development nearby.

Since the school moved from the Strand in the late 1800s it has gradually evolved constructing new facilities as required during the life of the school. This has resulted in a mishmash of buildings in various styles. Many of which are worthy of conserving while others their loss would not be an issue or upgrading will be welcomed.

Overall the proposals on the Master Plan are well thought out and will result in generally enhancing the school site. There are some points that need to be raised regarding parts of the plan. The green spaces and open field area are very important to the conservation area and any overall loss of green space should be avoided. Green spaces may be reclaimed in one area to allow development in another. The proposal to create a ‘New Quad’ overlooked by the Great Hall is welcomed, however the new hard play area to the south, which will result a large expanse of artificial surface replacing the grass play area is of concern and will a loss, and therefore ways of placing the hard play area elsewhere or reducing its size should be explored. Five of the existing hard tennis courts will be built on to create the new swimming pool and further indoor sports facilities. The remaining tennis court will revert to form an enlarged green area between the new pool and
lodge. Six new all weather courts are proposed to be created on the southwest corner of the site. Three of these will replace the existing swimming pool in area but the remaining three will cause a loss of Urban Green Space. Added to the proposed hard Play area this is an unacceptable loss of Urban Green Space even taking in the small gains elsewhere.

To change the reception to the front lower area of the Great Hall has potential. The proposal is to rearrange the space by removing internal walls. I do not see this as a problem but would require that the internal finishes, the cornices and panelling etc are reinstated when forming the new spaces. Other restoration in this area will be welcomed such as the removal of suspended ceilings and paint from panelling. The introduction of a lift will need careful consideration to reduce the impact on the Listed Building. Improvements to the frontage will be welcome and suggest that a stone/brick plinth and railings would give uniformity along the full frontage.

The proposal to enlarge the science and dining blocks is acceptable subject to the Urban designer’s comments. Internal alterations to the locally listed buildings must respect any original and historic fabric and preserve such features.

The new Music School does give concern. The proposal as it stands will cause loss of Priory Lodge, which is identified as having a positive impact on the conservation area. I believe that this small dwelling was built at the same time and probably by the architect of the neighbouring Grade II listed building, and therefore it should preferably not be demolished. The removal of inappropriate extensions and restoration of original features would be welcomed. The new Music School in this proposed position will mean the loss of a very fine mature specimen evergreen and other trees, and would also fill an open space close to the boundary. The bulk of the building will impact on the adjacent Grade II Listed building. The proposal for the music school should be rethought in conjunction with the part redevelopment of Collyer Hall to also include the Junior Library. The disused hard court could be a reinstated as a green space.
Key Issues for Consideration

Overall Approach

The Council is supportive of the overall approach of developing a clear and coherent masterplan for the future development of the school, which would take place over the next 15-20 years.

The masterplan is mostly about site planning and the location of new facilities, with the aim of improving the quality of existing facilities, rather than expanding pupil numbers. Although it is not going to be possible to have a universal architectural theme across the whole site, there is still an opportunity to include some broad guidance on design and architecture, to clearly express the school's aims and needs and help ensure design quality and a degree of consistency. New buildings should seek to positively add to the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of listed buildings, rather than simply preserving the existing character by the construction of 'safe' buildings.

It is considered that the masterplan could better consider some of the urban design issues relating to the proposals, such as the relationship to surrounding development and the quality and design of spaces around buildings. There are a number of pleasant and intimate spaces and courtyards created by the current buildings and the proposals present an opportunity to improve some of these and possibly create new ones.

New Entrance and South Hayes

The existing front entrance is located in South Hayes. It is rather drab and unassuming, which means it is not clearly identifiable as the front entrance to the school, leading to confusion for visitors.

The Council would support the proposal to relocate the entrance and reception to the Grade II listed, gothic Great Hall building. This is the school's original, defining and most distinctive building, featuring an imposing gable and projecting towers and therefore considered to be the most legible point of entry. The front entrance to South Hayes appears as a secondary entry point in comparison. The proposal to include an engraved stone to mark the new entrance would act as a further tool to guide visitors to the front entrance.
Policy BE.7 of the UDP states that alterations to listed buildings will only be permitted if the character and special architectural or historic interest of the building, and its structural integrity would be preserved. A new open reception area and waiting area would be created, by rearranging the space and removing internal walls. This is considered to be acceptable, although there would be a requirement that the internal finishes, cornices and panelling are reinstated. Other restoration, such as the removal of suspended ceilings and paint from panelling, would also be encouraged. The introduction of a lift would also need careful consideration to reduce the impact on the Listed Building and accord with Policy BE.7.

