Site Allocations – Deliverability Assessments

Preamble

For each of the sites allocated in the Sites and Policies Plan, an assessment of the deliverability of each site has been undertaken in accordance with the NPPF.

The deliverability assessment for each site contains the following information:

- An introduction and summary of the site ownership and its allocated use(s);
- A summary of the all the consultation responses received from Stage 1 (Call for Sites) to Stage 3 (draft plan) that referred to each site. Stage 4 (pre submission) consultation responses are detailed separately;
- Response to the issues raised during the consultation and the resulting actions or amendments;
- An assessment of the deliverability, particularly identifying any issues with the site availability, suitability or achievability;
- An assessment of any other issues raised such as strategic planning factors and other evidence received; and
- A summary of potential alternative uses for each site.

The sites are in the same order as they appear in the Sites and Policies Plan.
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Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 2 – 43-45 Palestine Grove
43-45 Palestine Grove
Colliers Wood
London
SW19 2QN

Area: 0.02 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occuper:</strong> Currently vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> Site is occupied by a vacant dilapidated storage/warehouse building with high brick and timber fencing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately east and adjoining the site is a similar sized property with a building being utilised by a manufacturing business (electric slotmeters London).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential uses, generally two/three storey terraced homes predominate including opposite and rear of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the immediate west of the site is a car park (approximately 10 spaces).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Vacant former workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation received from the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents / community groups (not including business groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbart – support for the preferred use as residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Environment Agency reiterated that the site is in flood zone 2 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any contamination on site will need to be submitted with any planning application also with regard to groundwater protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation explicitly states that a flood risk assessment will be required for any development of the site. The flood risk assessment will be required to meet the various criteria and policy set by the council and the Environment Agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site should be for employment or residential use**

The Conservative Group did not provide written justification for being solely office or employment use. It is therefore difficult to overcome this matter without further information. The Conservative Group also supported the preferred use as residential. It is therefore considered that following consultation there have been no issues raised regarding the redevelopment of this site for residential use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no issues raised in the consultation that need to be overcome, subject to a flood risk assessment being provided considered at the time a planning application is submitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for residential use. This is based on evidence of the existing residential development surrounding the site and in the general vicinity of the area. The unsuitability of the site for employment use is evidenced by its vacancy in recent times. It is not apparent that there are any site suitability issues with respect to the site being used for residential use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information available from council officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site suitability for the existing or proposed development suggested.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site was sold by the council in February 2013. The owner has since submitted an application for planning permission for residential use on the site. The availability of the site is implicit with this application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The availability of the site is implicit with the application for planning permission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

- The entire site is within medium risk of flooding (flood zone 2).
- The site is within an Archaeological Priority Zone
- The site is within an area of low accessibility to public transport (PTAL 2).

#### Have any other issues been identified?

Mitigate potential parking, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage. Access arrangements to this site should continue via the Christchurch Road entrance of Palestine Grove.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Alternative options/uses

- Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use for employment purposes. The site has been disposed of and the new owner intends to establish residential use on the site. If the site is not allocated it is anticipated that the site would be delivered for residential use regardless based on the nature of the surrounding environment being almost exclusively residential.

- Alternative uses on the site – based on size and location of the site, it is considered that there are no suitable alternative uses. The site is within a residential area and is characteristic of residential use as a result. The unsuitability of the site for employment use is evident by the site being vacant for an extended period of time.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

- **Uses:** Residential.
- **Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton.
- **Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.
- **Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council
| Potential occupiers: Private residential. |
| What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal? |
| No potential barriers identified. |
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 5 – Colliers Wood Community Centre
64-72 High Street Colliers Wood
Colliers Wood
London
SW19 2BY

Area: 0.13 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation received from the owner (Council).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esbester, D E – Support for the preferred mixed use for community, residential and possible commercial uses. It was suggested that the delivery timescale should be prior to 2018 however.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelbart, E &amp; L – Support for council’s preferred use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Environment Agency reiterated that the site is in flood zone 2 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any contamination on site will need to be submitted with any planning application also with regard to groundwater protection.

**Others**

Conservative Group – preferred use is for community uses.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allocation explicitly states that a flood risk assessment will be required for any development of the site. The flood risk assessment will be required to meet the various criteria and policy set by the council and the Environment Agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site should be for community uses**

Any redevelopment of the site will have to provide sufficient space, as a minimum, for the retention of the existing community centre. It is therefore considered that retaining the existing community uses on site will be a sufficient compromise as the community space is ultimately not being lost from the site. Providing a mix of uses will ensure the building is occupied 24 hours a day which creates a more secure environment, helping to minimise vandalism and crime, whilst providing key enabling development which could provide an enhanced community facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk will be taken into account when a planning application is submitted for development on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site should be for community uses**

It is considered that retention and enhancement of the existing community uses on the site will overcome the concerns raised. There are no barriers to the implementation (retention) of community uses following redevelopment of the site.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for a mix of uses including community, residential and small scale commercial use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is acknowledged that there is a flood risk on the site and any planning application will need to appropriately address this matter with a flood risk assessment. All future residential uses should be located on the upper floors or the rear of the site and community uses retained on the ground floor therefore the potential risk to occupiers is not altered to a significant degree.

It is not apparent that there are any site suitability issues that would affect the delivery of this site for a proposed mixed use development.

Information source: Council determination based on information available including representation made by the Environment Agency.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The flood risk will need to be appropriately addressed during the planning application phase. Given that the site is in flood zone 2 it is considered that appropriate mitigation measures will be able to be implemented. Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the flood risk.
and the critical drainage area.

The final mix of uses will be determined as part of a planning application.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Availability - ISSUES

### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. It is anticipated by council that the site will be disposed of following allocation for mixed use and that the site will be redeveloped by an external party. Council will retain ownership of any existing community use on the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

### Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

It is anticipated by council officers that the site will be disposed of following allocation. The site is considered to be viable for residential redevelopment although this will ultimately be determined by the future owner/developer and the sale price on the open market.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues regarding viability have been identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Other Issues

### Strategic planning factors

The site is within an archaeological priority zone and an area with good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 5). The eastern portion of the site is within the Colliers Wood town centre boundary, a medium risk flood zone (2) and a critical drainage area (CDA).

### Have any other issued been identified?

Mitigate potential parking, access, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage. The site currently only has one access point from the High Street but adjoins a block of flats to the rear which has access from University Road. No further investigation has been undertaken as to whether access from this point to the rear of the site (or some form of thoroughfare) is achievable.

The amenity of adjoining residential properties will need to be protected whilst also taking into account the sites’ frontage to the High Street.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission.
Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use as a community centre. This option would retain the status quo however it is considered that an opportunity would be missed to provide additional residential development in an otherwise underutilised town centre site.

Alternative uses on the site – based on size and location of the site being situated in a neighbourhood shopping parade and near Colliers Wood town centre, the site has the ability to establish a range of commercial uses on the site. Such uses could be established in accordance with existing and emerging policy and do not require a strategic allocation.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Community, residential, potentially small scale commercial (e.g. café).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. The existing community centre will be retained in its current capacity as a minimum. The potential for a small scale commercial use will be determined by a future developer.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential, community centre, café occupier.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers identified subject to the mitigation of potential flood risk and addressing the issues identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 8 – Leyton Road Centre
21 Leyton Road
Colliers Wood
London
SW19 1DJ

Area: 0.34 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Merton Youth Services and Action for Children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This single storey building has the three-storey Merton Bus Garage building to its east, All Saints Recreation Ground to the north and two-storey terraced housing to the west and south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officer site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Offices (B1[a] Use Class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Consider a range of uses including community and residential – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Any of the following or a mix of community (D1 Use Class – education/day centre etc) and residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation was received from the owner (Council) preceding the call for sites stage. No representations were received from either of the occupiers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green, P – Change of use will result in parking, access and over crowding in this location. The representation highlights the planning permission enabling the construction of a mosque across the road (council reference 10/P1756) on the land at the junction of Merton High Street, Holmes Road and Laburnum Road which will accommodate up to 600 people, the residents of Leyton Road will be affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizar, F – The proposal to change the use on the site will not result in any positive effect. Redevelopment will result in cumulative effects from additional housing including social problems, burglaries and racial issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Statutory agencies**

Environment Agency - reiterated that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any contamination on site will need to be submitted with any planning application also with regard to groundwater protection.

**Others**

Conservative Group – the Conservative Group’s preferred use was for a children’s centre or community use, but not both.

ThinkFuture – a community use should be retained and there is a good opportunity to provide outdoor space for children.

---

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Parking, access and overcrowding issues**

Potential traffic, access and parking effects on neighbouring streets and the local area will need to be appropriately mitigated. This will be assessed and determined at the planning application phase. A transport assessment will be required to take into account all the relevant matters mentioned and the receiving environment, including potential cumulative effects associated with other lawfully established uses in the vicinity, not just the mosque.

**Cumulative effects of housing including social problems, burglaries and racial issues**

With regard to the reference that redevelopment will bring additional people and pressure on the area, this will be determined on the future use and scale of development will still be subject to planning permission. Regardless, it is considered that only a change to residential use (which is possible) would result in additional people frequenting the site and area. Any actual or potential adverse effects of development will be considered during the planning application phase. There is no evidence to suggest that significant adverse effects will result from the allocation of this site for potential new uses. There was also no evidence provided to suggest that redevelopment of the site will result in any substantial increase in social abnormalities.

**Flood risk**

A flood risk assessment will be submitted as part of any planning application submitted for redevelopment of the site. Flood risk mitigation will be required as part of any planning application. The site is in the lowest flood risk zone (zone 1) therefore it is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures can be determined and implemented for any future development.

**Site should be for a children’s centre or community use, not both**

With regard to the suggestion that the site should be for community or children’s centre use, this is not precluded by the allocation. No justification for why the two uses should be kept separate was provided. From a planning policy perspective there is no evidence to suggest that the site should only operate as one use or the other. It is considered most likely that either a community or alternative use would predominate given the nature of the existing site, buildings, access, parking and proximity to open space. The site therefore lends itself well to use as a children’s centre or community centre. The site is considered suitable for residential use based on its PTAL rating, proximity to transport links, and to assist in meeting the housing targets set for the borough.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

The allocated use for the site is based on best available research regarding the location, demand, aspects of the site, and community needs. The preferred uses identified are considered to be the most appropriate long term uses for the site. With regard to the use, it is considered that there is sufficient certainty for potential future developers by
providing the potential for several uses (including residential), but also sufficient flexibility to enable a suitable range of community uses to exist on site. The desire for a children’s centre or community use outlined by the Conservative Group can be accommodated within the D1 use class for community uses. It is considered that the concerns raised are adequately taken into account with the site allocation.

The remaining issues will be primary considerations as part of any planning application submitted to redevelop the site. Such matters to be taken into account include (but are not limited to):

- A mix of uses including residential will facilitate the provision of modern community facilities on lower floors and create a more secure environment, helping to minimise vandalism and crime;
- Mitigating potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity;
- Localised footpath improvements will be required to improve pedestrian access;
- Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site;
- Respecting the character of the adjacent conservation area;
- Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage; and
- Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

It is acknowledged that there is a flood risk on the site and any planning application will need to appropriately address this matter with a flood risk assessment.

No issues regarding site suitability have been identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

The flood risk will need to be appropriately addressed during the planning application phase. Given that the site is in flood zone 1 it is considered that appropriate mitigation measures will be able to be implemented. Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the flood risk and the critical drainage area.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

It is anticipated by council officers that the site will be disposed of at some stage following allocation. The site is considered to be viable for community development based on the nature of the existing uses on the site. The site is also considered to be viable for residential redevelopment (as this is currently a profitable land use) although this will
ultimately be determined by the future owner/developer.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is within an archaeological priority zone and an area with very good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 5). A small part of the site is within a critical drainage area.

The site is adjacent to Wandle Valley conservation area (along the southern and eastern boundaries), open space (All Saints recreation ground) and the Colliers Wood town centre boundary.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Mitigate potential parking, access, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage. This is also paramount in light of the representations received regarding concerns over the future construction of the mosque which has been granted planning permission in the area bounded by the High Street, Holmes Road and Laburnum Road. An appropriate traffic assessment which takes into account the surrounding environment, including the approved planning permission, will need to be undertaken.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use as offices. The status quo would be retained however it is considered that an opportunity would be missed to provide additional residential development to assist with meeting local and national housing targets. The desire to have some form of community use on is evident in the allocation.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the size and location of the site no alternative uses excluding the existing and allocated uses are considered appropriate. Expansion of the existing use does not require a strategic allocation and the site has been identified as being suitable for community and/or residential use.

---

**Relevant Exports from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Community and/or residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. Any future community use will depend on whether a suitable tenant can be found.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Delivery timeframe(s):</strong></th>
<th>0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</strong></td>
<td>Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong></td>
<td>Residential, community use, education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers identified subject to the mitigation of potential flood risk and addressing the issues identified.
## Deliverability Assessment

### General Information

**Site** 14 – Taylor Road Day Centre  
**Wakefield Hall**  
**Taylor Road**  
**Mitcham**  
**CR4 3JR**

Area: 0.08 ha

---

### Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.  
© Crown Copyright  
London Borough of Merton: 100019259

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

---

### Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Positive Network – volunteer group providing services to the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site consists of a single storey building that is surrounded by two-storey houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officer information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current use:** Day Centre (D1 Use Class).

**Use suggested/organisation** Residential – London Borough of Merton.

**Allocated use:** Mixed use community (D1 Use Class) and residential (C3 Use Class) or solely residential (C3 Use Class), if the community service is provided elsewhere locally.

---

### Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation was received from the owner (Council) or the occupiers or users of the centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency - reiterated that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any contamination on site will also need to be submitted with regard to groundwater protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the Conservative Group’s preferred use was for the site to be retained as a community/day centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application which will ensure appropriate mitigation measures are derived and imposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preferred allocation for the site is subject to the community use being retained either onsite or elsewhere locally. If the site is to be redeveloped solely for residential purposes, this will be subject to the community use being provided elsewhere locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood risk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk mitigation will be required to be implemented as part of any planning permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a council perspective it is considered that the retention of the community use, either onsite or elsewhere locally, satisfies the Conservative Group requirement to retain the community element. This is because the allocation makes it clear that the community use will not be lost as a result of potential redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for both residential and community uses. The site is surrounded by residential properties in all directions hence the subject site is considered suitable for an extension of this use. The suitability of community uses is evidenced by the existing use operating on the site, subject to the future scale having regard to the surrounding residential environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. The site is currently leased for the community use however it has appropriate break clauses in place and is for a period of no longer than five years. It is therefore considered that there are no issues regarding the availability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability within the lifetime of the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is understood that the site will be disposed of by council following termination of the existing lease on site. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
market demand for the site and allocation for future use will determine the viability of the site. No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in an area with low accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable alternative locations need to be secured if community services are no longer to be provided on this site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.

A mix of uses including residential will facilitate the provision of modern community facilities on lower floors and create a more secure environment, helping to minimise vandalism and crime.

Mitigating potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to and in the vicinity of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use for community use. Subject to the community use being provided on the site or elsewhere, the site is considered a good opportunity to provide new residential development to contribute toward local and national housing targets.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the location of the site and the surrounding uses no suitable alternative uses excluding the existing and allocated uses are considered appropriate that would warrant a strategic site allocation.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Residential, community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. The demand for community use will not change as a result of the allocation.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</strong> Agent/owner; council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong> Residential, a variety of community users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers to the delivery of the site have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 18 – 60 Pitcairn Road
60 Pitcairn Road
Mitcham
CR4 3LL

Area: 0.03 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> c/- Ben Elsdon, Paper Project, Unit 16 Rufus Business Estate, Ravensbury Terrace, London SW 18 4RL. The agent states they are acting on behalf of the owner Mr Sivguru Sivaruban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant. The site has former B1 uses but is boarded up and derelict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site consists of a two-storey industrial building with access to both Pitcairn Road. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey houses, however there is a two-storey industrial building to the southeast of the site and a church use to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Agent provided information. A pre-app meeting was also held in early 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Vacant – last use small business approximately 10 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested / organisation:</strong> Residential – M Edwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A representation was received from the agent acting for the owner outlining the planning history and interest in developing the site. The representation referred to a pre-app meeting held in March 2011. The information included a statement regarding the availability, viability and achievability of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwards MC – Support for the proposed change to residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency - reiterated that the site is in flood zone 1 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any groundwater contamination will also need to be submitted due to the presence of a sensitive aquifer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**Flood risk**
A flood risk assessment is required to be submitted as part of any planning application which will outline suitable mitigation measures to ensure that there are no actual or potential adverse effects of flooding as a result of development. This will determine appropriate mitigation measures required for the site prior to and following development.

**Allocated use**
They have adopted a view of protecting all employment sites within the borough. This issue could not be overcome unless the site was removed from the Sites and Policies Plan. It is considered that employment use is not viable based on the vacant nature of the building for the last 10 years and marketing evidence suggests this. It is also considered to be a suitable location for residential use based on the receiving environment being entirely residential in nature. The gain of additional residential units is considered to outweigh the loss of the historic scattered employment site in this instance.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
There is no evidence to support ongoing employment use of the site therefore this will not be supported. The allocation will be retained for residential use. It is not considered likely or viable that the site would be reverted to employment use. The building would require a substantial investment to return it to a suitable condition to meet market requirements which is not likely to be recovered, therefore is unlikely to be invested in.

Scattered employment sites were not all detailed in Merton’s Economic and Employment Land Employment Study 2010, however these sites are to be considered on their merits with respect to ongoing maintenance of the sites. It is considered that the site would be deemed to be of poor quality based on council officer knowledge.

It is considered that there are barriers to implementation of an employment use on the site and there is various pieces of evidence to suggest it is not a suitable on going use on the site. The residential allocation is therefore considered to be the most appropriate use for the site in future.

There are no barriers to implementation of flood mitigation measures on the site.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**
The site is considered suitable for residential use. There are no apparent barriers to use of the site for residential purposes.

The potential flood risk is considered minimal based on the information received from the Environment Agency and will need to be addressed within a flood risk assessment at the time of application for planning permission. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation will be able to be determined.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**
There are no relevant issues regarding the suitability of the site for residential use.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES
## Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The council has been advised that the site is in freehold ownership and supports the allocation. The owner has intentions to redevelop the site for residential use.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

No issues have been identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

#### Have any other issues been identified?

The agent has provided information regarding the owner’s intention to develop the site for residential use which implies that the site is viable.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues regarding the site viability have been identified. The owner is willing to fund and redevelop the site in accordance with the allocation.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Other Issues

### Strategic planning factors

The site is in an area with moderate accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 3) and a critical drainage area.

## Other Issues

### Have any other issues been identified?

Site 80 (Crusoe Road industrial buildings) is situated to the rear of the property and ideally both sites will be delivered together.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The agent has advised that they also act for the owner of most of the adjoining site. Council is encouraging the site owners to work together to deliver the most appropriate and sustainable development across the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings Held with Landowners/Proposers

### What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

**Uses:** Residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for housing development in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known.** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 46 – The Old Lamp Works
25 High Path
Colliers Wood
London
SW19 2LQ

Area: 0.25 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Wisepress Limited, c/o Indigo Planning Ltd, 87 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1ET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Wisepress Limited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site description:** This site consists of a part-single and part-two storey industrial building. To the west are two storey houses and a two storey office building. South of the site, on the opposite side of High Path, is a two storey church and east of the church is a part-two and part-three storey industrial building. West of the site are single storey vehicle storage garages and beyond it is a twelve storey tower block. North of the site is a single storey church building and two storey houses.