New Three-Storey Classroom Building to be attached to Science Block
The reasons for the proposed three-storey extension to the existing Science Block seem logical, and would address the need for extra classrooms and science accommodation. The proposed building is to be constructed independently to the Science Block, with cantilevers over to provide access to the existing labs.

The Taylor Wing Building is located to the northwest of the existing playing field, with its south elevation fully visible when viewed from the south, and directly northeast of the Science Block. The Taylor Building, which is arranged over four floors, was constructed approximately 10 years ago. Given the proposed extension would jut out in front of part of the Taylor Wing Building, when viewed from the south, there are concerns regarding the impact that this would have on the visual integrity of the Taylor Wing Building.

The Science Building was itself extended to the south in 2006 (LBM Ref: 06/P1981). It is considered that this extension is not attractive and poorly finished with cheap looking zinc cladding. It is suggested that (given sufficient open space can be gained elsewhere, or the criteria regarding loss of open space (detailed below) is met, that the extension to the science block is positioned further to the south. This would provide the opportunity to mask the unattractive southern extension, whilst protecting views of the Taylor Wing Building, and retain the exposure of part of the more attractive pre-WW1 façade.

A part of the proposed extension would be built on designated open space. In terms of policy, there is a strong presumption against building on open space.
Policy CS.13 (Open Space, Nature Conservation, Leisure and Culture) of the Adopted Core Strategy states that the Council will:

"Protect and enhance the borough's public and private open space network including Metropolitan Open Land, parks, and other open spaces;”

London Plan Policy 7.18 (Protecting Local Open Space and Addressing Local Deficiency) states:

"The loss of local protected open spaces must be resisted unless equivalent or better quality provision is made within the local catchment area. Replacement of one type of open space with another is unacceptable unless an up to date needs assessment shows that this would be appropriate”.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 74 states:

"Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- an assessment has been undertaken, which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss."

To justify the departure from planning policy, robust evidence supporting the exceptional circumstances would need to be presented. There is strong planning policy support for development associated with school expansion, where the need for the expansion has been demonstrated (Core Strategy CS.11, London Plan 3.18, NPPF Para. 72 & Ministerial Policy Statement, 15th August 2011). However, the Ministerial letter only relates to state funded schools and the support on the NPPF, London Plan and Core Strategy is subject to the proposal addressing local needs.

The masterplan makes no reference to how the proposals would address local needs. The masterplan also states that the school does not envisage major
growth in student numbers, and that the need for works are due to the need to improve the facilities. The matters raised in the 'Establishing Needs' section, in particular pages 8, 10 & 11 do not amount to exceptional circumstances that would warrant a departure from policy based on 'need'.

The documentation submitted with any planning application for the classroom extension to the science building would need to demonstrate that:
- there are no other viable locations
- the open space is surplus to requirements, and
- there would be no harm to the public value of the open space with regards to sport, recreation and visual amenity.

The Council would then have to decide whether, on balance, a departure from planning policy would in this instance be acceptable.

In terms of meeting the policy requirements stated above, it would be extremely beneficial to link the demolition of the swimming pool building to the erection of the extension, rather than there being an 8-year time lag as currently proposed. The swimming pool building is currently on land, which is not designated as Open Space and is identified as a building as having a negative effect on the Conservation Area. This land could then be used as replacement Open Space in a location that would arguably have a greater public value and it would result in a net increase in designated Open Space.

**New Quad and All Weather Play Area**
The existing hard play area, which is located directly south of the Great Hall building, would be transformed into a new quad. This area is heavily used and unwelcoming and it is proposed that the new quad would become an informal landscaped area, with trees, planting, benches and paving, which can also be traversed to offer more direct links. The new quad is considered to be a significant improvement to the existing space and would create a strong sense of place for this key central area, and not just a route through the site.

However, there are concerns regarding the location of the proposed all-weather play area, which would take up part of the existing school playing fields. The play area would be located to the south of the Quad, and although full height netting would not be required, the large area of artificial surfacing could potentially impact
on the open green vista, particularly when viewed from the Great Hall. It is therefore suggested that an alternative location should be considered.

New Music School And Refurbishment of Collyer Hall and New Library

A new music school would be built on the Junior School hard play area, with other activities such as Drama expanding into the present music space in Collyer Hall. Indicative drawings provided in the masterplan show the music building arranged over three floors (including basement level) and featuring a hipped roof. The Priory Lodge, which is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area, would also be demolished to make way for the music building. The Priory Lodge is a part one/part two-storey red brick building to the east of the existing Music School and was probably built at the same time and by the same architect as the Grade II Listed Glencairn House to the south.