**Information source:** Agent provided landowner information.

**Current use:** Office, warehouse and distribution.

**Use suggested/organisation:** Residential – Indigo Planning (agent) representing Wisepress Ltd.

**Allocated use:** Residential (C3 Use Class) or education (D1 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

- Amend red line boundary as outlined in draft DPD as per the plan submitted from Indigo Planning Ltd.
- The landowner (who is also the occupier) wishes to redevelop solely for residential use.
- That the site should be for residential use only for the following reasons (abridged):
  - The existing building is unsustainable for office use due to its out-dated facilities and declining state
  - Not suitable for offices due to location (outside town centre) as outlined in the Core Strategy
  - Current occupier wishes to expand the current operation but site is not suitable
  - Difficulty of road access for traffic and deliveries
  - Conflicts with residential amenity of area as would redevelopment for office use
Further information was provided following a meeting with the agent and owner. Information regarding the viability of refurbishing the site for continued employment use, physical characteristics of the building and some marketing evidence was provided. The agent has advised that whilst refurbishment of the site is possible (but not for the current occupier) it would not be viable to do so due to the cost. They have determined that the most cost effective measure is to redevelop the site. Refurbishment and/or redevelopment would also result in substantial disruption to the existing business operation. Based on this information and other research by council, it was deemed that ongoing office or employment use was not suitable for the site.

The further information also portrayed the landowner’s intention to expand the existing services (not possible on the site) but remain within the borough. Ideally the landowner would relocate within the Merantun Way industrial estate.

The site also experiences delivery and access issues for heavy goods vehicles required to service the employment use and any ongoing employment use of the site.

Local residents/organisations
- Protect Dundonald Rec Campaign Group – support for the reference and allocation for education use.

Statutory agencies
- Environment Agency – a flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted as part of a planning application because the site is in a critical drainage area. A preliminary assessment for any potential groundwater contamination will also be required due to past uses on the site.

Others
- Conservative Group – future use should be for employment or office use only.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Allocated use – support for residential, opposition to loss of employment
The council acknowledges the information submitted by the agent acting on behalf of the owner with regard to the use being solely for residential. The evidence submitted includes detailed information regarding the condition and limitations of the existing building for ongoing employment use. The existing operation has outgrown the functional use of the building and it is anticipated that they will relocate within the borough, ideally to a purpose built facility in the nearby industrial area. Council therefore agrees that residential is the most appropriate allocated use for the site given there will be not net loss of jobs following allocation, only the loss of a scattered employment site. The owner also submitted historic marketing evidence which illustrated that the site was not desirable even when the market was substantially stronger. The protection of existing employment was considered appropriate in principle. However, the owner submitted evidence to state that there would be no net loss of employment or jobs and that overall they wish to move and expand their existing operations within the borough. Ongoing employment use would also require the existing building to be demolished and redeveloped from the ground up to ensure its ongoing suitability for employment use. It was stated that this is not economically viable. This was accepted when considered against the overwhelming need for housing in Merton. The surrounding area is largely residential in nature, with several scattered employment sites to the east. The site is therefore considered appropriate in this instance.

Education use has only been included as the site The site, together with the neighbouring garages, was assessed in a “short list” for its suitability as a school in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton. As a result, the potential use for a school has been added to the list of council’s preferred uses. It is acknowledged that the site was identified as being suitable only in conjunction with neighbouring properties. It would also require the approval of the owner of the subject site and acquisition of adjoining land. It is not detrimental to the owner to have
the allocation included.

**Flood risk**

All flood risk matters will be addressed and taken into account as part of any planning application to redevelop the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The only representation which is not remedied is with regard to employment use being retained on the site. Evidence has been considered and taken into account as outlined above, with residential being considered the most appropriate use in this instance. This measure will therefore not be implemented as the preferred use is for residential development on the site. The site is not considered ideal for employment in policy terms use because it is an out of centre location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for residential use. This is based on the compatibility of residential use with the surrounding area adjoining and to the north and west of the site in particular. The owner has stated anecdotal evidence in which the site floods from Merantun Way during heavy rainfall events. Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk mitigation measures will need to be determined and implemented as part of any redevelopment. Information source: Landowner, landowner’s consultants and FRA, Environment Agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site owner has stated their intention to relocate their operations from the site then redevelop the site in accordance with the allocation. The site has been in their freehold ownership since 1996. Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability. Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The owner has stated that the site is no longer viable for employment uses based on the nature of the site and building in its current condition. The site would need a wholesale redevelopment in order to render it suitable for ongoing employment use, but this is unlikely to be viable. The agent acting on behalf of the owner has stated their intention to redevelop for residential use within the next five years which implies that redevelopment is viable. If the site is deemed appropriate to provide additional school places, a market appraisal of the site would be required and either agreement with the landowner or a compulsory purchase of the site initiated. This would not occur without prior funding and thus viability work being done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding site viability.

Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**
The site is within an archaeological priority zone, a critical drainage area and an area with good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 4).

**Have any other issues been identified?**
Retention of existing business and employment within the borough.

Potential parking, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets need to be managed. There is not sufficient turning space or access for HGV’s to the site at present.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area. Anecdotal evidence of surface water flooding from High Path was provided by the owner.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above measures.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**
Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain existing lawfully established use. The council is aware that the owners intend to relocate their operations from the site to a purpose built facility. Based on the information received, the existing building is not fit for purpose and would struggle to be sold or re-let. The site was marketed prior to the recession and there was very limited interest. It is realistic that the site would remain vacant for an extended period of time.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is a scattered employment site and could be considered for a range of employment uses suitable in a residential area. The site could be suitable for community uses (D1 use class) however there is no evidence of viability for such uses on the site.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Residential (C3 use class) or potential school (D1).

Capacity (if relevant): There is capacity and a need for housing in Merton.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery timeframe(s):</th>
<th>0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</td>
<td>Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential occupiers:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</strong></td>
<td>No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 59 – Corner Baltic Close and High Street
Colliers Wood
194-196 High Street Colliers Wood
Colliers Wood
SW19 2BH

Area: 0.02 ha

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Underground Limited, c/- Transport for London Corporate Finance – Property Development (TfL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a private car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is a hardstanding area on the corner of High Street Colliers Wood and Baltic Close. At the opposite side of Baltic Close to the southwest of the site is a three storey public house (Charles Holden). To the west of the site is a four storey residential block (Oslo Court) with the Wandle Park beyond. The High Street Colliers Wood frontage of the site is adjoined on the northern side by a three storey shopping parade with retail units at ground level and flats above. The site is almost directly opposite the Colliers Wood underground station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Information supplied by TfL and council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Informal car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Any of the following or a suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurant or cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), hot food takeaways (A5 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class) and residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TfL (Property Development only) – general support for the Sites and Policies DPD and the flexible approach to the allocated uses. This approach reflects the requirements of the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Local residents/organisations |
Colebourne S – the site should be regenerated together with neighbouring shops. The best result would be achieved if adjoining Oslo Court was also replaced. The road would also need enhancements including an eastbound bus lane.

Gelbart E&L – the current use is messy and undefined. A mixed use retail and residential development would be appropriate, however there are already enough fast food outlets in the area which contribute to rubbish in the streets.

Maidment C – the parade and residences to the north of the site are of poor quality and should be removed. Such as what happened with the community centre next to the Red Lion. The Royal Standard should be retained and become a listed building. This is in conflict with the statement “recognition of the distinctive history of the terrace buildings to the northeast of the site”.

ThinkFuture – support for council’s preferred use and does not support solely residential use.

### Statutory agencies

**English Heritage** – requests more analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal about the site’s role in the Wandle Valley Conservation Area.

**Environment Agency** – the site is in flood zone 2. A sequential test should be undertaken to ensure there is no alternative land at lower risk of flooding that can be developed prior to this site. A flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted as part of a planning application to ensure all sources of flooding are appropriately mitigated because the site is in flood zone 2 and a critical drainage area. A preliminary assessment for any potential groundwater contamination will also be required due to past uses on the site.

**National Grid** – the site is in close proximity to National Grid’s high voltage underground electricity transmission cables. Consultation received in December 2012 stated that there may be an easement or wayleave agreement which protects the pilot cable. National Grid requires no permanent structures to be built over the cable or the easement.

### Others

No consultation received.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Regeneration should also include the adjoining parade of shops**

The parade of shops was not put forward at the call for sites stage for potential redevelopment therefore has not been considered as part of the Sites and Policies DPD process.

**A mixed use retail and residential development should be provided, without any additional hot food takeaways**

A mixed use retail and residential development is allocated for this site which is appropriate for a town centre location. Council could consider excluding fast food retail from future uses as part of the strategic allocation, but it is more appropriate to consider this information as part of a planning application with evidence to support the position. Recent investigations by council officers show that there is not a proliferation of hot food takeaways in Merton, however new policy DM R5 is a new method of protecting against such risk.

**The Royal Standard should be a listed building**

The Royal Standard is already locally listed. A statutory listing would require an application to English Heritage. It is unknown if this has ever been done and is not currently being promoted by the council. It is not a relevant
consideration to the preparation of the Sites and Policies DPD.

**The Sustainability Appraisal should have more information regarding the Wandle Valley Conservation Area**
The Sustainability Appraisal will contain more detailed information regarding the Wandle Valley Conservation Area. This will also be given further and material consideration as part of any planning application submitted for redevelopment of the site.

**Flood risk mitigation**
It is acknowledged that the site is within flood zone 2. A site specific flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted with any planning application in order to determine appropriate mitigation measures for any development. This information will be required to accompany any planning application submitted for the site.

**Proximity to high voltage transmission lines**
Future design of any structures on the site will need to ensure they are clear of any easement. Reference to the high voltage lines will remain in the Sites and Policies DPD to ensure information is available when a planning application is submitted.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**
The matters above regarding flood risk, fast food outlets and development near the electricity easement will be appropriately addressed during the planning application phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Suitability - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for a range of town centre uses given its location in the town centre. A range of preferred uses is therefore suggested to promote a suitable mixed use development on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Availability - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of Transport for London who supports redevelopment. There are no known issues regarding the availability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is considered that due to its location in the town centre and excellent public transport links that an appropriate mixed use development will not only be viable, but desirable for potential developers. Vacant sites in town centres...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are typically in short supply.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no apparent issues regarding viability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site is within the Wandle Valley conservation area, an archaeological priority zone, an area with a very good level of public transport accessibility (PTAL 6a), flood zone 2 and a small part of the eastern corner of the site is within a critical drainage area.

The Colliers Wood Underground Station building to the east of the site is a grade II listed building.

The parade of shops to the north of the site is of poor quality and the immediately surrounding area is in need of appropriate environmental improvements, incorporating pedestrian access into Wandle Park.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.

Respecting the character and the views into and from the neighbouring conservation area and the setting of the listed building (Colliers Wood tube station) located to the east of the site.

Minimise impact on highway capacity, safety and movement.

The site appears to be within 50m of London Underground tunnels and infrastructure therefore London Underground Infrastructure Protection must be consulted.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the location within a flood zone and a critical drainage area.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site, particularly in relation to Oslo Court to the west of the site.

Recognising the opportunity to improve the environment of Baltic Close.

Recognise the National Grid power lines running under Baltic Close.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – it is considered likely that the site will continue to be used as a car park until such time that the owner, TfL, sought to dispose of it.
Alternative uses on the site – the site is located within Colliers Wood town centre therefore a range of uses can be established as of right in accordance with emerging policy and the Core Strategy. Uses considered inappropriate on the site would be industry, commercial and warehousing.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses</strong>: Various town centre type uses and residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (if relevant)</strong>: There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. Future town centre uses will be determined by market demands at the time of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known</strong>: Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s)</strong>: 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by</strong>: Agent/owner, council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers</strong>: Residential, town centre retailers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 78 – 191-193 Western Road
191 – 193 Western Road
Colliers Wood
SW19 2QD

Area: 0.51 ha

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: James Davis, 11 Park Avenue, Bromley, BR1 4EF.


Site description: The site is situated on the southern side of Western Road, which is a busy arterial thoroughfare. The site is currently occupied by a warehouse building and hardstanding parking area. Sole access to the site is achieved centrally along the Western Road frontage.

The site is surrounded by two storey residential properties to the south, east and west. To the north of the site on the opposite side of Western Road is a large industrial site occupied by Blackout, a blinds and rigging company situated within a strategic industrial location.

Information source: Owner supplied information and report from pre-application meeting.

Current Use: Factory and open storage (an industrial building currently used for pharmaceutical production and open storage). The pharmaceutical company was scheduled to vacate the premises in March 2013.

Use suggested/organisation: Residential – by owner James Davis.

Allocated use: Residential.

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

- No representation received as part of the Stage 2/2a consultation process
- Call for sites (Stage 1) had various pieces of information to support redevelopment
  - Factory run down
  - Squatted 3 times and has security issues
  - Open storage has limited appeal as surrounded by residential use on 3 sides
  - Existing factory has no heating and limited toilet facilities
  - Uneconomical to refurbish or develop new units due to lack of demand in area
  - Has had previous demand for housing from external parties
- Pre-app meeting held
  - Change of use from B1, B2 and B8 to C3 residential with the construction of 25 residential units.
  - Rows of terraced houses with a block of apartments
  - Maintain existing access point

**Local residents/organisations**

S Colebourne – the site is suitable for residential use however it is relatively distant from Colliers Wood station and is primarily serviced by bus.

Davies D – development should not be more than two storeys. Blocks of flats, and their inherent issues, would not be desirable or wanted. They would be too high a density and congestion issues would be exacerbated along Western Road. Any development abutting the gardens of properties on Church Road needs to be sympathetic to the surrounding properties. There are no overlooking or noise issues from the current use. The western part of the site has been home to foxes and if it could become green open space the issue of noise and overlooking would be kept to a minimum whilst preserving a wildlife habitat.

Williams C – development should not be more than two storeys to avoid overlooking. Blocks of flats would be too high a density, congestion issues would be exacerbated along Western Road, and increased noise pollution. Any development abutting the gardens of properties on Church Road should be sympathetic to the surrounding properties. There are no overlooking or noise issues from the current use even though it is unsightly. The western part of the site has been home to foxes and if it could become green open space the issue of noise and overlooking would be kept to a minimum whilst preserving a wildlife habitat.

**Statutory Agencies**

Environment Agency – site is within a critical drainage area and development needs to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues. Development will require a Phase I assessment for groundwater and land contamination potential due to industrial use.

GLA – support council’s preferred use.

Met Police – no reference to Secured by Design (SBD) principles.

Natural England – site is a green corridor and potential for protected species along boundary of site.

National Grid – the site is crossed by or in close proximity to underground electricity transmission cables. Underground cables are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway. National Grid agreements require no structures to be built over cables or within the zone specified by the agreement.

**Others**

Conservative Group – site should be allocated for a mixed use development comprising residential, office and retail.

---

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Servicing by public transport**

It is acknowledged that the site has a PTAL 2 rating. It is therefore likely that any development would need to provide sufficient onsite parking for the number of residents likely to be dependent on a private vehicle. The site is an approximate 10 minute walk from Colliers Wood tube station. There are also a total of 6 different bus routes within the same walking distance connecting the area with Mitcham, Morden, Clapham, Wimbledon, Kingston and Epsom.
It is considered that a combination of onsite parking and the existing bus and tube routes within the vicinity of the site will provide suitable private and public transport to any redevelopment.

Site should be allocated for a mixed use development comprising residential, office and retail

There was no justification from the Conservative Group for the suggested mixed use development. The area is not considered appropriate for retail or office use primarily due to its location outside of any town centre. The need for housing in the borough is also considered to outweigh any potential benefit achieved by having office or retail use.

Development should be sympathetic to adjoining properties (on Church Road)

It is considered acceptable for any new development adjoining existing properties to have an appropriate design which has regard to the scale and location of adjoining properties. In this instance, there should be some separation provided to the existing properties on Church Road to ensure new development is in keeping with the surrounding environment. Site specific design related matters will be determined and considered as part of the planning application process.

Critical drainage area

A site specific flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted with a planning application for redevelopment. The site is located within flood zone 2 and a critical drainage area. Appropriate mitigation measures would need to be determined and implemented in order for residential uses to be established on site.

Secured by Design principles

Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through any planning application to redevelop the site.

Green Corridor

This comment appears to have resulted from an error in the drafting of the DPD which states the impact of any development would need to take into account protected species, biodiversity and the adjacent green corridor. The site does not adjoin any green corridor nor is there one in the immediate vicinity.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

It is considered that there are no significant issues raised in the representations. All of the above matters can be taken into account and implemented appropriately as part of the planning application process for the site.

The only objection/matter raised that was in conflict with the information contained in the Sites and Policies DPD was from the Conservative Group seeking alternative uses which are not considered appropriate for the site.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

Due to historic industrial uses on site there will need to be some form of contamination investigation to determine whether any remediation of the existing site is required to ensure it is suitable for residential use. It is understood that the landowner has already begun these investigations.

No other issues have been identified regarding the suitability of the site for residential use.

It is not apparent that there are any significant issues with regard to the suitability of the site for residential use.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?
There are no issues identified regarding site suitability for the potential future uses identified. The matters regarding potential contamination, flooding and drainage will be dealt with through the planning application phase.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The owner has confirmed freehold ownership of all the land identified in the site allocation map. The existing lease for occupation on the site ended in March 2013.

Information source: Information provided to council by the owner.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

It is considered that there are no issues regarding the site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its current B use class. Any redevelopment proposal would be considered on its merits at the time a planning application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is an established scattered employment site within the borough. The site borders industrial, residential and open space (allotments) uses. Excluding the existing and allocated uses and based on the size and location of the site, it could be considered for either C2 or D1 type uses. The site is an out of centre location therefore A uses are generally not suitable. The council has not received any information from the owner or other party to suggest any alternative use would be viable.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The landowner is actively pursuing redevelopment of the site. The owner has had pre-application advice from council and engaged an architect to assist with development. The owner considers the site viable for development for residential use based on 25 units. Pre-application advice from council stated that this density was appropriate and acceptable in principle, subject to site specific design considerations.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is within flood zone 2 and the entire site is within a critical drainage area.

The site is adjacent to the Western Road allotments which are situated to the southeast of the site.

The site is in an area with moderate access to public transport services (PTAL 3) and is within the Colliers Wood archaeological protection zone.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

The frontage along Western Road is busy and adjoins residential properties.
Mitigating potential parking, traffic and safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site.

Recognise the National Grid power lines running under Western Road.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified which act as a barrier to redevelopment. These matters will need to be addressed at the planning application stage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Residential (C3 Use Class).

**Capacity (if relevant):** Unknown.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown but provision of 25 residential units.

**Delivery timeframe(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 – 5 years</th>
<th>5 – 10 years</th>
<th>&gt;10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 80 – Crusoe Road Industrial Buildings
45 A & 45B Crusoe Road
Mitcham
CR4 3LJ

Area: 0.12 ha

Location Map

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder:
45A Crusoe Road – Vasan Printers Limited, Vasan Thurairajah, Unit A 45 Crusoe Road, Mitcham CR4 3LJ.
45B Crusoe Road – Irshad Ibrahim, 1 Rural Way, Streatham, London SW16 6PF.

Occupier: Various light industrial occupiers including vehicle tyre service, motorcycle repairs and warehousing and storage for an online shop.

Site description: The site is occupied by single storey commercial buildings, and has a small concrete forecourt which is informally utilised for parking and loading associated with the businesses.

The adjoining site to the west contains a two storey industrial building which is vacant on the ground floor and accommodates the Rhema Church Ministries on the first floor. The general character of the surrounding area is dominated by two storey residential terraces.

Information source: Council officer site visit and information provided from owners.

Current Use: Light industrial/warehousing.

Use suggested / organisation: Residential – site owners of 45A and 45B Crusoe Road.

Allocated use: Residential (C3 use class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

A meeting was held and subsequent email correspondence outlining both owners support for proposed residential development of the site.

Local residents/organisations

Conservative Group – the site should be retained for light industrial use.
### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**Retention of light industrial use**

The subject site comprises several light industrial units in a predominantly residential area. The units are in relatively poor condition and when considered with adjoining land at 60 Pitcairn Road, form a relatively derelict part of the street scene. The sites have also been the subject of numerous complaints to council’s environmental health team regarding fly tipping and other issues. The site was submitted for residential use by local councillors and supported by the owners of the site. Council officers also support the proposed use as residential based on the nature of the site and surrounding area, and knowledge of residents’ opinions regarding the existing site and operations. The suggestion to retain light industrial use was submitted by the Conservative Group. No evidence or supporting information was included as part of the representation. Ultimately, there are no measures that could overcome the concern raised without removing the site from the DPD. The need for housing in the borough and the benefits of allocating sites for residential use, particularly in residentially prominent areas such as the subject site, is considered to outweigh the effects of the loss of small scale employment in this instance. Council therefore considers that an allocation for residential use on this site is the most appropriate land use to assist in meeting Merton’s housing targets.

**Secured by Design principles**

Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through any planning application to redevelop the site.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

Secured by Design matters should be taken into account as part of any planning application for redevelopment of the site. Any application would have to have regard to Merton’s Core Planning Strategy and not be contrary to the London Plan. Both these documents address Secured by Design matters.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable for residential use based on the nature of the surrounding area being a predominantly residential environment with two storey terraced houses.

Information source: Council officer determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding the sites’ suitability for residential use.

Information source: Council officer determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

---

**Statutory agencies**

| GLA – support for council’s preferred use. |

| Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design (SBD) principles. |

**Others**

| No consultation received. |
### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The site is in freehold ownership as outlined above and both owners support the allocation of the site for residential use. The owners have also advised they wish to redevelop the site in the first half of the plan period (2014 – 2019) and have engaged professional services to assist with their investigations and design. The owner of 45a Crusoe Road has engaged the same architects as site 18 (60 Pitcairn Road) and is likely to be delivered in conjunction with that site.

Information source: Correspondence with landowners, agent provided information.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

---

### Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

#### Have any other issues been identified?

It is understood that the landowner’s are currently investigating the viability with suitable professionals. Council has not been made aware of any issues with the viability of redevelopment. The owner of 45a has engaged an architect to assist with the planning application and delivery of the site. The viability of the development is considered to be implicit with the desire to develop it for residential purposes.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site. The landowner is willing and able to redevelop the site and has confirmed their intentions to council.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

---

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site is in an area with moderate accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 3). The site is within a critical drainage area and the southern boundary of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

Protecting the residential amenity of the adjoining properties.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

Mitigate potential parking, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

It is considered that appropriate measures for the above issues can be determined and implemented during the planning application phase for redevelopment of the site. It appears logical that an extension to the two storey terraced housing adjacent the site would be appropriate for the site, however an alternative design may be appropriate and is not disregarded.

A parking survey of the on-street demand may be required to determine the level of onsite parking that may or may...
not be required. However, it is anticipated that additional on-street parking could be provided once the site is developed as the forecourt and frontage of the existing land uses would not require such a wide area of access compared to future residential uses. The kerbs could be restored and additional parking provided within the road reserve fronting residential properties and the loading bays would not be required.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

**Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) –** the site would continue to operate with its current B uses. Any redevelopment proposal would be considered on its merits at the time a planning application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is a scattered employment site and is surrounded by residential uses in all directions. Based on the nature of the surrounding environment, with the exception of the existing and allocated uses, only D1 uses would be considered appropriate on site.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for additional housing in Merton.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner: council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential use.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 9 – Mitcham Library
London Road
Mitcham
CR4 2YR

Area: 0.18 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Mitcham Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This site contains a two-storey library and community facility with a car park located to the east of the building. The site is surrounded by buildings ranging between two and five storeys in height that consist of blocks of flats and retail parades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Internal Council information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Library and other community facilities (D1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Library to be maintained and improved either on site or closer to Mitcham town centre. Residential on part of site to support library function – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Library to be retained and improved (either on site or closer to Mitcham town centre). The remainder of the site considered for an appropriate mix or any of community (D1 Use Class), office (B1[a]) Use Class) or residential (C3 Use Class) uses. Small town centre uses (less than 280 m²) would be suitable given the edge of centre location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation was received from the owner (Council) preceding the call for sites stage. No representations were received from occupiers or users of the library.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?
The Conservative Group stated their preference for the library to be retained with no other uses on the site. The council’s preference is for the library to be located closer to the town centre and this may be achievable as part of the Rediscover Mitcham project. As part of the allocation council requires the library to be retained in its current capacity as a minimum, but also opens the door for complementary uses to exist on the site. The reason for the aversion to additional uses on the site is unknown however it will provide positive planning outcomes if alternative such as residential uses can be provided. A similar outcome to the Raynes Park library redevelopment is envisaged. If the library is to be relocated the site will be available for residential and alternative uses appropriate to the locality in the vicinity of Mitcham town centre.

It is therefore considered that there is no improvement that needs to be made to overcome the issue raised, primarily because the library will be retained in its current capacity on the site as a minimum. Ideally, the library will move closer to the town centre into a purpose built modern facility.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
It is considered that there are no measures that need to be implemented.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?
Any future redevelopment will need to have regard to the original pitched roof library building which is locally listed.

It is not apparent that there are any site suitability issues that would affect the delivery of this site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?
There are no site suitability issues that are required to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES

Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?
The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?
There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?
No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.
Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Other Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is located outside the Mitcham town centre boundary (which was reduced through preparation of the Sites and Policies Plan). The site is located in an archaeological priority zone and an area with good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The original pitched roof library building is locally listed but not the more modern flat roofed side and rear extensions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have any other issues been identified?

The Mitcham library facility needs to be improved to service specifications. This can occur either on the site as part of redevelopment or on a new site.

Any redevelopment proposal will need to respect the character of the locally listed building. This will be taken into account as part of any application for planning permission.

Mitigate potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. The provision of some parking on site would be desirable. This will be taken into account as part of any application for planning permission.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage. This will be determined and assessed during the planning application stage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use as a library. The status quo would be retained however it is considered that an opportunity would be missed to provide an enhanced library facility on a more central location, and additional residential development to assist with meeting local and national housing targets.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the location of the site no suitable alternative uses excluding the existing and allocated uses are considered appropriate.

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: Library, residential and possible town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** The library service needs to be retained and enhanced (either on site or on a new site). There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. Potential town centre uses on the site are likely to be determined by market demands at the time of development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers identified subject to appropriate measures being taken into account through the planning process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 17 – Worsfold House/Chapel Orchard
Church Road
Mitcham
CR4 3BE

Area: 1.35 ha

Location Map

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: London Borough of Merton.

Occupier: Council offices and Chapel Orchard day care centre.

Site description: This site is located to the south of Church Road. Adjoining Church Road is a single storey former office building (Chapel Orchard) and single storey former surgery building currently being used as part of Cricket Green school (1 Church Road). To the rear of the site served by an 80 m long access road off Church Road is a single story council office building (Worsfold House).

The surrounding area is characterised by large low-rise buildings with generous spaces between them and many large trees and shrubs.

Along the south-western boundary is a footpath (Church Path) with a large publicly accessible park (London Road Playing Fields) beyond.

To the west is a single storey special needs secondary school (Melrose School) and to the west of the access road is a two-storey hostel building (Hall Place).

To the east of the site is a part two-storey special needs school (Cricket Green School) and to the south east is a row of two-storey terrace houses that front onto Broadway Gardens.

Information source: Council officers.

Current use: Council offices (Worsfold House); school use (Chapel Orchard; former surgery)

Use suggested/organisation: Residential - by owner (London Borough of Merton).

Allocated use: A suitable mix of school (D1 Use Class) and/or residential (C3 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

No representation was received from the owner (Council) or occupiers of the site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Local residents/orrganisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage – favour community and educational uses for the future of Worsfold House and would encourage it to be considered in conjunction with neighbouring Cricket Green School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitcham Village Residents Association – support the allocation for school use but not for residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Statutory agencies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage – would like more regard to be given to the conservation area status in the Sustainability Appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayors Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – development may have an impact on policing needs in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Others</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the Conservative Group’s preferred use was for the site to be retained solely for school/education use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThinkFuture – “Surely a school site, built with flexibility to accommodate community businesses and live/work units, would help to retain potential employment land, whilst safeguarding school places”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**Allocated use**

The allocated use includes D1 which enables the provision for education and community uses. It is envisaged that the site can be appropriately developed for these uses but also include the provision for additional housing which is needed in the borough and London-wide. If further research determines the site not to be suitable for providing school places, residential use is considered the most appropriate alternative given the need for additional housing within the borough and London-wide, and the nature of the surrounding area.

With regard to the representation made by ThinkFuture, the allocated use accommodates most of the suggestions made with the exception of business units. This site is not considered suitable for this use due to its out of centre location where it is more desirable for business and employment uses to be situated.

**Regarding the conservation area**

Appropriate regard will be given to the conservation area in the Sustainability Appraisal and any subsequent planning application to be submitted for development on the site. The site allocation has appropriate reference to the conservation area and relevant matters.

**Potential impact on policing needs**

More recent correspondence received from the MPS stated that they have undertaken a borough wide assessment of policing needs and are overall reducing the number of sites allocated for policing needs in the borough. If residential use is provided on the site, the potential impact on infrastructure will be considered at the time a planning application is made.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

Council is continually undertaking borough wide research into the need for school places. If the site is identified as being required for providing school places, the allocation will enable this. If the entire site is not required, the allocation also enables an element of residential to be established. If the site is not identified for school needs then a residential development is considered appropriate. Therefore, if the demand exists for a school on this site, the above measures will be addressed. If there is not a demand for a school on this site then the next bets alternative is considered to be residential use. It is considered that the allocation suitably enables the provision of school places if
required, but also provides an alternative option if this is not the case. There are no barriers to the implementation of school use on the site.

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the existing uses operating on the site and in the immediate vicinity of the property, both community and residential uses are considered appropriate for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. A short term lease exists for the former council office building however this does not affect the deliverability of the site in accordance with the allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding the availability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuation and expansion of the existing community uses on the site is feasible given the nature of the site and the education use operating on and adjacent to it. Ultimately, the provision of any education use will be subject to demand and independent viability testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding the availability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is within the Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area, an archaeological priority zone and an area with a moderate level of access to public transport (PTAL 3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The London Road playing fields to the southwest of the site are designated as open space, a site of (Borough) importance for nature conservation (Grade II), a green chain and the footpath (Church Path) along the south-western boundary needs to be preserved.

Portions of the site are within a critical drainage area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issued been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protecting the residential amenity of the adjoining properties.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures of address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

There may be potential for redevelopment to encompass either or both of the school sites to the east and west, ensuring the provision of the school(s) in a modern facility. Further investigation of this should be undertaken.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measure that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use. The site is considered to be underutilised at present and contains little development with large tracts of private open space which provides little benefit to either the owners or occupiers. It is considered that an appropriate redevelopment of the site could achieve a sustainable development which much better utilised the space available, whilst contributing to the demand for either or both education and housing needs.

Allocate the site solely for education or residential – education is currently an unknown quantum but is the subject of investigation, hence why it is included in the allocation. The allocation also enables either use to be provided on its own. The allocation requires the education provision to be determined prior to the site being specified as required for solely one use or the other.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the location of the site no suitable alternative uses excluding the existing and allocated uses are considered appropriate.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Education and/or residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. There is also demand for school places within the borough.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential, education providers.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the site have been identified.
# Deliverability Assessment

## General Information

Site 20 – Wilson Hospital
Cranmer Road
Mitcham
CR4 4TP

Area: 0.54 ha

---

## Location Map

![Location Map](image)

---

## Site Details

### Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

**Freeholder:** NHS Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust, 120 The Broadway, London SW19 1RH.

**Occupier:** NHS - Wilson Hospital.

**Site description:** The site consists of a large part single and part two-storey hospital building fronting Cranmer Road. Along the south-eastern boundary is Caesars Walk and two-storey terrace houses. To the south and south-east of the site are Cranmer Primary School and its playing fields. The access road to Cranmer Primary School runs along the north-western boundary with a row of two-storey terrace houses beyond. On the opposite side of Cranmer Road is a large open space known as Cranmer Green.

**Information source:** NHS information provided and council site visit.

**Current Use:** Health clinics relating to mental health, drugs and early intervention, and a GP surgery (D1 Use Class).

**Use suggested/organisation:** Mixed use nursing home (C2 Use Class), residential (C3 Use Class), community (D1 Use Class) and health (D1 Use Class) – Sutton and Merton PCT.

**Allocated use:** The size and location of this site gives it potential for a range of community uses (D1 Use Class) in whole or in part including healthcare and education.

If the Local Care Centre is to be located on this site then a healthcare (D1 Use Class) led mixed use scheme that may include some 'residential institution'-type accommodation (C2 Use Class) and/or some residential (C3 Use Class).

If the Local Care Centre is to be located at another nearby site then the site has potential for community uses (D1 Use Class) including education and/or nursing home (C2 Use Class) and residential (C3 Use Class).

---

## Consultation Responses Summary

**Landowners/occupiers**

NHS - The NHS has stated through several stages of public consultation that the site will be available for redevelopment within the next 5 years. The representation made as part of Stage 3 in particular is supported by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group. The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms comments that
there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (those not subject to redevelopment in the Sites and Policies Plan) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments.

The Wilson Hospital site is being considered for a new Mitcham Local Care Centre. Redevelopment of the site will depend on whether the site is used for the Local Care Centre or not.

Planning permission granted for the creation of a Local Care Centre at Nelson Hospital (Kingston Road, SW19) in September 2012. The Wilson Hospital will accommodate some of Nelson Hospital’s services during the construction of the Nelson Local Care Centre, which is due to start in 2013.

The site is also being considered for a new Mitcham Local Care Centre but this is less likely to be the Wilson Hospital site based on issues around developing the site and public transport links. The preferred sites for the new centre are the Wilson Hospital and Birches Close (Site 21).

Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust (PCT) will cease to exist from 01 April 2013 and will be replaced by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group Merton Partnership Health and Wellbeing Board and the Clinical which will replace the PCT for strategic health matters.

The NHS stated that delivery of the site would occur in conjunction with Better Healthcare Closer to Home with funding from the NHS/private sector (if it is not used for the Local Care Centre).

### Local residents/organisations

- **Bryce SC** – opposition to development for residential use but would support uses related to community and health, but with a preference for educational use including improved access to Cranmer School.

- **Conservative Group** – their preferred use is for community and healthcare or education and residential.

- **London Borough of Merton Children, Schools and Families Department** – any development must improve the access to Cranmer Primary School.

- **Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage** – the site should be retained for health, education and community use. Do not support residential other than for institutional purposes on the site. Any development should respect the existing footprint of the building and avoid any loss of open space.

- **Mitcham Village Residents Association** – if the local care centre cannot be provided on the site then residential use is supported.

- **The John Innes Society** – there should be greater provision for educational use and not link it with other possible uses.

### Statutory Agencies

- **English Heritage** – recommends making the comments about the potential impact on the conservation area more explicit

- **Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Services** – development may affect policing needs on the site and that the allocation include the provision for community facilities such as policing.

- **NHS** – support for proposed use.

### Others

- No other consultation received.
Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opposition to residential development, retention of the existing use/site should be used solely for healthcare, education and/or community uses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHS has confirmed to the London Borough of Merton that the site, subject to the Local Care Centre being provided elsewhere, is surplus to requirements. NHS has also advised council officers that the site is not preferable for the Local Care Centre primarily due to the low accessibility to public transport (PTAL 3) rendering it unsuitable for the scale of expansion envisaged. The site is therefore unlikely to generate ongoing demand for the same use due to the lack of alternative providers of such uses and the likely future of a new Local Care Centre in Mitcham being located in close proximity to the site. Based on the future of the site being unlikely to contain ongoing healthcare/community uses, the council therefore considered potential alternative uses on the site. Based on the demand and need for additional housing in Merton, a residential allocation was considered most appropriate in this instance. The benefits of allocating the site for potential residential uses (in addition to community, healthcare and education) are considered to outweigh any potential benefit achieved from allocating the site for an alternative use. The site is 1.8 ha and represents a considerable opportunity to achieve a good number of residential units on the site as a result. The demand for ongoing community, healthcare and education uses are considered to be low based on information received from the NHS.

It is acknowledged that residential use may result in a range of different effects emanating from the site compared to the current use. Potential effects of residential development could include noise, traffic, parking, construction related effects, litter and potential daylighting impacts depending on the scale of development. These matters are more appropriately determined during the planning application phase. It is considered that design will be a key element of any residential component and that a conversion of existing buildings on the site may be appropriate.

**Access to Cranmer School should be improved**

The site is currently owned by NHS therefore any alteration to the existing access would have to be negotiated with them or the subsequent owner as part of any redevelopment. It is considered feasible that the access could be improved along the boundary of the two sites to Cranmer School. Evidence should be sought from the London Borough of Merton Children, Schools and Families Department that the existing access is not serving its purpose or poses a restriction to efficient use of the school. There appears to be sufficient width located within the existing land holding of Cranmer School to expand the existing access however it is covered in trees and vegetation along its length (school gates are closed to access at beginning and end of day due to restricted access). It is considered that any alterations to access to the adjoining property can be considered as part of a planning application for redevelopment of the site. The issue is appropriately referenced within the allocation to ensure an appropriate investigation is undertaken at the time a planning application is submitted.

**Potential effects on the conservation area**

Any future development on the site would have to have specific regard to matters associated with the conservation area. It is considered appropriate for future development to be assessed to determine whether and redevelopment should be confined to the existing footprint of the buildings on site. Design specific aspects of any future development cannot be determined as part of the strategic allocation due to the unknown factors such as use and density among others. Design aspects will be a primary concern if any planning application is made to redevelop the site. This is considered an appropriate mechanism of taking into account and assessing concerns relating to design and potential effects on the conservation area.

**Potential impact on policing needs**

The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The allocation provides the ability to establish community uses on the site and therefore police needs. This is considered an appropriate measure of
accounting for additional community space if needed.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Generally speaking it is considered that most of the issues raised above can be taken into account and considered as part of a future planning application. The future of the site is unknown in its current service as the NHS has stated it is surplus to requirements. The allocation therefore enables the continuation and provision of existing uses such as community, education and healthcare, but acknowledges that these uses are likely to no longer be viable on the site, therefore also includes a residential allocation. The same applies for the potential impact on policing needs by providing the ability for such services to be provided on site. It is therefore considered that the site allocation enables a range of uses consistent with issues raised in the representations as well as evidence received regarding the future of the site.

The remaining issues raised regarding access and design are considered more appropriate to be dealt with during the planning application stage for any redevelopment once the scale and type of development is known.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

The site is considered suitable for a range of uses based on the nature of existing activities on the site and the surrounding area. The site is obviously suitable for healthcare/community related facilities as evidenced by the nature of the existing NHS services on the site. The site is considered suitable for education needs also, although would need to be considered further based on its proximity to the adjoining Cranmer Primary School. The site has a relatively low building coverage and is in a predominantly residential area comprised of two storey terraced houses. Any residential use on the site would be considered appropriate and congruous to the surrounding area.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES

Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The NHS has stated that the site is in their ownership and will be surplus to requirements. The NHS stated in their Stage 2 representation that the site is anticipated to be developed within the first 5 years of the plan on conjunction with a private sector partner.