Policy BE.2 of the UDP states that:

"... a development scheme that will involve the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building in a conservation area that makes a positive contribution to its character or appearance will not be permitted unless the following can be demonstrated:

- There is clear and convincing evidence that reasonable efforts have been made to continue the present use or to find a viable use for the building and these efforts have failed and it is demonstrated that preservation of the building as part of the scheme or in some form of charitable or community ownership is not possible, or
- The costs of repairs or maintenance of the building cannot be justified against its importance or value derived from its retention, provided the building has not been deliberately neglected, or
- There will be substantial planning benefits for the community from redevelopment, which would decisively outweigh loss from the resulting demolition.

It is considered that the masterplan has not provided sufficient evidence to justify the demolition of the Priory Lodge. The building is currently occupied and appears to be in good order. From the information provided, it would also appear that the Music building would not bring substantial benefits to the wider
community, which would outweigh the loss of the building. It is therefore likely that the Council would resist the demolition of the Priory.

The proposed Music building would be located immediately to the north of Glencairn House, a gothic style Grade II Listed building, which was built in 1866. Policy BE.8 (Setting of Listed Buildings, Ancient Monuments, Historic Parks and Gardens and the Wider Historic Landscape) of the UDP states that in considering the design and siting of development, special regard will be had to the desirability of protecting the settings of Listed buildings.

Given its location, height and large footprint, the Council has serious concerns regarding the impact that the proposed Music building would have on the setting of Glencairn House, which currently enjoys a rather open vista to its north, due to the low height and small footprint of the Lodge and adjacent Junior Play Area. The Music building, given its much larger size would be overpowering and it is considered that a more subtle and thoughtful approach to development in this area is needed.

The proposal would result in the loss of a large and very fine Cedar Tree, which is currently located where the northwest corner of the building would be sited. The proposed building would also come close or even under the canopy of other important trees, which are currently located adjacent to the Reeve building. The proposal for the music block would also be resisted in terms of impact on these trees.

Collyer Hall, which currently accommodates the Music School, is a part single, part two-storey wing to the south of College Court. It is advised that this building among others should be considered for redevelopment first, before a building such as the proposed Music building is considered. This could be done in conjunction with the proposed Junior Library, which is to be accommodated on a new first floor level over the current music practice rooms. This is welcomed as this would make much more efficient use of the land whilst providing a much improved library space.

**Improvements to Q Block**

Q block was built in the 1920s with a further wing added in the 1960s with the erection of the Dining Hall. The wing, which fronts Woodhayes Road is between
two and three storeys in height and comprises a mixture of red brick and concrete facing materials. It is considered that wing is of poor architectural quality and has weathered badly over the years. Given the wings prominent position, fronting Woodhayes Road, this has resulted in it having a very negative impact on the wider conservation area, particularly when viewed from the common.

The masterplan proposes the redesign of Q Block with the refacing of its north facing elevation and by extending the second storey to provide two new classrooms. In addition, the dining hall is also considered to be of an inadequate size, serving considerably more meals each day than what it was designed for. To make more room for dining, a new glazed extension to the dining hall is proposed.

Policy CS. 14 (Design) of the Adopted Core Strategy promotes high quality sustainable design that retains and adapts existing buildings where appropriate. Given Q Block is a sound structure the Council would support a proposal for its refurbishment rather than its demolition. The refacing of the north elevation is welcomed, subject to the use of appropriate materials, and the introduction of additional windows would improve its visual appearance further by giving it a more vertical emphasis. Q Block is set back from the Great Hall and separated by the first floor level walkway. Given this, it is not considered that the extension of the second storey would undermine its presence and is therefore acceptable.

The original Q Block building and its subsequent wing extension enclose a courtyard, with the dining room extension to the south and west facing elevations of Q Block reducing the size of this area. It is considered that the use of glazing in this instance, would respect the good quality architecture of the original south part of the Q building, as it would not conceal for example the arched promenade, which is a positive feature. The use of glazing would also avoid making the existing dining area too dark. The improvements to Q Block would also present an opportunity to improve the existing courtyard area.

The high brick wall fronting Woodhayes Road gives the building a rather hostile appearance. It is considered that the boundary treatment needs to be redesigned to be more welcoming and it is suggested that a continuation of the low height plinth wall with railings above on front of the Great Hall would be most suitable in this instance.
Sports Facilities

The existing sports hall, which is located on the northwest corner of the site, was built in the 1980s, and further extended in the 1990s. The sports hall, and six outdoor tennis courts enclose the west and south boundaries of The Lodge. Southside House, which is Grade II* Listed is located immediately to the east of the lodge and the tennis courts.

The sports facilities would be developed over three phases, with the construction of a new addition to the sports centre, and swimming pool proposed in phases 2 and 3 respectively. The tennis courts would be moved to the site of the present cricket nets, with the cricket nets moved to Colman’s Field.

The development of the sports area for a range of sports is sensible, but runs the risk of creating a set of piecemeal buildings that won’t relate well to one another. They are also space intensive, large, bulky buildings that will be difficult to provide with active frontages. Given the location of the swimming pool building, there are also concerns regarding the loss of the southerly views from The Lodge. It is also considered that the swimming pool may appear dominant when viewed from the adjacent Southside House. With this in mind, it is suggested that it is investigated whether the new sports hall and swimming pool can be combined in a single new building to the south of the squash courts.

Although the removal of the swimming pool and rifle range creates a larger flexible space, it does not seem that the opportunity has been taken to reconfigure this in a more fundamental way, to use the space more efficiently, and therefore allow the netball courts, which are currently proposed to be located south of the new Quad, to be located there instead. Moving the all-weather tennis courts to a similar location would then bring all the hard-surface facilities to the centre of the site, with reasonable access from all parts of the school.

Conclusions

It is clearly evident that much of the school’s facilities no longer meet its requirements and as such are in need of improving or updating. The Council is therefore supportive of the overall approach of developing a clear and coherent masterplan for the future development of the school.

The masterplan has a number of positives:
• The relocation of the entrance to the Great Hall Building is logical given this is the schools defining and most distinctive building.

• The transformation of the hard play area into a new quad, with an informal landscaped area would be a significant improvement to the existing space (although an alternative location for the proposed hard play area to the south should be sought to avoid adversely impacting on the open, green vista from the Great Hall in particular).

• The redesign of Q Block, and in particular, the refacing of its north facing elevation is also highly encouraged given the negative impact that this element has on views from the common and the wider conservation area.

The development of the sports area for a range of sports is sensible. There is however a risk of creating a set of piecemeal buildings that will not relate well to one another, and given the location of the swimming pool building, there are also concerns regarding the loss of the southerly views from The Lodge. The space left from the removal of the swimming pool and rifle range could have also been configured in a more fundamental way.

There are two key issues:

• The impact that the extension of the science block would have on the visual integrity of the Taylor Wing Building. There is also the need to link the extension of the science block to the demolition of the swimming pool in terms of the development timetable. This would overcome policy objection to loss of open space by making alternative provision.

• Music School – Involves the loss of Priory Lodge, which makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and loss of important trees, both of which would be resisted by the Council. The proposed building would also have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Glencaimn House. This element of the proposal is not considered to be acceptable.

North Team Leader, 15/8/12
6 OPEN SPACE STATEMENT

6.1 OPEN SPACE STATEMENT

The open green space of the sports fields is a very important asset to King’s College School. The adjustment to its boundaries required by the new classroom project have been considered very carefully by the school to ensure that there is no loss in sports offer at the school.

The school and design team are also aware that the playing fields forms an important aspect of the character of the Wimbledon West Conservation Area and that they are designated open spaces within The London Borough of Merton’s UDP.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 74 states:

“Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:
• An assessment has been undertaken, which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
• The loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
• The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.

The proposed scheme within the school’s development masterplan meets these three requirements.

Quantity of open space

In considering the impact that this single development will have on open space, it is important to consider not only this building in isolation but the entirety of the school’s development masterplan.

Plan 1 opposite accurately depicts open space as defined in The London Borough of Merton’s UDP and the area of the space is measured at 41,400m². Plan 2 shows the school site following completion of all phases of the masterplan and the extent of the open space at 41,785m².

It can be seen that the quantum of open space will INCREASE on completion of the masterplan. The reason for this is that the 695m² reduction in designated open space resulting from the classroom development is more than compensated for by the re-location of the swimming pool and rifle range buildings which free up additional and more usefully located open space.

Function

There is no loss in the actual function of the playing fields as a result of the development. The amount and siting of the classroom building has been carefully controlled to allow the sports field’s present function as a full size rugby pitch or athletics track to continue including proper allowances for run-offs and surrounding space. In addition the development increases the level of sports offer at the school. Some of the identified uses for the indoor multi-use hall are for activities such as dance, drama and martial arts.

The school’s masterplan will achieve a longer term gain in function and sports offer on the open space. Following the relocation of the swimming pool and rifle range out of the field space later in the masterplan, the western section of open playing fields will become enlarged and more flexible for sports and recreation use. This western section of the open space is the heart of the school’s sports activity and the increase in open space here is where it is most effectively positioned.
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