Information source: Information provided from NHS.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

Viability of continued healthcare services is considered to be implicit based on the existing services operating on the site. The site is allocated appropriately to enable the establishment of a local care centre if it is required. If it is not required then alternative uses can be established on site. If the site is disposed in accordance with the latter, alternative uses, then the viability will be implicit with disposal and the sale price.
Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Other Issues

Strategic planning factors

The site is within the Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area, an archaeological priority zone and an area with a moderate level of access to public transport (PTAL 3). A part of the site is designated as green corridor. The hospital building is a locally listed building.

The Cranmer Green to the northeast of the site is designated as metropolitan open land, open space, green corridor, green chain, local nature reserve and is within the Wandle Valley Regional Country Park.

The northeast portion of the site is within a critical drainage area.

Have any other issues been identified?

Whether the proposed Local Care Centre to serve this part of the borough will be provided. This site among others is being considered.

Protecting the residential amenity of the adjacent properties.

Protecting the habitat of the protected species that have been identified on/near the site in past ten years i.e. Common Toads, Smooth Newts and Common Frogs.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The assessment above outlines the matters which need further investigation during the planning application phase. It is considered that all the identified issues can be appropriately accommodated or mitigated as part of the allocation and any subsequent planning permission.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use. If the site is not pursued for a local care centre and becomes surplus to requirements, it would risk being left vacant or underutilised for an otherwise extended period of time with no planning certainty over its future.

Alternative uses on the site – the allocation includes a range of uses considered suitable on the site, subject to the determination of whether the local care centre will be provided on site or elsewhere. The site is not considered suitable for any alternative use other than those identified in the allocation primarily based on the receiving environment and the distance to the closest town centre and amenities.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Community, education, healthcare, residential.

Capacity (if relevant): NHS has plans for a new Local Care Centre in Mitcham. This will result in services currently on
the site being located on an alternative site. It is unlikely that there is capacity to retain the site for healthcare once the Local Care Centre is established. There is capacity for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential, healthcare providers, education or community services.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

Determination of a suitable scale of residential use if it eventuates on the site. For example, whether a redevelopment of the existing buildings is viable and appropriate or a redevelopment of the whole site.
General Information

Site 21 – Birches Close
1-7 Birches Close
Mitcham
CR4 4LQ

Area: 0.96 ha

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: NHS Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust, 120 The Broadway, London SW19 1RH

Occupier: NHS.

Site description: The site, which has access from Cricket Green, consists of various single and two storey buildings accommodating specialist NHS clinics and supported accommodation units. To the north, on the opposite side of the footpath, Cold Blows, is a three storey office building and three storey blocks of flats. To the east of the site is a single storey nursing home and to the south is a bowling green, the Methodist Church and a row of two storey terrace houses. To the west is a row of two and three storey detached and semi detached houses.

Information source: NHS representation and council officer site visit.

Current Use: Specialist health facilities including a polyclinic, day centre and chiropody clinic (D1 Use Class) and 8 assisted living units for people with learning disabilities.

Use suggested/organisation: Mixed use dwellings (C3 Use Class), community (D1 Use Class) and health (D1 Use Class) – Sutton and Merton PCT.

Allocated use: The size and location of this site give it potential for a range of community (D1 Use Class) uses in whole or in part including healthcare and education.

If the Local Care Centre is to be located on this site then a healthcare (D1 Use Class) led mixed use scheme that may include some ‘residential institution’ type accommodation (C2 Use Class) and/or some residential (C3 Use Class).

If the Local Care Centre is to be located at another site then the site has potential for community uses including education (D1 Use Class), and/or a nursing home (C2 Use Class) and/or residential (C3 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

The NHS has stated through several stages of public consultation that the site will be available for redevelopment within the next 5 years. The representation made as part of Stage 3 in particular is supported by the Merton Clinical
Commissioning Group. The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (those not subject to redevelopment in the Sites and Policies Plan) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments.

The Birches Close site is being considered for a new Mitcham Local Care Centre. Redevelopment of the site will depend on whether the site is used for the Local Care Centre or not. The NHS has stated that the Birches Close site has its constraints due to its size, transportation and access issues. The preferred sites for the new centre are the Wilson Hospital and Birches Close (Site 21).

Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust (PCT) will cease to exist from 01 April 2013 and will be replaced by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group Merton Partnership Health and Wellbeing Board and the Clinical which will replace the PCT for strategic health matters.

The NHS stated that delivery of the site would occur in conjunction with Better Healthcare Closer to Home with funding from the NHS/private sector (if it is not used for the Local Care Centre).

### Local residents/organisations

Conservative Group – their preferred use is for school or healthcare.

Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage – believes there are covenants on the site restricting use of the site to community uses. The site should be retained for health, education and community use. Objection to residential use other than for institutional purposes on the site. There are important urban design considerations for the site and should only be developed in the context of an overall design framework in conjunction with the local community. Any development should respect the existing footprint of the buildings, avoid any loss of open space and retain the character and setting of the existing historic buildings, including Birches House and the adjacent Cold Blows footpath. Any development also needs to acknowledge the existing access constraints from Cricket Green and retention of the character of the road.

Mitcham Village Residents Association – the site is suitable for the Local Care Centre.

The John Innes Society – there should be greater provision for educational use and not link it with other possible uses as evident in the preferred uses for the site. There is a need for new schools with a good standard of facilities such as outdoor playgrounds.

### Statutory Agencies

Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Services – development may affect policing needs on the site and that the allocation include the provision for community facilities such as policing.

NHS – support for preferred use.

### Others

No other consultation received.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site should be retained/used for education, healthcare, or community use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NHS has confirmed to the London Borough of Merton that the site will be surplus to requirements if the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere. NHS has also stated that Birches Close is currently favoured for the Local Care Centre based on the most recent investigations, however it does have constraints related to size, access and transportation. The decision has not yet been made NHS regarding the preferred site for the Local Care Centre.
Centre is to be provided on the subject site then the site will continue, and possibly expand, the existing healthcare/community services. If the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere, the existing services are likely to be provided on the new site, therefore the subject site would become surplus to requirements as outlined by the NHS. The allocation therefore takes into account both scenarios by providing a range of uses suitable for the establishment of a Local Care Centre if it is to be provided on the site, or suitable alternative uses if the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere.

It is acknowledged that residential use may result in a range of different effects emanating from the site compared to the current use if the Local Care Centre is to be provided elsewhere. Potential effects of residential development could include noise, traffic, parking, construction related effects, litter and potential daylighting impacts depending on the scale of development. These matters are more appropriately determined during the planning application phase. It is considered that design will be a key element of any residential component and that a conversion of existing buildings on the site may be appropriate. This is evidenced by the existing planning application submitted by the NHS which was refused at appeal based on design related matters.

Potential effects on the conservation area
Any future development on the site would have to have specific regard to matters associated with the conservation area. It is considered appropriate for future development to be assessed to determine whether and redevelopment should be confined to the existing footprint of the buildings on site. Design specific aspects of any future development cannot be determined as part of the strategic allocation due to the unknown factors such as use and density among others. Design aspects will be a primary concern if any planning application is made to redevelop the site. This is considered an appropriate mechanism of taking into account and assessing concerns relating to design and potential effects on the conservation area.

Potential impact on policing needs
The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The allocation provides the ability to establish community uses on the site and therefore police needs. This is considered an appropriate measure of accounting for additional community space if needed.

Access
It is acknowledged that the site only has one vehicle access point from a narrow no exit road. This will need to be considered within an appropriate transport assessment to be submitted and considered at the time a planning application is made. Any redevelopment should have regard to the nature and character of the existing road and surrounding area.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
Generally speaking it is considered that most of the issues raised above can be taken into account and considered as part of a future planning application. The future of the site is unknown in its current service as the NHS has stated it will be surplus to requirements if the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere. The allocation therefore enables the continuation and provision of existing uses such as community, education and healthcare, but acknowledges that if the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere, then an appropriate alternative use can be established on the site.

The same applies for the potential impact on policing needs by providing the ability for such services to be established on site (D1 Use Class). It is therefore considered that the site allocation enables a range of uses consistent with issues raised in the representations as well as evidence received regarding the future of the site.

The remaining issues raised regarding access and design are considered more appropriate to be dealt with during the planning application stage for any redevelopment once the scale and type of development is known. It is
considered that concerns raised can be taken into account and considered as part of this process.

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable for a range of uses based on the nature of existing activities on the site and the surrounding area. The site is obviously suitable for healthcare/community related facilities as evidenced by the nature of the existing NHS services on the site. It is also apparent that the site could be suitable for education purposes. The site has a relatively low building coverage and is situated in a predominantly residential area, although it does contain a range of uses. Any residential use on the site would be considered appropriate and generally congruous to the surrounding area.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The NHS has stated that the site is in their ownership and will be surplus to requirements if the Local Care Centre is provided elsewhere. The NHS stated in their Stage 2 representation that the site is anticipated to be developed within the first 5 years of the plan on conjunction with a private sector partner.

Information source: Information provided from NHS.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES**

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The viability of continued healthcare services is considered to be implicit based on the existing services operating on the site. The NHS is rationalising services and this site could become surplus to requirements. The NHS has previously submitted a planning application for a residential redevelopment of the site which was refused on matters related to design and layout, not the scale or use. Appropriate viability testing would have been undertaken by the NHS prior to undertaking that assignment and this is considered to relate to the proposed redevelopment of the site if the Local Care Centre is located elsewhere.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Other Issues**

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is within the Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area, an archaeological priority zone and an area with a moderate level of access to public transport (PTAL 3). ‘The Birches’ (a.k.a. ‘Birches House’) is a locally listed building on the site.
The Mitcham Cricket Green to the west of the site is designated as metropolitan open land, open space, green corridor, green chain and is within the Wandle Valley Regional Country Park. The footpath (Cold Blows) along the northern boundary needs to be preserved.

The setting of the ‘The White House’ at 7 Cricket Green and ‘Chestnut Cottage’ at 9 Cricket Green are both grade II listed buildings and need to be preserved and respected.

Portions of the north, east and west of the site are within a critical drainage area.

The principle of residential development on the site was tested as part of planning application 10/P0153 which was only refused on design related matters.

Have any other issues been identified?

The site has restricted vehicular access.

Protecting the residential amenity of the adjacent properties.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Design – the planning history for the site illustrates that design of any future redevelopment of the site will be key with respect to the form of any built development within the conservation area. The scale, form and appearance of buildings need to be appropriate for the site whilst recognising the importance of the locally listed building on the site and two adjoining grade II listed buildings. The most recent planning application was refused at appeal on design related matters which emphasises this fact. There was no objection in principal to the use of the site as residential. If the site is redeveloped or expanded for healthcare/community services design will remain a crucial factor. Such site specific design issues will be subject to scrutiny at the time any future planning application is made to redevelop the site as there is not sufficient information available at this point in time.

Critical drainage area – potential issues associated with the drainage from the site are more appropriately considered at the planning application stage.

The assessment above outlines the matters which need further investigation during the planning application phase. It is considered that all the identified issues can be appropriately accommodated or mitigated as part of the allocation and any subsequent planning permission.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use. If the site is not pursued for a local care centre and becomes surplus to requirements, it would risk being left vacant or underutilised for an otherwise extended period of time with no planning certainty over its future.

Alternative uses on the site – the allocation includes a range of uses considered suitable on the site, subject to the determination of whether the local care centre will be provided on site or elsewhere. The site is not considered suitable for any alternative use other than those identified in the allocation primarily based on the receiving environment and the distance to the closest town centre and amenities.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses</strong>: Community, education, healthcare, residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant)**: NHS has plans for a new Local Care Centre in Mitcham. This will result in services currently on the site being located on an alternative site. It is unlikely that there is capacity to retain the site for healthcare once the Local Care Centre is established. There is capacity for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known**: Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s)**: 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by**: Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers**: Residential, healthcare providers, education or community services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHS is due to make the decision on the future of the Mitcham Local Care Centre in early 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether the site is designated by the NHS for the new Mitcham Local Care Centre. If the site is to be used for the centre, the allocation for a healthcare led mixed use development in the DPD will aide the redevelopment of the site for these uses.

Achieving a suitable design for any redevelopment which acknowledges the listed buildings and conservation area setting appropriately.
General Information

Site 33 – Elm Nursery Car Park
Car Park Adjacent 125 London Road
Mitcham
London
CR4 2JA

Area: 0.1 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a public car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This site is a surface car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring the site to the north is a single storey commercial unit and a public access footpath lies between the commercial unit and the car park. Adjacent to the south are flats ranging from three to five storeys, to the west are four storey flats and to the east are two storey terraced houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is not within the Mitcham town centre boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is accessed from London Road with pedestrian access also to Feltham Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Car Park (sui generis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council – no consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statutory agencies
No consultation received.

Others
Liberal Democrat Group – raised general concerns at the potential loss of town centre car parking with several sites across the borough being identified for a change of use from a car park.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Loss of town centre parking
All of the car parks in Mitcham are underutilised based on council officer assessments. It is therefore evident that a surplus of parking exists in Mitcham. Even if several car parks were no longer used, there would still be sufficient parking available in Mitcham Town Centre. As part of the Rediscover Mitcham project, further detailed parking surveys of Mitcham will be undertaken which will confirm the exact current and future demand for parking in the town centre.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
It is considered that there is no issue with regard to a parking shortage or potential parking shortage in Mitcham Town Centre. This is being investigated further as part of Rediscover Mitcham and will be taken into account when redeveloping town centre sites.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?
The site is considered suitable for residential purposes. The site is an edge of centre location and there are existing residential areas to the east, south and west of the site. The Mitcham town centre boundary has been reduced significantly as part of the Sites and Policies DPD based on evidence and further research undertaken by council officers. Retail and commercial uses are considered more appropriate in the town centre and should be concentrated in the revised town centre boundary. The site is therefore considered most appropriate for residential use based on this and the need for additional borough in the borough.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?
There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES

Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?
The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. There are no known issues regarding the availability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?
There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.
Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is relatively large for an undeveloped area in close proximity to the town centre. It is considered to be a prime site for residential development and it is considered that there will be no issues with regard to viability for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This site is identified as part of a larger site in the Mitcham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) [2006] as being suitable for residential uses (C3 use class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is in an area with moderate good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL level 4).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigate potential parking, road safety and traffic impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of some onsite parking is desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative options/uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use. The site would most likely be retained as a car park until it was disposed of by the council. It is considered that there wouldn’t be a demand for a private car park on the site therefore it is likely to be developed to some extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for residential uses as an alternative which is considered the most appropriate use for the based on the nature of the surrounding environment and emerging policy. The Mitcham town centre boundary is being rationalised through the emerging Sites and Policies Plan and the site is now located further from the town centre than previous, therefore it is not considered suitable for town centre type uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: Residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (if relevant): There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the site have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 35 – Mitcham Fire Station
30 Lower Green West
Mitcham
CR4 3AF

Area: 0.04 ha

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, c/- Steve Dark, Dron &amp; Wright, 80 Cannon Street, London EC4N 6HL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Fire brigade - however a new fire station has received full planning permission at 421 – 445 London Road, Mitcham approximately 700 m from the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This site consists of a two to three storey building set in a group of buildings, including the three to four storey Vestry Hall adjacent to the rear of the site (north east) and the two storey Cricketers public house adjacent to the southeast of the site. Adjacent to the northwest of the site is a triangular area of open space known as Lower Green which contains the war memorial. The site fronts Lower Green West Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Green lies to the south east of the group of buildings, across London Road from Vestry Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Agent acting on behalf of the owner and council officer site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Fire station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested / organisation:</strong> Residential led mixed use development which could include any of the following: retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurant or café (A3 Use Class), drinking establishment (A4 Use Class), business use (B1 Use Class), or health uses (D1 Use Class) – London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> A mix of uses which could include any of the following: community uses (D1 Use class), community uses such as a cinema, gallery, theatre (D2 Use Class), residential (C3 Use Class), restaurant, cafe (A3 Use Class), office (A2 or B1 Use Class), drinking establishment (A4 Use Class) or non-food retail (A1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dron &amp; Wright (on behalf of LFEPA) – the agent acting on behalf of the owner has made a representation at each stage of the public consultation. The representations have contained information regarding the owners suggested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
use for the site with supporting information. The suggested use for the site above reflects the most recent information received from the owners.

Local residents/organisations

Mitcham Cricket Green Community and Heritage – proposal should be for community uses for the site as it would complement historic land uses around Cricket Green. Should also include neighbouring buildings (Cricketers Pub and Vestry Hall). Design of new development to enhance conservation area and Cricket Green setting.

Mitcham Village Residents Association – support for the council’s preferred use.

English Heritage – because the fire station is a locally listed building any redevelopment should have reference and obtain guidance the English Heritage document “London’s Historic Fire Stations”.

Think Future – the site is a good location for community/social business venue.

Statutory agencies

No consultation received.

Others

No consultation received.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

The site should be for community uses

Both the use suggested by the owner and the preferred use by council includes potential community uses. The site is considered to be relatively unique based on the size, location, access, listed nature and setting within the adjoining building and Cricket Green conservation area. Flexibility is therefore offered for a range of future uses which are considered appropriate on the site. A range of uses is considered appropriate and necessary to ensure the site does not become vacant for an extended period of time.

Reference to published English Heritage documents and design related matters

The site allocation has specific regard to the published English Heritage guidance and points out the fact clearly that design will be a crucial component of any redevelopment plan. For example, the adjoining Cricketers public house, which is not listed, has been refused planning permission on three occasions on design related matters. These matters will be considered during the planning application phase.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Design related matters will be taken into consideration as part of any planning application submitted for redevelopment of the site.

With regard to use of the site, the allocation enables the range of uses suggested in the representations. A range of uses is considered appropriate in this scenario due to the unique nature of the site as illustrated above.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

The LFEPA have provided evidence of numerous other fire stations which have been converted into alternative uses.
This has formed the basis for a majority of the preferred uses for the site by council. Council has therefore received sufficient information regarding the suitability of historic fire stations for alternative uses.

Information source: Council identified issue based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the suitability of the site for alternative uses.

Information source: Information to be supplied by owner/agent.

## Site Availability - ISSUES

### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The LFEPA has stated that they have the freehold ownership of the site. This will be disposed of once the new fire station is complete and has been relocated to the new site. The access to the site is owned by the London Borough of Merton which provides access to the adjoining Vestry Hall and the fire station. The LFEPA has been in contact with council’s property team to discuss existing covenants on the access with a vision to resolve historic interests.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

No issues have been identified. Access will remain to the site if the ownership is transferred. Regardless, the current owner is investigating the ability to “tidy up” the existing access arrangements in consultation with the council.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

### Have any other issues been identified?

The viability of the site for redevelopment will largely be dictated by the market value and demand for the site when it is disposed. The LFEPA has stated that it will become surplus to requirements and will be disposed of following the move to the new station in 2014.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site for redevelopment.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Other Issues

### Strategic planning factors

The building is locally listed and is adjacent to Vestry Hall which is also locally listed.

Full planning permission was granted for a replacement modern fire station approximately 700 m from this site at 421-445 London Road, Mitcham in November 2012. Development is anticipated to be completed in 2014 with the transfer of services and disposal of this site following.

The site is within the Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area, an archaeological priority zone and an area with a moderate level of access to public transport (PTAL 3).

The site is located off a one way gyratory near the junction with London Road and the strategic road network. Parking is limited on or near the site.

The triangular open space to the north west of the site is designated as metropolitan open land, green corridor and green chain.
The ‘Mitcham Parish Rooms’ to the west of the site is a grade II statutory listed building.

The neighbouring Cricketers public house was the subject of two planning appeals in January 2013 which were dismissed on design related matters.

### Have any other issues been identified?

Planning permission for a larger replacement fire station has been granted approximately 700 m from this site so redevelopment of this fire station will not compromise fire services in the Mitcham area.

Any redevelopment or change of use should retain the building and design should be sensitive to its form and function. Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area character assessment and management plan should also inform any design considerations.

Proposals should take account of the joint guidance between English Heritage and London Fire Brigade - *London’s historic fire stations, March 2010*.

The existing emergency service contraflow road linking the fire station with London Road will need to be closed, which could provide improved walking and cycling facilities.

Mitigate potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. A ground floor use requiring frequent deliveries from large vehicles would be required to demonstrate the safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians was not compromised.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

**Information source:** Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No other issues have been identified. The above matters will be considered and taken into account as part of any planning application to redevelop the site.

**Information source:** Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

**Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) –** the existing fire station is being relocated and the owners have advised that the site will be disposed of. This would likely result in the site being sold to a developer and an ad hoc planning application being brought forward for redevelopment of the site. The council considers it more appropriate to provide a strategic allocation for development of the site which will provide guidance on how the council wishes to see this building retained in perpetuity.

Alternative uses on the site – It is considered that the allocation provides for a suitable and wide range of uses which provides an appropriate range of flexibility for development of the site. No other uses outside those allocated for the site are considered suitable on the site.

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings Held with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> A range of potential future uses on the ground floor as illustrated in the allocation, with residential likely on the upper floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for housing in Merton. Any non-residential use will be determined on market demand.
**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner, council

**Potential occupiers:** Refer above.

---

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

Future development achieving a suitable and acceptable design for any use and development.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 53 – Brook House
1A Cricket Green
Mitcham
CR4 4LA

Area: 0.28 ha

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: Lionsgate Properties, c/- Planning Works Ltd, 71 The Ridgeway, Stanley Hill, Amersham, Bucks, HP7 9HJ.

Occupier: Vacant.

Site description: The site consists of a three storey office building with vehicle access on the western side off Cricket Green and on the eastern side off Chatsworth Place. To the north is a three storey former office building, Mitcham Court, which is currently used as a school and to the east are three storey blocks of flats. To the south of the site, on the opposite side of the footpath (Cold Blows), is a two-storey house that has been converted into a day care nursery and numerous single and two storey buildings accommodating specialist NHS clinics at Birches Close (Site 21).

Information source: Cliff Thomas – Planning Works Ltd (agent) on behalf of Lionsgate Properties Ltd (owners).

Current Use: Vacant since 2008 but the established use is for office (B1[a] Use Class). Planning permission (11/P2839) was granted on 16 February 2012 for the change of use of the property to class D1 educational use. This proposal was submitted and obtained by a third party and not on behalf of the owner.

Use suggested/organisation: Residential including retirement housing (C3 Use Class), nursing home/care home (C2 Use Class), hotel (C1 Use Class), or day nurseries/crèches (D1 Use Class) – by planning consultant (Gary Thomas, Planning Works) for owners (Lionsgate Properties).

Allocated use: Any of the following uses or a suitable mix of community (including education D1 Use Class), nursing home/care home (C2 Use Class), hotel (C1 Use Class), and/or residential (C3 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

The owner has provided marketing evidence for the site which proves the site is not viable for office use. The building has been marketed both in full and in part since 2008. It has been vacant the entire time. The marketing
Evidence was submitted as part of planning application 11/P2839 and was accepted by council for a change of use to D1. The marketing evidence suggests the site is suitable for the following uses:

- Residential including retirement housing (C3);
- Nursing home/care home (C2);
- Hotel (C1); or
- Day nursery/crèche (D1).

The owner does not support suggestion that a combined approach with adjoining and nearby sites in Cricket Green for potential “medical” uses.

### Local residents/organisations

Mitcham Village Residents Association – the preferred use for a nursing home/care home is supported.

### Statutory agencies

English Heritage – requested an analysis of the sites role in the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area.

NHS – prefer the site to be available for D1 use aligned and as part of the redevelopment of Birches Close as a Local Care Centre.

### Others

Conservative Group – preferred use is for a school or employment.

---

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>An analysis of the sites role in the Mitcham Cricket Green Conservation Area should be provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and conservation area issues will be determined through the planning application stage. The allocation in the Sites and Policies DPD will enable redevelopment of the site but any future use will have to have regard to these matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The site should be allocated for a school or employment**

The site has planning permission for a school (granted on 19 March 2012) but this was not obtained by the owner and has not been implemented. According to the owner the person who obtained the permission has not even made contact regarding the site. Purchase of the site would be required to implement this approval. This suggests that the site may not be viable for a school. If it was viable it is presumed that the site would have been purchased (or at least investigated). It has been on the market for a substantial period without success. It has been vacant since 2008 and even the approved school has not come to fruition (to date). Marketing evidence has been provided which illustrates the site is not suitable for B1[a] use. Other employment related uses are not considered appropriate in this location therefore are not promoted or allocated.

**The site should be allocated for D1 use and aligned with Birches Close**

The NHS has advised that the future of the Mitcham Local Care centre is currently unknown following the dissolution of the PCT. A local care centre may not even be provided in Mitcham. If a local care centre is provided, further work needs to be undertaken to determine whether Birches Close is appropriate. Regardless, the site is considered appropriate for such uses by both the owner and council and therefore includes D1 uses in the allocated use.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

There are no barriers to implementation of the above. There were no issues raised that are either outstanding or
would not be considered as part of a planning application for the site.

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**
The site is considered suitable for any of the preferred uses outlined above. The marketing evidence proves that office use is not viable and has suggested certain alternative uses. It is considered most likely that any change of use on the site would be accommodated within the confines of the existing building structure with possible internal and external alterations.

It is not apparent that there are any site suitability issues with respect to the site being used for the preferred uses.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**
There are no issues identified regarding site suitability for the potential future uses identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**
The agent has stated that Lionsgate Properties are the sole freehold owner of the site. The site is vacant and available at this present point in time. The building has been vacant since 2008 and has been continually marketed since. It is therefore considered that there are no issues to site availability.

Information source: Representations received from landowner’s agent.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**
It is considered that there are no issues to site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES**

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**
There do not appear to be any issues to viability of the site with regard to the use suggested by the agent or council. The owner believes the site is viable for a range of uses and has expressed this in their representations.

There could possibly be viability issues regarding D1 education use based on the fact a third party has obtained planning permission for the site for this use but has not purchased the site or implemented the permission. This use however is not suggested by council or the agent therefore is not considered to affect the viability of the site or its deliverability within the lifetime of the DPD.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**
It is not considered that there are any issues regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Other Issues**

**Strategic planning factors**
The site is within the Mitcham Cricket Green conservation area, an archaeological priority zone and an area with
good access to public transport (PTAL 4).

The Mitcham Cricket Green to the west of the site is designated as metropolitan open land, open space, green corridor, green chain and within in the Wandle Valley Regional Country Park. The footpath (Cold Blows) along the southern boundary needs to be preserved. ‘Mitcham Court’, to the north of the site is a locally listed building. Parts of the eastern and western portions of the site are within a critical drainage area.

### Have any other issues been identified?

Potential loss of employment space considered against the contribution this site has made as an employment location in recent years. The site has been marketed both in whole and in part since 2008 without occupation.

Protecting the residential amenity of the adjacent properties.

Respecting the character of this part of the conservation area.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified which act as a barrier to redevelopment. The matters referred to above will be taken into account and addressed as part of any planning application submitted for the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use as offices, with an approved planning permission for education use. The site has been marketed continuously for a period of almost five years without being able to be let. The entity who obtained the planning permission has made no approach to the owner regarding the purchase or lease of the site. It is likely the site would continue as a vacant building for the foreseeable future.

Alternative uses on the site – the allocation provides for a range of uses considered appropriate for the site based on evidence, consultation and policy.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Any of the following uses or a suitable mix of community (including education, D1 Use Class), nursing home/care home (C2 Use Class), hotel (C1 Use Class), and/or residential (C3 Use Class).

**Capacity (if relevant):** Unknown. It is known that there is no capacity for employment/office use in this area. There is demand and capacity for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** The total office floor space is 2159 m². The site area is 0.28 ha.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner: council

**Potential occupiers:** Unknown.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers to delivery of the site have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a public car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site description:** The site is an irregular quadrant shape, is adjacent a busy main road and is occupied by parking spaces for approximately 50 vehicles, redundant public conveniences, London buses driver facilities and a community recycling area.

Access to the site is via an entry from Holborn Way at the northeast boundary with egress along the southwest boundary. There are two points of pedestrian access to the site from London Road via Sibthorp Road and from the Mitcham Fair Green via a passage adjacent the King’s Arms public house.

The site is surrounded by business uses which generally address the pedestrianised section of London Road to the east or Upper Green West to the south, however there are also several businesses which have shop fronts orientated toward the car park.

To the west of the site on the opposite side of Holborn Road are large four to five storey residential apartment buildings at Sadler Close.

**Information source:** Council officers.

**Current use:** Car Park (sui generis).

**Use suggested/organisation:** Town centre uses and residential - London Borough of Merton.

**Allocated use:** Town centre type uses and residential.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Responses Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landowners/occupiers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council – no consultation received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local residents/organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Mitcham Village Residents Association – support for the proposal to redevelop this site so that the regeneration of Mitcham Town Centre is assured. However, “town centre uses” is too vague. They would support a development which could include retail or, like the fire station, a mix of uses such as cinema, gallery, theatre and restaurant. They would not support redevelopment for only residential use, but they could agree to “living over shops” if it was incidental to other town centre uses. Any new building should reference the height of the adjoining buildings fronting London Road in the town centre and should not exceed three floors. If this site was redeveloped then the use of Raleigh Gardens (Site 34) would remain essential.

Wimbledon Society – the present appearance of the rear of this street block is lamentable and contributes to the very poor quality of the local environment around Fair Green. With rear elevations fully exposed to the highway, there is a need to repair the structure of the remaining part of the street block and form a frontage to Holborn Way. The existing pedestrian links to London Road and Sibthorp Road should be formalised and prioritised. Small scale business uses are needed locally and could help to regenerate the economic activity of the Fair Green area. These uses could be considered as well as some retail/café uses etc. Residential is not considered to be an appropriate major user, therefore no decision should be pre-empted for this site until the overall plan for Fair Green has been produced.

Statutory agencies

English Heritage – some reference should be made to the fact that the site is in the wider setting of a Grade I listed building.

GLA – London buses currently have a driver mess room and toilets in the former public toilet building. These facilities should be provided in any redevelopment.

Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design principles.

Others

Conservative Group – use should be for a restaurant/café and residential.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Preferred use of the site should be restricted

Whilst a more specific list of town centre uses could be provided, it is still likely to be relatively extensive due to the flexibility sought for redevelopment of the site. Flexibility for development of this site is preferred to enable an appropriate development to come forward which would provide a substantial benefit to the existing, and soon to be redeveloped, town centre. The viability of a town centre is dependent on a range of uses. This is also referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy within the definition of town centre type uses which outlines a range of uses which contribute to the viability and vitality of town centres. It is not considered appropriate to unduly restrict the development potential of this town centre site without any evidence to suggest any particular use is not suitable. Mitcham town centre will also be undergoing a substantial amount of change as part of the “Rediscover Mitcham” project. Redevelopment of this site will occur following implementation of this. The preferred range of uses will enable a suitable mixed use development to be proposed which will seek to complement and grow the existing town centre.

Based on the information it is considered inappropriate to unduly restrict the potential uses which could be established on the site without sufficient evidence. A broad approach to enabling development will provide the best opportunity for redevelopment to provide a range of uses appropriate to the site and the location in the town centre.
The scale of development should reference adjoining buildings in terms of height
Several issues raised were in relation to the built form of any future development on the site in relation to design aspects of future buildings, the layout and use of the site. This is more appropriately dealt with as part of an application for planning permission therefore cannot be determined or guaranteed as part of the site allocation. Development of this site will not occur prior to Rediscover Mitcham being implemented.

Loss of town centre parking
There is an oversupply of parking in Mitcham town centre and sufficient town centre parking will remain available even if Sibthorp Road and Raleigh Gardens (Site 34) are developed. This will be continually monitored as part of Rediscover Mitcham and the rejuvenation of Mitcham town centre. There is no desire to have a shortfall of commuter and short stay parking in the town centre.

The existing environment is of poor quality and an enhanced frontage should be provided to Holborn Way
It is acknowledged that the public realm surrounding and including the site is of poor quality. The site is relatively isolated in its physical presence from Fair Green and the remainder of the town centre. Rediscover Mitcham ultimately seeks to enhance the quality of the town centre. Any redevelopment would be subject to design review in order to achieve an appropriate frontage not just to Holborn Way, but also acknowledge the existing surrounding built form and enhance the physical presence to Fair Green. This will be considered and taken into account following the implementation of Rediscover Mitcham and the submission of a planning application.

Formal pedestrian links to the site and surrounds should be formalised
Refer to the comments immediately above.

Reference should be made to the fact the site is in the wider setting of a Grade I listed building
The allocation document was amended to include reference to Eagle House, a Grade I listed building.

The existing facilities building for London Buses should be retained
The allocation provides the ability for the existing or a new facility to be provided. This can be protected in consultation with London Buses if required through the planning application process.

There is no reference to Secured by Design principles
Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. These matters will be taken into account as part of the planning application process.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Preferred use of the site should be restricted
The preferred use for the site could be more defined to have a specific list of uses, however it is considered that this would only restrict the viability of the site and its ability to contribute to the overall regeneration of Mitcham. The site is relatively large and vacant of substantial built development therefore has the ability to establish a new mixed use development comprising appropriate uses for a town centre. Restricting the uses allocated for the site is considered to be a potential barrier to redevelopment therefore has not been altered in this instance. No evidence has been provided to suggest that the uses should be restricted, or that certain uses are not appropriate.

The scale of development should reference adjoining buildings in terms of height
All design related matters will be considered during the planning application stage. A good quality design will be required for the site due to its dual frontage with Holborn Way to the west, and adjoining buildings and Fair Green on all other sides. Any future development will need to appropriately address the street frontage whilst providing suitable amenity and service space for occupiers, residents and visitors. It is considered that there are no barriers to
implementation of design restrictions, however these are most appropriately dealt with through the planning application phase once the scale, form, bulk, location and design of future building(s) and or uses have been submitted.

**Loss of town centre parking**
The redevelopment of Mitcham town centre will be continually monitored to ensure that a shortage of parking does not result. Council officer surveys indicate that there is a large oversupply of parking in Mitcham at present, and that there is sufficient capacity in existing parking areas even if Sibthorp Road and Raleigh Gardens were redeveloped. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of ongoing parking surveys being carried out to ensure a shortage of parking does not result.

**The existing environment is of poor quality and an enhanced frontage should be provided to Holborn Way**
All design related matters will be considered during the planning application stage.

**Formal pedestrian links to the site and surrounds should be formalised**
Footfall in and around Mitcham town centre should be enhanced to and from the site where possible. This is considered a matter which is more appropriately considered as part of a planning application.

**Reference should be made to the fact the site is in the wider setting of a Grade I listed building**
The allocation includes reference to Eagle House, a Grade I listed building as requested.

**The existing facilities building for London Buses should be retained**
The allocation document was amended to include reference to Eagle House, a Grade I listed building.

**There is no reference to Secured by Design principles**
Secured by Design principles are referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. These matters will be taken into account as part of the planning application process. There are no barriers to implementation of Secured by Design principles.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for a range town centre uses due its location in Mitcham town centre. The site is predominantly vacant which renders it suitable for a mixed use development comprising typical town centre uses on the ground and lower floors with the possibility for residential use above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. There are no issues identified regarding the site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is relatively large, undeveloped and situated in Mitcham town centre which is receiving substantial investment for regeneration of the town centre as part of the Rediscover Mitcham project. It is presumed that council will dispose of the site and that the market price will ultimately contribute to the viability of the site for redevelopment.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome. The site is likely to be disposed of following implementation of Rediscover Mitcham.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

---

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

- South east of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.

- This site is within an archaeological priority zone.

- The site is within the wider setting of a grade I listed building (Eagle House).

- The site has a good level of access to public transport services (PTAL 4).

- There are several businesses which have oriented shop fronts toward the car park (eastern side) to the detriment of the local high street on London Road.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Mitcham town centre is receiving £6.2 million in investment between 2012-2016 to help boost local shops and businesses, enhance the public realm and transport infrastructure. The project is known as “Rediscover Mitcham”. Redevelopment of the site will be considered after the completion of the Rediscover Mitcham project and the delivery timescale has been adjusted to reflect this.

Research and consultation responses associated with the Rediscover Mitcham project will be used to help inform the future of this site. Redevelopment proposals should be considered after the Rediscover Mitcham project has been delivered and evaluated.

- This site is adjacent a heavy vehicular traffic route along Holborn Way. Any potential redevelopment should seek to mitigate traffic noise for its occupiers.

- The developable portion of the site is constrained by the dual frontage businesses addressing the site along the eastern side. There may be opportunities to create an attractive streetscape along the eastern side of the site (opposite side to Holborn Way).

- The potential loss or relocation of town centre car parking spaces will need to be considered.

- Respecting and enhancing the character and the views into and from neighbouring Mitcham Fair Green.

- Mitigating parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

- Limiting traffic movements so as not to hinder traffic flow on the surrounding roads or cause safety concerns for
other road and pavement users.

To protect bus operations suitable replacement driver facilities must be provided prior to development.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters. Rediscover Mitcham will be implemented prior to the site being redeveloped therefore any future development will be able to take in account any changes to the site or access to it as a result.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate as a car park. It has been determined by council officers that there is ample parking in Mitcham town centre. Following implementation of the Rediscover Mitcham project, the council would review its position with regard to the ownership and operation of the car park within the town centre. This would be analogous to the current position.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is situated within Mitcham town centre. The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses to be established which are consistent with the Core Strategy and emerging policy for town centres. Any alternative use would be subject to meeting policy, evidence and consultation. There is no evidence to suggest that any alternative uses would be viable or comply with policy for the site.

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: Town centre uses, residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. Town centre uses will be determined based on market demand at the time of development.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential, town centre retailers, financial and professional services.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

### General Information

Site 75 – Former Mitcham Gasworks
49 Seagas House
Western Road
Mitcham
CR4 3ED

Area: 2.4 ha

---

### Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.

© Crown Copyright

London Borough of Merton: 100019259

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

---

### Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong></td>
<td>National Grid Property and Scotia Gas Networks, c/- Michael Meadows, Deloitte LLP, 66 Shoe Lane, London EC4A 3BQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGP owner the larger vacant area of the site (1.78 ha) generally described as the area excluding the gas holder structure and surrounds. The SGN (0.63 ha) land includes the gas holder on the corner of Western Road and Portland Road.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong></td>
<td>The site has been cleared with the exception of a large gas holder in the northern corner of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the site is via a driveway entrance from Western Road, a reasonably busy road which connects the site with Mitcham town centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the north of the site is a recently completed supermarket, to the west and east are two storey residential dwellings, whilst to the south is the excluded part of the gasholder site beyond which are three storey residential apartment buildings and a medical centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong></td>
<td>Council officers and information provided by landowners’ agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong></td>
<td>Vacant. Last used as regional offices for the National Grid. The adjacent site has full planning permission for a major residential scheme. Outline permission for employment uses lapsed in July 2012. The gas holder is still operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong></td>
<td>Residential and retail (convenience) – Deloitte on behalf of National Grid Property and Scotia Gas Networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong></td>
<td>Residential led redevelopment with open space and some community use (e.g. crèche, healthcare).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the gasholder is decommissioned, it is recommended that site redevelopment is taken forward through the preparation of a planning brief (supplementary planning document) to clarify the proposed uses, address the
Layout, design, essential infrastructure requirements (including school places) and deliverability taking into account the unique issues associated with this site.

## Consultation Responses Summary

### Landowners/occupiers
The following information represents a summary of the most up to date information received from the owner.

- General support for a residential led redevelopment of the site in principle, subject to detailed viability testing to confirm value. The previous representation stated that the site should be allocated for food retail purposes with residential development where possible, which would ensure viability.
- A reasonable degree of flexibility should be provided in the allocation.
- Future use and development of the site needs to be viable to offset the cost of deconstruction and decontamination of the site.
- Delivery timescale based on the development of the adjoining NGP land the site could be delivered within the next 3-5 years, subject to viability.
- NGP and SGN do not consider that the preparation of a planning brief (supplementary planning guidance) is necessary to deliver the site.
- The NGP land had planning permission for light industrial uses on the subject site. This lapsed in July 2012 as there was no demand in which to proceed with implementation of the approved uses. The remainder of the permission, comprising a largely residential development is currently being implemented following approval of a reserved matters application in November 2012.
- Development in the vicinity of the gas holder is subject to restrictions set out in the HSE’s land use planning methodology, which limits the potential for residential and retail uses at present.

### Local residents/organisations
Colebourne, S – the site would be suitable for residential use however it is remote from good public transport access to key centres. The site also represents a key potential route for Tramlink which would dramatically change the perception of Mitcham.

### Statutory agencies
Greater London Authority – no issues, support council’s preferred use.

Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – development of the site may have an impact on policing needs. It was recommended that the site allocation be amended to include for community facilities such as policing.

Metropolitan Police Service – the site allocation does not have regard to Secured by Design principles.

National Grid – the site contains or is in close proximity to National Grid high voltage underground electricity transmission cables.

### Others
No consultation received.

## Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**The allocated use**

Previously council had preferred use as subject to decommission and should be brought forward through an SPD. This was amended following discussions with the landowner to allocate the site for a residential led mixed use scheme. This would provide the best chance of achieving a viable development (excluding a large foodstore which...
The site lacks public transport infrastructure
The site has a PTAL rating of 3/4 depending on which part of the site is being considered. This is considered a moderate to good rating of access to public transport. Any planning application and planning brief considered for the site will have to appropriately address access to and from the site, transportation matters and taking into account public transport. Potential improvements to public transport in the area will be considered as part of the planning brief and subsequent planning application. The provision of tram services in the borough have already been determined and considered as part of the Sites and Policies Plan.

Impact on policing needs
The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. However it is considered appropriate for this to be assessed when the scale and density of development is actually known through the planning application phase. The allocation includes the provision of “some community uses” which could enable the provision of community space for policing needs. This will be subject to demand and viability testing by the relevant authority. At present, the Metropolitan Police Service are reducing facilities in Merton and London therefore it is considered that adequate provision and demand for services has been assessed by the organisation.

Reference to Secured by Design Principles
Secured by Design principles are referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy and the policies of the Sites and Policies Plan. It is not considered necessary to double up on the information within the site allocation also. Development will have to have regard to the principles as required by existing and emerging policy.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

The allocated use
Following further consultation with the landowner they now agree with the allocated use for the site.

The site lacks public transport infrastructure
The site benefits from moderate to good access to public transport (PTAL 3-4) at various points around the site. This is considered suitable for a residential development and can even be considered for car free development. Highways and public transport related matters will be taken into account as part of the planning application process. It is also likely that resulting s106/CIL charges will be implemented which will seek to offset any adverse effects created from the additional and improve existing infrastructure where possible.

Impact on policing needs
It is considered likely that the above measures referred to will be taken into account and implemented where appropriate as part of the planning application process.

Secured by Design principles
It is considered that appropriate mechanisms are in place via existing and emerging policy for development of the site to take into account Secured by Design principles as part of any proposal.
### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable, subject to the decommission of the gas holder, for the following reasons:

- The site is in close proximity to Mitcham town centre which offers a range of retail, leisure and essential services;
- The site is a relatively large brownfield site; and
- There is a pressing need for housing in the borough.

Information source: Council officer determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding the suitability of the site for residential use, subject to the decommissioning of the gas holder.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The landowners have confirmed that the site is available for redevelopment in accordance with the allocation and within the lifetime of the Sites and Policies Plan.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

No issues have been identified regarding the site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The major factor affecting the viability of the site is the ability for development to offset the costs required to decommission the gas holder and associated infrastructure on the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

For this reason council will require the site to be delivered by a planning brief which will govern the final mix of uses to be provided on the site which will be determined by appropriate viability evidence and taking into account the unique nature of the site. A high value use is required and in the current market this is predominantly residential or food retail use. Food retail is not considered appropriate on this site due to the proximity to the town centre and the existence of a recently established large foodstore immediately opposite the site. Therefore an appropriate residential led mixed use development will need further viability work to be done through the preparation of an SPD to determine the appropriate scale and form of development on the site.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site had outline planning permission for a major residential and employment scheme. A reserved matters application was submitted for the residential component (indicated by the hatched area) was approved in November 2012.

The employment component of the permission (which extended onto the site surrounded by the red line, reaching
Western Road) lapsed in July 2012 due to a lack of demand from occupiers for that use.

The site’s potential uses and layout is currently constrained by the gasholder on the corner of Western Road and Portland Road.

Development within the vicinity of the gasholder is subject to restrictions set out in the Health and Safety Executive’s land use planning methodology (PADHI), which limits the potential for residential-led mixed use development at present.

National Grid Property states that the gasholder is expected to be decommissioned within the next five years.

The site located on the opposite side of Western Road has been redeveloped to provide a large supermarket.

The site is within the Mitcham archaeological priority zone. The site has moderate/good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 3/4) and is approximately 100 m from the Mitcham town centre boundary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the gasholder is decommissioned and the site decontaminated and cleared, this will remove any HSE restriction on use, function and layout of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the above, the site may be able to accommodate more residential development and may therefore need to consider how the needs for school places may be met on or off site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The planning brief to be developed and consulted on will address most of the issues raised above including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Viability of the site for a residential led development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The final mix of uses within the redevelopment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other parking, access and traffic related matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is considered that these matters will be identified and overcome as part of the preparation of the planning brief for the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative options/uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – this option is not considered a logical alternative given the landowners intention to decommission and dispose of the site to the market following allocation. The option of doing nothing is therefore beyond the control of the council. If a viable development could not be achieved, the site is still likely to be pursued for some form of employment or open space use, which is considerably less viable, but has the ability to coexist with the gas holder on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative uses on the site – the landowner initially suggested a preferred use of a large food retail store on the site. This was not supported from a policy perspective due to the edge of centre location and existence of a large food retail store recently established immediately opposite the site on Western Road. Mitcham town centre was considered to be vulnerable if the sprawl of retail use outside the town centre continued. The allocated use of residential with some community and open space is therefore considered the most appropriate use for the site, especially when taking into account the need for housing in the borough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative options/uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – The site would continue to be vacant with the exception of the operational gas holder. There was a previous planning permission for the site however this has lapsed therefore cannot be implemented. Any redevelopment proposal would be considered on its merits at the time a planning
application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site had planning permission for an employment led development of the site however this lapsed due to a lack of interest from occupiers and was thus not viable. The site is situated in an edge of centre location therefore has limited scope for A use classes. Employment led uses are considered appropriate on the site however it is known that there is no demand for such uses on the site. The site is considered suitable for a range of C (excluding hotel) and D use classes.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: A residential led development with open space and some community use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (if relevant): There is demand and capacity for housing in Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential occupiers: Private and social housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?

The costs of decommissioning the gas holder being offset by the cost of a residential led development.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 24 – Morden Road Clinic
256 Morden Road
London
SW19 3DA

Area: 0.26 ha

Location Map

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: NHS Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust, 120 The Broadway, London SW19 1RH.

Occupier: NHS – Morden Road Clinic, Boots Pharmacy.

Site description: The site consists of a part single and part two-storey building and is surrounded by single and two storey houses.

On the opposite side of Morden road to the east of the site is Morden Hall Park.

Information source: NHS information provided and council officer site visit.

Current Use: Medical Clinic and retail (pharmacy).

Use suggested/organisation: GP plus D1 expansion – Sutton and Merton PCT.

Allocated use: A healthcare (D1 Use Class) led mixed use scheme with some residential (C3 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers

The NHS has provided the following information through several stages of public consultation.

- the site will be available for redevelopment within the next 3 – 7 years;
- the Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (those not subject to redevelopment in the Sites and Policies Plan) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments. However future development outlined in the Sites and Policies DPD in Morden will require extra services. This could be provided on the subject site;
- Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust (PCT) will cease to exist from 01 April 2013 and will be replaced by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group Merton Partnership Health and Wellbeing Board and the Clinical which will replace the PCT for strategic health matters;
- The preferred use for the site was supported;
- the NHS stated that delivery of the site would be within approximately 5-10 years and a combination of NHS, CIL and Section 106 funding to support growth in Morden.
**Local residents/organisations**

Clarke E – claims that the site does not have good accessibility to public transport as stated. The site is located 10-15 minutes from the nearest bus stop or tube station. If the services are expanded on the site and car parking on the site is lost, the only transport method will be via minicab. Additional housing in Morden should be small flats not new houses for families due to the impact on school places.

Conservative Group – the site allocation should be for healthcare only.

Maidment C – Stane Street passes through the site and the exact location should be determined, recorded and advised.

Tipler G – support for expanded healthcare services. Also recommends apartments be established on site given the good public transport links and proximity to Morden Hall Park.

**Statutory Agencies**

English Heritage – the site description should have regard to Morden Hall Park’s registered historic park status and the presence of Grade II heritage assets within it also. The most recent correspondence acknowledged that this reference was provided in the description.

Environment Agency – the site is located within flood zone 1 and is adjacent to the River Wandle and an investigated site.

**Others**

No other consultation received.

---

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Public transport accessibility**

The site benefits from a PTAL 6a rating therefore has good accessibility to public transport. The site is approximately 300 m from Morden station which contains the northern line tube as well as a bus depot for 12 bus routes. There are bus stops located on Morden Road located opposite the site for routes heading south and approximately 250 m to the north of the site heading north in addition to Morden station. The site therefore has very good public transport links.

**Use of the site should be for healthcare related uses only**

The NHS has stated that they support the preferred use of the site which provides for a healthcare led mixed use scheme with some residential use. Council has promoted to residential component to the allocation to aide in delivering the substantial need for housing in Merton. The site is considered appropriate for residential uses given the good public transport accessibility as well as proximity to open space. The NHS also stated that the redevelopment of Morden town centre will also generate additional demand for healthcare services which could be expanded and provided on the site. It is therefore envisaged that if the site is redeveloped for enhanced healthcare services, a residential element could be provided on upper floors which could also assist in delivering such a scheme.

**Reference to Morden Hall Park**

English Heritage requested reference to the adjacent Morden Hall Park as part of their Stage 2 representation and this was provided as part of the Stage 3 consultation document which was acknowledged by English Heritage.

**Flood zone**
The Environment Agency stated that redevelopment of the site would result in certain reports/assessments being required to assess certain risks. It is acknowledged that various investigations and assessments will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application to redevelop the site. These will be considered during the planning application phase.

**Stane Street/APZ**

Stane Street was the main Roman thoroughfare from Chichester to London and passes through Morden in the vicinity of the site and the current A24 road (Morden Road). This is acknowledged by the site surrounding the route being located within an Archaeological Protection Zone. Any future development of the site would require planning permission and appropriate archaeological reporting from a suitably qualified professional. It is also anticipated that conditions would be imposed on any planning permission accordingly to give effect to this.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

It is considered all of the above measures will be implemented in due course as part of the planning application process, with the exception of the site being solely used for healthcare use. The site is considered appropriate for expanded healthcare service which is considered to largely address the issue raised by the Conservative Group. However, as stated above, if the site is redeveloped to provide an enhanced service it is considered that a residential component could be provided as the site is deemed suitable for various reasons. It is also likely that future redevelopment would also be more viable with the inclusion of a residential element.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable for both continued/expanded D1 use as evidenced by the nature of the existing use on the site and the evidence provided by the NHS of the likelihood of expansion of services. The site is also considered suitable to accommodate a residential element based on the good public transport links, proximity to open space and the need for housing in the borough.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The NHS has stated that the site is in their ownership and is being investigated for redevelopment to provide additional services within the next 5 – 10 years. The site is therefore available for redevelopment within the lifetime of the Sites and Policies Plan.

Information source: Information provided from NHS.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The NHS has confirmed that they have identified the subject site as being suitable to accommodate additional
healthcare services when coupled with the expansion of Morden town centre. This would be achieved by a combination of CIL/s106 funding which could be applied for. The allocation also includes a residential element, which if provided could add to the viability of the redevelopment of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site is within an archaeological priority zone and an area with excellent access to public transport (PTAL 6a).

Morden Hall Park to the east of the site is a registered Historic Park which is within the Wandle Valley conservation area and the Wandle Valley Regional Park. The park is also designated as metropolitan open land, green corridor, green chain and a site of importance for nature conservation.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

The expansion of this site to provide additional healthcare capacity would depend on the additional needs assessed from redevelopment of other sites in Morden town centre (e.g. sites 57, 58, 60 and 61). Therefore expansion is a long term project in conjunction with the redevelopment of Morden town centre.

A mix of uses on this site that include residential will ensure a more effective use of this property which has a good level of access to public transport (PTAL 6a).

In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site.

Respecting the character and the views to and from the adjacent Wandle Valley conservation area and Morden Hall Park which is a Registered Park of Historic Interest (by English Heritage) containing a range of grade II listed assets.

To mitigate potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above issues will be considered as part of the planning application phase for any development proposed on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use and continue to operate in its current capacity. The GP services would likely be expanded on the site once the demand arises from the redevelopment of Morden town centre. The site owner and the council believes it appropriate to provide for an appropriate mixed use development incorporating residential use on the site to aide with development viability and commercial interest in the site.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is located outside of the town centre but is an edge of centre location. The site is not likely to be viable for small scale retail or office development as a result, and there is a lack of footfall adjacent
to the site compared with the town centre. The allocation provides for residential uses as an alternative which is considered the most appropriate use for the based on the nature of the surrounding environment, emerging policy, and suitability for an enhancement of the site given the excellent public transport links. No alternative uses have been submitted to the council as part of the preparation of the Sites and Policies Plan.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Healthcare, residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** NHS has advised that the existing services is needed and could be expanded. There is capacity for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** NHS, residential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 32 – Wyvern Youth Centre
18 Arras Avenue
Morden
SM4 6DF

Area: 0.12 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Apex Investments Management Limited, c/- Martin Henneberry, Urban Spectrum, 114 Balham High Road, Balham SW12 9AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Currently vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is a 2-3 storey detached building in a residential area. To the east, west and opposite to the south are 2 storey semi-detached houses. To the north are terraced houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Vacant. The previous youth centre established on the site has been closed for some time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council – No representation was received from the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council has contacted the new owner of the site who has stated their support and intention to redevelop for residential use in accordance with the allocation. The owner has received pre application advice from the council in relation to the development of the site for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G Tipler – would recommend the construction of high quality apartments to raise house prices in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statutory agencies
No consultation received.

### Others
Conservative Group – preferred use was for the site to be retained as community/youth centre.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**The site should be retained as a community/youth centre**

It was resolved at the July 2012 cabinet meeting to close the Wyvern Youth Centre and redirect services to other existing locations as part of a transformation of youth centre services. This represents the position of the council with respect to the previous community use operating from the site. This has subsequently been put into place and the site recently sold.

#### What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

The only issue raised was regarding the future use. It was resolved by council at a previous meeting that the site be closed and disposed. The site is surplus to operating requirements and given the nature of the area and surrounding environment, residential use is considered most appropriate for the site.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

#### Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

The site is in a residential area and is surrounded by residential properties. An allocation for residential development is considered the most appropriate use for the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues to site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

#### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The freehold ownership of the site was transferred from the London Borough of Merton on 19 March 2013 to Apex Investments Management Limited. The owner has outlined their intention to redevelop the site for residential purposes.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

No issues regarding site availability have been identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

#### Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

Viability of the site for its potential use has been confirmed at the recent sale. The new owner has purchased the site with the intention of developing it for residential purposes.
### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

- The site is in an area of low accessibility to public transport (PTAL 2).
- The site is within an archaeological priority zone.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

- Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.
- Connaught Garden is susceptible to surface water flooding.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

**Alternative options/uses**

- Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use. The site has also been disposed of therefore any future development would be subject to existing and emerging policy. Following the council’s decision to close and relocate the community services using the site, a strategic policy direction regarding future use will provide a degree of certainty over its future use which would otherwise not be obtained if there was no allocation for the site.

- Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for residential uses as an alternative which is considered the most appropriate use for the based on the nature of the surrounding environment and emerging policy.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for additional housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):**

- 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 36 – Chaucer Centre
Canterbury Road
Morden
SM4 6QB

Area: 0.63 ha

Location Map

Site Details

| Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| **Freeholder:** London Borough of Merton. |
| **Occupier:** London Borough of Merton, Merton Music Foundation. |
| **Site description** The Chaucer Centre is a two storey building used as a venue for training, meetings and conferences, mainly for council staff and Merton Music Foundation. |
| Adjacent to the north of the site is the Smart Centre which is an education facility and a former nursery school building. The site is mainly surrounded by two storey terraced houses. |
| Access to the site is obtained from Canterbury Road. |
| Portions of the north and west of the site are within a critical drainage area. |
| **Information source:** Council officers. |
| **Current use:** Training, meeting and conference centre. |
| **Use suggested/organisation:** Consider potential for a mix of uses or single uses: community and residential – London Borough of Merton. |
| **Allocated use:** Mixed use residential and community (D1 Use Class) or solely residential use (C3 Use Class) subject to the existing training facility being provided on a suitable site elsewhere. |

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation was received from the owner (Council).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Music Foundation (occupier) – the charity has its offices and provides borough wide activities on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They also suggested that the allocated use should provide for solely community uses. The foundation has an ambition to expand their services on the site with a greater use from 2015-2020 onward.

**Local residents/organisations**

Merriman D – stated that there was an error regarding the location of Merton Music Foundation and that it is situated on the site within the Chaucer Centre.

The John Innes Society – not directly related but implies that education use should be retained on the site. The representation relates to the removal of education uses and proposals for predominantly residential uses across the borough.

ThinkFuture – states that it is a good potential for a mixed residential and community use.

**Statutory agencies**

Environment Agency - clarification that the site is in a critical drainage area and a small portion of the site is in the vicinity of a sensitive aquifer.

Mayors Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – development should take into account potential impacts on policing needs in the area and possibly provide for it onsite.

**Others**

Conservative Group – preferred use was for the site to be retained solely for education or community use.

---

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Site should be for community/education use only**

The site could be retained for solely community/education use if desired as it represents the existing established use class on the site. The site has been identified by council’s property team as being surplus to requirements and therefore able to be redeveloped. It is preferred to provide a mixed use development with an enhanced community/education facility and supporting residential use. However, it is acknowledged that it may not be viable to provide an enhanced community facility and therefore the provision exists for a solely residential development.

**Potential impact on policing needs**

Any potential impacts on policing and community needs will be determined as part of the planning application.

**Critical drainage area and within the vicinity of a sensitive aquifer**

These matters will be addressed through the planning application phase for any redevelopment of the site.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

It is considered that there are no major issues which need to be overcome. The allocation enables an expanded or solely community/education facility which was desired by several parties. The council recognises that a solely community development on the site may not be viable as well as the demand and need for housing in the borough, therefore promotes residential use on the site either as a mixed use or possibly solely residential development.

Flood risk mitigation will be required to be implemented as part of any planning permission.
## Site Suitability - ISSUES

### Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

The site is located in a predominantly residential area with only the subject site and adjoining building to the north comprising non-residential activities in the vicinity. There are no apparent issues with regard to suitability of the site for future residential use. The existence of community uses on the site and adjoining site to the north illustrate that these types of uses are also suitable on an ongoing basis. The provision therefore exists to establish a mixed use proposal comprising residential and community uses or solely residential use.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Availability - ISSUES

### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding the availability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

### Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

Viability for the redevelopment proposal will be investigated further following allocation. Council officers have advised that the existing Chaucer Centre operations are running at a loss therefore the site is not considered suitable for ongoing community use in its current capacity. The site is large and has significant potential to redevelop for a possible mixed use residential and community scheme or solely residential use. When the site is disposed of, the sale price coupled with the demand for residential and community uses in the vicinity will determine the sites viability. It is presumed that due to the nature of the existing buildings with large rooms, poor heating and high ceilings, that the building would be redeveloped or demolished to make way for a new development. A rationalised and modernised community facility could be provided in a future redevelopment.

The site was allocated in the UDP 2003 for a mix of community and residential uses and included the land immediately to the north which has the SMART Centre. It is possible that this site did not come forward for redevelopment as the SMART Centre was established in 2005, shortly after adoption of the UDP 2003. The SMART Centre is in ongoing use therefore was not put forward for potential redevelopment by council as part of the call for sites.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Viability needs to be investigated further however it is the intention of council to dispose of and pursue redevelopment of this site in accordance with the allocation. It is expected that a substantial residential component will result and will provide enabling finances for any provision of an enhanced community facility.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.
Other Issues

Strategic planning factors
The site is located in an area with moderate accessibility to public transport services (PTAL level 3).

The Chaucer Centre was allocated for a mix of community and residential uses in Merton’s Unitary Development Plan 2003.

Have any other issues been identified?
In a mixed use development residential uses should be on upper floors.

A mix of uses including residential will facilitate the provision of modern community facilities on lower floors and create a more secure environment helping to minimise vandalism and crime.

Mitigate potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring street and local amenity.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?
Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses
Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate at its current capacity. It has been determined by the council that the site is not being used to its full potential, therefore alternative uses should be sought on site, hence the allocation. The existing council services would then be relocated and the site released to the market. The council considers it appropriate to provide a strategic allocation for the site which affords protection to the existing community uses operating on the site.

Alternative uses on the site – Based on the nature of the surrounding environment no other uses other than residential or community uses are considered appropriate.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Residential, community uses.

Capacity (if relevant): There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. A rationalised and modernised community facility could be provided in a redeveloped site.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years

Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential occupiers: Residential, community, education providers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design and viability of a suitable development for the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Deliverability Assessment

## General Information

**Site**

57 – Morden Station Offices and Retail Units 66A – 82 London Road  
Morden  
London  
SM4 5BE

**Area:** 0.09 ha

---

## Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Underground Limited, c/- Transport for London Corporate Finance – Property Development (TfL). Peer Properties hold a 99 year lease which is due to expire in 2086 for the office building above. The leaseholders have an option to extend the lease for a further 26 years but the landlords can determine after 25 December 2036 if the building or structure is required for undertaking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Occupier:** Vacant – current use is a public car park.

**Site description:** The site comprises a four storey building at the entrance of Morden Underground Station. The allocation only refers to the offices and retail units adjacent to above Morden Station. The ground level station entrance and other buildings directly associated with the functions of the train station are therefore excluded from the site.

To the southwest of the site are single storey retail units and to the northeast of the site is a two storey parade of shops with flats and/or offices above. Northwest of the site is the Morden Underground Station with various buildings ranging between one and three storeys in height. To the south of the site is the hard standing of the Morden Bus Station, London Road and on the opposite side of London Road are various mixed use three and four storey buildings.

**Information source:** Information supplied by TfL and Council officers.

**Current use:** Retail units at ground level and offices above.

**Use suggested/organisation:**  
Stage 2: Residential – TfL  
Stage 3: Hotel (C1 Use Class) – TfL.

**Allocated use:** Upper floors - hotel (C1 Use Class) and/or offices (B1[a]) Use Class).

The ground floor is considered suitable for any of the following uses or a suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurant and cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class) and community functions (A5 Use Class).
Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class) and community (D1 Use Class).

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TfL (Property Development only) – general support for the Sites and Policies Plan and the flexible approach to the allocated uses. This approach reflects the requirements of the NPPF. The site will be brought forward and developed as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief which is being conjointly developed between TfL and the London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merriman D – unless there is a like for like replacement, the removal of parking facilities will have a catastrophic effect on locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton Park Ward Residents Association – new residential development will have an impact on essential services such as healthcare and schooling in Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Future – do not agree that the entire site should be residential. Support with council’s preferred uses and the issues identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipler G – Hopes that the regeneration helps to stimulate the Morden economy. Would be in favour of a mix of retail uses (high street chains rather than independents), restaurants and cafes in the form of a shopping mall on the first three or four floors with offices above. Is it possible to build over the tracks and extend this northward? There could also be scope for high end bars and other night time entertainment such as a cinema or theatre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Heritage – the reference to the listed building and Merton’s tall building strategy should be prominent in all site allocations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the preferred use should be for retail and offices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential impact on town centre parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of this site may create additional demand for town centre parking in Morden. The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites are town centre car parks. Town centre parking is a paramount issue and will be considered and taken into account as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief being developed for the town centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential impact on existing infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites seek to propose new residential development. New residential development will result in increased demand for essential services such as healthcare and schooling. Appropriate measures to be considered as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief and subsequent planning applications will take into account and address these matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred use should be for retention of retail and offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there may be temporary losses of some employment and office uses, however the redevelopment of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Morden town centre anticipates a greater offering of retail and offices uses.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

It is considered that all of the above matters will be taken into account and considered as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief. A comprehensive regeneration of the existing town centre is proposed in conjunction with the majority landowner, TfL. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of the above matters as a result.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable for a range of town centre uses given its location in the town centre. A range of preferred uses is therefore suggested to promote a suitable mixed use development on the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of Transport for London who support redevelopment. There are numerous leasehold interests across the site which will be investigated in due course by TfL and the council. These matters will be raised and addressed as part of the planning brief to be prepared for the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The proposals set out in the draft Morden Station planning brief illustrate the minimum quantum of development that would be required to be commercially viable, whilst being compliant with Merton’s planning policies.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues regarding viability have been identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is within the proposed moreMorden Masterplan area, an area with an excellent level of access to public transport services (PTAL 6b), an archaeological priority zone and a small part of the southern corner of the site is within a critical drainage area.
The Morden Underground Station is a locally listed building (though not the office building above it).

### Have any other issues been identified?

- An exemplary design would be required at this central site.
- Enabling and managing appropriate parking and servicing arrangements.
- The redevelopment of this site will be part of the proposed moreMorden regeneration proposals, which include redeveloping the public realm.
- Core strategy policy CS14 refers to the appropriateness of tall buildings in Morden town centre.
- Facilitating improved public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure and connections.
- Improving connectivity from London Road to Morden Park and Morden Hall Park and legibility along London Road.
- The site appears to be within 50m of London Underground tunnels and infrastructure therefore London Underground Infrastructure Protection must be consulted.
- Developing a facility which could make heat and/or power available to local users.
- Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.
- Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.
- Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.
- Currently (2013) residential development (C3 use class) is not deliverable on this site. If residential development were to become deliverable on this site, it would be an appropriate use for the site on the upper floors.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The draft Morden Station planning brief has taken into account relevant issues the redevelopment faces. These matters will be considered in more detail as part of the development of the planning brief through public consultation and evidence, and the subsequent planning application.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

- Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – given that the allocations are being made in conjunction with the draft Morden Station planning brief, the presumption is made that the planning brief would not be progressed either. If this was the case, it is presumed that the sites would continue to operate in the current manner. This site is located within Morden town centre and is also identified in the Core Strategy for intensification, therefore would have the ability to be developed in a similar manner regardless, if the owner wished to pursue it.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses considered appropriate for the site and in accordance with the Core Strategy definition.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses**: Various.
**Capacity (if relevant):** Unknown.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Various – to be determined.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 58 – Sainsbury’s (Peel House) Car Park
Car park rear of 127-149 Kenley Road
Morden
London
SM4 5BE

Area: 0.42 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Underground Limited, c/- Transport for London Corporate Finance – Property Development (TfL). Car park is currently leased to Sainsbury’s. Verity Trustees Limited hold a 125 year lease which is due to expire in 2110 for the ground floor parking area. The London Borough of Merton holds a lease for commuter parking at the first floor level. Note that as part of Peer Properties’ lease for the offices on Sites 57, the have reserved access to an area with 30 car parking spaces that straddles the northern boundary of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Occupier: | Vacant – current use is a two storey public car park. |

| Site description: | The site consists of a two storey car park located on land to the rear of 127 – 149 Kenley Road. Adjacent to the site to the south is a two-storey terrace of mixed commercial and residential properties on London Road. Kenley Road, which is northeast of the site, is predominately made up of two storey terraced housing. Adjacent to the site to the east is a four storey building at 34-44 London Road with a Sainsbury’s supermarket at ground level and an educational establishment (Morden College) above. West of the site is Morden Underground Station. |

| Information source: | Information supplied by TfL and Council officers. |

| Current use: | Car park (short/long stay). |

| Use suggested/organisation: | Residential or mixed use development – Transport for London. |

| Allocated use: | Any of the following uses or a suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants or cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), hot food takeaways (A5 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class), residential (C3 Use Class), community (D1), gym or cinema (D2 Use class). |

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TfL (Property Development only) – general support for the Sites and Policies DPD and the flexible approach to the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
allocated uses. This approach reflects the requirements of the NPPF. The site will be brought forward and developed as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief which is being conjointly developed between TfL and the London Borough of Merton.

Local residents/organisations

Merriman D – unless there is a like for like replacement, the removal of parking facilities will have a catastrophic effect on locality.

Merton Park Ward Residents Association – new residential development will have an impact on essential services such as healthcare and schooling in Merton. Also raised concerns over the number of car parks in the town centre proposed for redevelopment and future parking demand.

Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Limited – support the redevelopment of underutilised town centre sites. However, car parking is an important component of town centres’ vitality and viability. The NPPF requires local authorities to improve the quality of parking in town centres to provide convenient, safe and secure environments. The London Borough of Merton’s parking survey indicates the site benefits from a high occupancy throughout the week. In this regard, car parking should be retained in any proposed redevelopment of this site.

Squires N – supposedly the site is not owned by TfL, but leased by them from a property company. Would like ownership made clear before proposals for development go further.

Think Future – do not agree that the entire site should be residential. Support with council’s preferred uses and the issues identified.

Tipler G – Hopes that the regeneration helps to stimulate the Morden economy. Would be in favour of a mix of retail uses (high street chains rather than independents), restaurants and cafes in the form of a shopping mall on the first three or four floors with offices above. Is it possible to build over the tracks and extend this northward? There could also be scope for high end bars and other night time entertainment such as a cinema or theatre.

Statutory agencies

Mayors Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – scale of development may have an impact on the need for policing in the area. Development should therefore be required to comply with existing policy 8.2 in the London Plan.

Others

Conservative Group – the site should be retained as a car park.

Liberal Democrat Group – potential impact of loss of town centre parking.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Potential impact on town centre parking

Development of this site may create additional demand for town centre parking in Morden. The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites are town centre car parks. Town centre parking is a paramount issue and will be considered and taken into account as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief being developed for the town centre.

Potential impact on existing infrastructure
The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites seek to propose new residential development. New residential development will result in increased demand for essential services such as healthcare and schooling. Appropriate measures to be considered as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief and subsequent planning brief and planning applications will take into account and address these matters.

**Preferred use should be for a car park/loss of town centre parking**

It is acknowledged that town centre parking is crucial to the efficient operation and function of Morden. Key factors include the Sainsbury’s supermarket, station users and staff of town centre employers. The site has been identified as having potential for redevelopment and regeneration as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief. The regeneration of Morden town centre was adopted in principle by the council in 2008, however the economic environment has stalled progress until recently. Town centre parking is a critical component of the planning brief and will be taken into account and delivered appropriately in conjunction with the regeneration and the planning brief. It is not desirable or anticipated to have Morden town centre redeveloped with a shortfall in parking, particularly when taking into account the scale of additional development envisaged and the likely increase in demand for parking. Parking provision will be determined collectively in the town centre as part of the planning brief and not on a site by site basis.

**Potential impact on policing needs**

The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this representation refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The allocation does not preclude the ability to establish community uses on the site under the D1 use class. This is considered an appropriate measure of accounting for additional community space if needed. If any redevelopment is proposed it will be subject to a s106 agreement and possible CIL charges which will also take into account mitigation measure for any such impacts.

**Ownership of the site**

TfL have confirmed to council that they are the freehold owner of the site and it is leased to Sainsbury’s for parking purposes.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

It is considered that all of the above matters will be taken into account and considered as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief in a more detailed manner. A comprehensive regeneration of the existing town centre is proposed in conjunction with the majority landowner, TfL. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of the above matters as a result, except retention of the site as a car park. Car parking will be a key component of the planning brief as mentioned above. It is unlikely the site will be retained solely as a car park.

---

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for a range of town centre uses given its location in the town centre. A range of preferred uses is therefore suggested to promote a suitable mixed use development on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.
### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of Transport for London who supports redevelopment. Sainsbury’s have a lease agreement regarding the car park and will be a key partner in the planning brief, which will be investigated in due course by TfL and the council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measurest that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals set out in the draft Morden Station planning brief illustrate the minimum quantum of development that would be required to be commercially viable, whilst being compliant with Merton’s planning policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measurest that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No viability issues have been identified. Any issues raised will be considered and determined as part of the development brief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site is within the proposed Morden Masterplan area, an area with an excellent level of access to public transport services (PTAL 6a), an archaeological priority zone and a small part of the site is within a critical drainage area.

There has been a positive sighting of a protected species (House Sparrow) within vicinity of the site.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

- Enabling and managing appropriate parking and servicing arrangements.
- Core Planning Strategy Policy CS14 refers to the appropriateness of tall buildings in Morden town centre.
- The impact of traffic on congestion, movement and road safety need to be carefully scrutinised and managed.
- The site appears to be within 50m of London Underground tunnels and infrastructure therefore London Underground Infrastructure Protection must be protected.
- Better connectivity and permeability by walking and cycling is required.
- Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.
- Developing a facility which could make heat and/or power available to local users.
- Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.
Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are numerous matters that will need to be taken into account when developing the site. All of the above issues will be considered initially as part of the Morden Station planning brief and subsequent planning application. It is considered most appropriate that these issues are taken into account at that time.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – given that the allocations are being made in conjunction with the draft Morden Station planning brief, the presumption is made that the planning brief would not be progressed either. If this was the case, it is presumed that the site would continue to operate in the current manner. This site is located within Morden town centre and is also identified in the Core Strategy for intensification, therefore would have the ability to be developed in a similar manner regardless, if the owner wished to pursue it.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses considered appropriate for the site and in accordance with the Core Strategy definition.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: Various.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (if relevant): Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential occupiers: Various – to be determined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 60 – York Close Car Park
Car Park Adjacent 18 York Close
Morden
London
SM4 5HW

Area: 0.56 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Underground Limited, c/- Transport for London Corporate Finance – Property Development (TfL). The site is currently leased by the London Borough of Merton for a period of 20 years which is due to expire in 2026.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a public car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This site is a pay-and-display car park which is predominately used by London Borough of Merton staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining the west of the site is York Close and Morden Court which are characterised by residential two storey semi detached and terraced housing. The Morden underground railway depot adjoins the east of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Long stay car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TfL (Property Team only) – general support for the draft Sites and Policies Plan and the suggested allocation for residential use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (occupier) – no consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merriman D – concerned about the loss of parking facilities in the town centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Merton Park Ward Residents Association – new residential development will have an impact on essential services such as healthcare and schooling in Merton. Also raised concerns over the number of car parks in the town centre proposed for redevelopment and future parking demand.

Tipler G – would support high calibre apartments on this site to raise house prices in the area, however the adjacent parade of shops would need investment as it is quite run down.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Agency - the Environment Agency would encourage the de-culverting of the Merton D culvert which traverses the site for biodiversity reasons. A preliminary risk assessment would also be required for any potential contamination on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the site should be retained as a car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrat Group – raised general concerns at the potential loss of town centre car parking with several sites across the borough being identified for a change of use from a car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**Preferred use should be for a car park/loss of town centre parking**

A parking survey of public car parks in Morden was undertaken in June 2012. Resulted showed that York Close was predominantly used by council staff during weekdays. The car park had low occupancy during the weekend. Council has no obligation to provide staff parking which is the predominant use for the site. The results of the parking survey illustrate that it is not really used by commuters or other people, therefore a significant loss of town centre parking would not result. The site is also located within the moreMorden masterplan area. Town centre parking will be considered as part of this masterplan and also the Morden Station Planning Brief. It is noted that this site is not within the development area for the Morden Station Planning Brief. It is not desirable or anticipated to have Morden town centre redeveloped with a shortfall in parking, particularly when taking into account the scale of additional development envisaged and the likely increase in demand for parking. Parking provision will be determined collectively in the town centre as part of the planning brief and not on a site by site basis.

**Potential impact on existing infrastructure**

The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites seek to propose new residential development. New residential development will result in increased demand for essential services such as healthcare and schooling. Appropriate measures will need to be considered as part of the moreMorden masterplan and any subsequent planning applications.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of mitigation measures regarding the above concerns. The matters will be considered further as part of work to be done on the masterplan, planning brief, and any subsequent planning application.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**
The site is considered suitable for residential purposes. The site is bounded by the railway lines to the east and residential development to the west. It represents a relatively large undeveloped site which has excellent public transport links therefore will be attractive to developers.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of TfL and is leased by the London Borough of Merton. The lease is currently due to expire in 2018 following which the site will be released to the market. There are no known issues regarding the availability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

No issues have been identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is relatively large for an undeveloped area near a town centre. It is considered to be a prime site for residential development for the following reasons:

- The site is relatively large (0.56 ha) and is vacant of development;
- The site is in close proximity to an existing town centre with excellent public transport links (PTAL 5 with most adjoining areas being 6);
- Excluding the railway lines, the site adjoins residential properties only; and
- It is considered that the site is not suitable for any other type of development.

All of the above will contribute to the viability of the site. It is not apparent that there are any issues regarding viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding site viability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site is within the proposed moreMorden Masterplan area and an area with a good level of access to public transport accessibility (PTAL 6a). A small part of the site, at the north-eastern boundary, is within a critical drainage area.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

Potential impacts of displaced commuter parking on neighbouring streets and local amenity needs to be carefully
Managing.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site.

Developing a facility which could make heat and/or power available to local users.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

This site could be considered for redevelopment in conjunction with other sites.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site is likely to be retained as a car park for the remainder of the lease.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is located outside of the town centre and between residential use and the railway lines. The only alternative use that could be considered appropriate on the site would be some form of employment use suitable in a residential area due to the close proximity to housing, or community use. There is little demand for such uses in the current market and the council has not received evidence to suggest such a use would be viable on the site.

---

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner, Council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 61 – Morden Station Car Park
Car Park Station House
Kenley Road
Merton Park
SW19 3DP

Area: 0.33 ha

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Underground Limited, c/- Transport for London Corporate Finance – Property Development (TfL). The car park was leased to the London Borough of Merton however this expired in 2012. Currently, London Bus Services Limited is using 50% of the spaces to support their office use and the remainder is let to the London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a public car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site comprises hardstanding land currently used as a car park for staff of Morden Station and long stay visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to the north and west of the site are two storey terraced houses and adjoining the east of the site is Morden Underground Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Information supplied by TfL and council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Car parking for Morden Station staff / commuters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Mixed use development – Transport for London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Any of the following uses or a suitable mix of residential (C3 Use Class), employment (B1[a], B1[b], B1[c] Use Classes) and community (D1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TfL (Property Development only) – general support for the Sites and Policies DPD and the flexible approach to the allocated uses. This approach reflects the requirements of the NPPF. The site will be brought forward and developed as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief which is being jointly developed between TfL and the London Borough of Merton. It was also suggested that the site should be allocated for retail use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local residents/organisations

Merriman D – unless there is a like for like replacement, the removal of parking facilities will have a catastrophic effect on locality.

Tipler G – high class apartments would be the best use for the area.

Statutory agencies

No consultation received.

Others

Liberal Democrat Group – potential impact of loss of town centre parking.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Retail use should be included in the allocation

TfL considered that the site should also be allocated for retail use. This was proposed by TfL as it was deemed that excluding such use classes could limit future development options and regeneration potential. Council does not consider this allocation appropriate as if it had an allocation for retail use, there would be nothing to stop the site being developed solely for this use independently from the remainder of the moreMorden project. This risk will not be borne by the council as it is not considered an appropriate site for retail for the following reasons:

- The site is primarily surrounded by residential development
- The site is located outside the town centre boundary
- The site is physically separated from the high street and the desired area for retail enhancement.

If, as a result of the moreMorden project, that some form of retail use was considered appropriate to expand into the site, this should be considered as part of detailed viability and appropriate impact assessments at the time of development. There is insufficient evidence to allocate the site for retail use at this point in time. It is also considered likely that if such a scale of development resulted on the site that it is likely to be beyond the timeframe of the Sites and Policies DPD (i.e. beyond 2024).

Potential impact on town centre parking

Development of this site may create additional demand for town centre parking in Morden as well as removing an existing public car park. The comments were more directed at the wider Morden developments proposed noting that several sites are town centre car parks. Town centre parking is a paramount issue and will be considered and taken into account as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief being developed for the town centre.

Preferred use should be high quality apartments

Future use of the site will be governed by the Morden Station Planning Brief. The site is considered appropriate for a range of uses including residential, employment and community uses hence they are allocated in the Sites and Policies DPD. Any future residential development will be considered in the planning brief and subject to planning permission. Any type of housing delivered on the site, such as apartments, cannot be guaranteed through the Sites and Policies Plan as it would be contrary to policy.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

It is considered that all of the above matters will be taken into account and considered as part of the Morden Station Planning Brief in a more detailed manner. A comprehensive regeneration of the existing town centre is proposed in conjunction with the majority landowner, TfL. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of the
above matters as a result, except retention of the site as a car park. Car parking will be a key component of the planning brief as mentioned above. It is unlikely the site will be retained solely as a car park.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for a range uses given its location in the town centre and proximity to residential properties. A range of preferred uses is therefore suggested to promote a suitable mixed use development on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership of Transport for London who supports redevelopment. There are no issues identified regarding the site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposals set out in the draft Morden Station planning brief illustrate the minimum quantum of development that would be required to be commercially viable, whilst being compliant with Merton’s planning policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues regarding viability have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is within the proposed moreMorden Masterplan area and an area with an excellent level of access to public transport accessibility (PTAL 6a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enabling and managing appropriate parking and servicing arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing traffic demand, congestion, movement and road safety, including impacts on Kenley Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating improved public transport, walking and cycling infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site appears to be within 50m of London Underground tunnels and infrastructure therefore London Underground Infrastructure Protection must be consulted.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.

Developing a facility which could make heat and/or power available to local users.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are numerous matters that will need to be taken into account when developing the site. All of the above issues will be considered initially as part of the Morden Station planning brief and subsequent planning application. It is considered most appropriate that these issues are taken into account at that time.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – given that the allocations are being made in conjunction with the draft Morden Station planning brief, the presumption is made that the planning brief would not be progressed either. If this was the case, it is presumed that the site would continue to operate in the current manner. This site is located within Morden town centre and is also identified in the Core Strategy for intensification, therefore would have the ability to be developed in a similar manner regardless, if the owner wished to pursue it.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses considered appropriate for the site and in accordance with the Core Strategy definition. Alternative uses would need to be consistent with both the existing and emerging Local Plan documents.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Various.

**Capacity (if relevant):** Unknown.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Various – to be determined.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 65 – Kenley Road Car Park
Car Park Adjacent Kendor Gardens
Kenley Road
London
SW19 3HZ

Area: 0.31 ha
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Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description


Occupier: Vacant – current use is a public car park.

Site description: This site is a pay-and-display car park with approximately 120 vehicle spaces, which are predominately used by commuters utilising Morden Underground Station.

The site is generally rectangular in shape. To the immediate west of the site is a linear park above the northern line tube, to the north and east are two storey residential terraces, and to the immediate south is a three storey residential apartment building. The surrounds of the site can be generally characterised as residential.

Information source: Council officers.

Current use: Public car park.

Use suggested/organisation: Residential – London Borough of Merton.

Allocated use: Residential (C3 use class) to be developed in conjunction with the moreMorden masterplan or education (D1 use class).

Consultation Responses Summary

Landowners/occupiers
Council – no consultation received following call for sites.

Local residents/organisations
Colebourne S – support for intensification of this site and others in the vicinity of railway stations. Support/encouragement for compulsory purchase to enlarge the site to form a more unified development.
Conservative Group – site should be retained as a car park (subject to masterplan).

Fisher I – concerned that development will have an adverse impact upon the quality of life and house prices on Daybrook Road. Issues raised include privacy, noise and opposition to any building larger than two storeys. A more acceptable development would be for an extension to the park or as allotments. If residential development is to result it should be a combination of two storey development with additional green space that reduces impacts on Daybrook Road residents.

Protect Dundonald Rec Campaign Group – welcome the inclusion of the potential for education use.

Rayner F & M – concern over existing lighting used during the night when the site is vacant with regard to light pollution and security. Preference for the site not to be developed due to loss of open space. Should development be allowed their preference would be for development to be keeping in scale with existing houses (i.e. not the adjoining flats) and seek to extend the park where possible. There is also demand for allotments in the area.

Robinson M and Wu P – preference would be for an expansion of the adjoining recreation area. An alternative would be for an allotment area. Should justifiable reasons for the land to be built on exist, it should be residential only and in keeping with the existing typical family demographic. Development should also be sufficiently distanced from the Daybrook Road fencing to ensure no reduction in privacy. The height of new buildings should be single storey to blend into the existing green space, prevent overlooking into the adjoining properties and avoid shadowing effects.

Wimbledon Society – there should be no ad hoc planning decisions made until the masterplan is produced. If there is any surplus car park it should be used to extend the park and include facilities such as tennis courts. The site should be allocated as open space.

**Statutory Agencies**

GLA – The site has the potential to provide a bus stand which would help provide space for a tram interchange with the northern line at Morden.

English Heritage – recommend that some reference is made to the views in and out of Morden Hall Park to be respected (Stage 2a).

Environment Agency – no consultation received.

Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design principles.

**Others**

Natural England – would welcome the opportunity to comment on the site in relation to potential for green infrastructure and open space.

NHS South West London – there is a need to develop modern healthcare facilities in Morden town centre to support the new population. This site could be considered for such uses (Stage 2a).

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

*Privacy, overlooking, daylighting, light pollution and similar issues*

Design matters regarding scale, bulk and massing will primarily be considered as part of a planning application to redevelop the site. Due to its size and location the site is considered suitable for residential use. There is also an
overwhelming demand for housing and schools in London and Merton. It is considered that there is sufficient space on the site in which to develop an appropriate residential development whilst respecting the residential amenity of adjoining and nearby properties, whilst mitigating potential effects on privacy, overlooking, daylight, light pollution and other matters. It is acknowledged that the surrounding area is predominantly comprised of two storey residential terraced houses, with the exception of the adjoining Naish House, and that it is likely it will be appropriate to continue this form of development on the site. Any alternative proposal would need to address numerous constraints such as design, privacy, overlooking, and daylight/shadowing effects among others such as its context in the wider environment as part of an application. It is considered that a terraced house development would mitigate potential effects, subject to appropriate scale and siting of buildings and that any alternative residential development would have to have specific regard to the issues raised.

With regard to respecting views into and out of Morden Hall Park, future development is highly unlikely to result in development being viewed from the park or views being obtained into the park. It is considered that development of such a scale would not be in keeping with the surrounding environment and would be out of place. This will be confirmed and assessed further as part of any planning application for development of the site.

Objection to residential use/generally regarding development on the site
Several representations stated that the site should be retained as a car park and should not be developed. A parking survey undertaken of car parks in Morden identified that the site has less than 20% capacity even during its peak use. It is therefore not deemed to be necessary infrastructure and is surplus to requirements. Based on housing demands in the area, the nature of surrounding residential development and the proximity to public transport links, residential or educational use is considered most appropriate for the site. In particular, the need for housing in the borough is considered to outweigh the potential effects of development when coupled with the underutilised nature of the existing car park.

Loss of open space, expansion of adjoining open space, use for allotments/park
Firstly, the site was not submitted for designation as open space and does not meet the criteria for open space in the DPD. In addition, there is a large amount of open space in the vicinity of the site such as Kendor Gardens adjoining the site, Merton Park and nearby Morden Hall Park. There is substantial evidence regarding the need for housing and schools in Merton and the borough has one of the highest percentages of open space in London. The need for housing and schools is considered to outweigh the need for additional open space or allotments, particularly in this location.

Natural England would welcome the opportunity to comment on the site in relation to potential for green infrastructure and open space. However, Natural England did not comment in relation to the sites potential for green infrastructure and open space as part of their representations. It is considered that there is sufficient existing open space and contributing green infrastructure in the vicinity of the site and the borough therefore it is not needed in this regard. There are also appropriate policies in the London Plan which implement these requirements.

Compulsory purchase of additional land for development
Compulsory purchase of adjoining sites is considered unlikely based on the adjoining areas being outside the moreMorden masterplan area. The masterplan is considered to represent an appropriate redevelopment mechanism for Morden town centre. The adjoining land to the west is owned by TfL and is situated above the northern line therefore has limitations for development, whilst providing and important green link. It is also proposed as new open space in the DPD. The surrounding environment consists of established residential terraces therefore compulsory purchase of additional land is not considered appropriate in this instance.

moreMorden Masterplan
Council anticipates that the site will come forward for redevelopment in conjunction with the moreMorden Masterplan.
Masterplan and potentially in conjunction with the Morden station planning brief due to the timeframe of the existing leases on site and the need to ensure the site is appropriately developed. Council could consider a planning application for the site at any stage, but it is considered that it would be most appropriately brought forward in conjunction with the masterplan.

Need for land for the implementation of transport proposals
The GLA stated that the site has potential to provide a bus stand which would help provide space for a tram interchange with the northern line at Morden. The site has not been identified in any transport proposal as being required for a bus stand. A number of options are being investigated by TfL and the London Borough of Merton regarding a future tram interchange at Morden. Future designations will be made in due course when more detail is known but at this point in time the site has not been identified as being required for any such purpose.

Secured by Design
Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through any planning application to redevelop the site.

Need for healthcare services
The NHS stated that there is a need to develop modern healthcare facilities in Morden town centre to support the new population and that this site could be considered for such uses (Stage 2a). The more recent Stage 3 representation received by NHS stated that “the Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms previous comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites ... to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments.” It is therefore considered that the most recent correspondence received from NHS clarifies the position that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites when taking into account the redevelopment of Morden Road Clinic (site 24).

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
It is considered that appropriate design matters regarding the bulk and location of residential development will be implemented through the planning application process. Council considers that the most appropriate development would be for some form of residential terraces to occupy the site, however the allocation is not intended to inherently restrict the site, or conclude that an alternative design cannot be considered. Design issues cannot be determined at this stage and will be assessed at the time an application for planning permission is made. Residents will be able to make representations once a planning application is made with appropriate evidence regarding design matters. It is however considered that the issues raised above regarding daylighting, height, privacy and overlooking will be taken into account and imposed by council.

Secured by Design principles and the need for supporting infrastructure (schools, healthcare) will be determined through any planning application for redevelopment of the site.

The claims for the site to be allocated as open space or allotments are not justified. The need for housing outweighs the benefit of providing open space in this location. Because the site is a car park, it is considered to be developed and would have to be redeveloped to provide open space. There is no functional need to provide this additional area of open space.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?
The site is considered suitable for residential purposes. The site has also been determined as suitable for a school. No issues have been identified.
Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified regarding the site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. The access to the site is owned by TfL and leased by LBM. Discussions with TfL have taken place who has advised that the intention is for the access to be transferred to LBM when the lease expires in 2018.

It is considered that there are no issues regarding site availability.

The site will be disposed of by council and the viability will affect the sale value of the property for redevelopment.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is included as part of the Morden Station planning brief which illustrates the minimum quantum of development that would be required to be commercially viable, whilst being compliant with Merton’s planning policies. This site is included within the draft planning brief.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues regarding viability that need to be overcome.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is within the proposed moreMorden Masterplan area and is an area with an excellent level of access to public transport services (PTAL 6a).

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Access off Kenley Road is in separate ownership (TfL), without which the site is landlocked, but is currently leased by the council. This lease currently ends in 2018. TfL have verbally stated their support for redevelopment and the availability of the land accordingly.

The site appears to be within 50m of London Underground tunnels and infrastructure therefore London Underground Infrastructure Protection must be consulted.

The site is adjacent to public open space. Any development should appropriately address the open space.
Design considerations for any redevelopment proposal should protect the amenity of neighbouring homes.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no other issues identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate as a car park for the interim. The council has assessed the site and its operation as a car park, and based on its very low usage following the Morden town centre parking survey undertaken in 2010, is considered surplus to requirements. The council would then review its position with regard to its ownership and future.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the site being situated within a predominantly residential area and adjacent to open space, the only alternative uses considered suitable on the site would be community use or residential institutions. Council has not received any interest to develop the site for such a use therefore the viability and deliverability would be uncertain. The site is also an edge of centre location therefore could have the potential for small scale retail or office use. There is no evidence to suggest either use would be viable on the site however.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Residential, possibly school or education.

Capacity (if relevant): There is sufficient capacity for housing and education uses in the London Borough of Merton.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years

Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council

Potential occupiers: Residential, school.

What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?

No potential barriers to delivery of the proposal have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 15 – West Barnes Library
West Barnes Lane
10 Station Road
New Malden
KT3 6JJ

Area: 0.1 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> West Barnes Library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> Single storey building tucked away behind Motspur Park station. To the west the site is limited by the railway lines. To the east there is a 2-3 storey business block which sits partially overhanging the library site. The site has no active frontage along the street except for the library itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Library (D1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation</strong> Library to be maintained and improved. Residential on part of site to support library function – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Library (D1 Use Class) with residential (C3 Use Class) on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation was received from the owner (Council).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends of West Barnes Library – support for the proposed redevelopment to enhance the library facility with residential use on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh H – the flooding risk from Beverly Brook is exaggerated and the area around the library has not been flooded in the last 25 years. The last time the area was flooded was in the early 1950s however canalisation of Beverly Brook has almost removed the risk entirely. There is also general support for the principal of the redevelopment, subject to suitable parking for library users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McAlister S – considers that residential uses should not be supported on the site and that a GP/surgery type use would be more appropriate. Redevelopment also provides the opportunity to provide a community hub with an informal meeting space such as café.

Nicholson JD – expressed the desire to ensure a library facility is retained on the site and preferably enhanced.

Statutory agencies

Environment Agency - reiterated that the site is in flood zone 2 therefore a flood risk assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. A preliminary risk assessment of any groundwater contamination will also need to be submitted due to the lack of historical data.

Others

Conservative Group – the Conservative Group’s preferred use was for the site to be retained as a library.

Liberal Democrat Group – general support for redevelopment and enhancement of the library facility with appropriate supporting uses on upper floors. They also expressed some residents’ views that a GP surgery may be appropriate on site and that residential use on upper floors may exacerbate parking problems in the area.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Flood risk
The comments regarding the flood risk being exaggerated are acknowledged. A flood risk assessment will be prepared and submitted as part of any planning application which will ensure appropriate mitigation measures are derived and imposed.

Allocated use
With regard to the suggestion for a GP surgery/healthcare service to be provided on site, council has received no evidence to support this position from either residents or the relevant authority, therefore these claims are unjustified. The NHS has made representations at each stage of consultation for the Sites and Policies Plan and has not identified any need for additional services, excluding the proposed Morden town centre redevelopment and Nelson hospital. Given the primary reason for allocation is to provide an enhanced library facility which would be provided on the ground floor, a GP surgery would typically not be provided on upper floors so is therefore not considered appropriate for the site.

With regard to the representation made by the Conservative Group, the allocation for the site is subject to the library facility being retained and enhanced. It is therefore considered that given the library facility will be redeveloped and enhanced, that it will provide a better facility than the current one which should represent a positive outcome which accords to the preferences of the Conservative Group whilst providing much needed residential development that could also fund the library development.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Flood risk
Flood risk mitigation will be required to be implemented as part of any planning permission.

Allocated use
Council cannot support the suggested use for a GP surgery/healthcare unit without sufficient evidence or justification. This issue will therefore not be overcome unless the preferred use is changed. The preferred use will not be altered in light of information received from the NHS and research undertaken by the council.
## Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is considered suitable for both residential and community uses based on the nature of the existing activity and the ability to expand and redevelop the site to incorporate additional uses.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding the availability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

Viability for the redevelopment will be subject to market conditions at the time of disposal. It is considered that an allocation including residential use will increase the value of the site sufficiently to ensure developer interest to deliver the site for community and residential uses. For a comparable example, the recent redevelopment of the Raynes Park library in 2006 was undertaken by disposing of the site on the open market, but with the council committing to a 1,000 year lease on the site for the library component.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues regarding viability have been identified.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Other Issues

### Strategic planning factors

The site is within an area with low access to public transport (PTAL 2) despite the proximity to Motspur Park station. The site is also within flood zone 2 and a critical drainage area.

### Have any other issues been identified?

Library to be retained and improved to service specifications including space for a new public/community space. Service specifications should increase customer floor area and provide more adaptable and suitable modern space.

The design of any proposals will need to be sensitive to the railway lines.

In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.

A mix of uses will facilitate the provision of upgraded community uses on lower floors and create a more secure environment.
Manage parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring residents.

Initial space requirements for a new library have been drawn up and will be assessed for deliverability and viability during 2013 and 2014.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use as a library. The status quo would be retained however it is considered that an opportunity would be missed to provide an enhanced library facility and additional residential development to assist with meeting local and national housing targets.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the location of the site no suitable alternative uses excluding the existing and allocated uses are considered appropriate. The site is not a suitable location for commercial or industrial uses and market trends suggest it is not suitable for new office floor space.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Residential, library.

Capacity (if relevant): There is sufficient capacity for housing in the London Borough of Merton. The existing library is well utilised therefore capacity exists for an enhanced library offer.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council

Potential occupiers: Residential, library and a variety of community users of the library.

What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?

No potential barriers to the delivery of the site have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 23 – Amity Grove
9 Amity Grove
Raynes Park
SW20 0LQ

Area: 0.09 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

**Freeholder:** NHS Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust, 120 The Broadway, London SW19 1RH.

**Occupier:** NHS – Amity Grove clinic.

**Site description:** The site consists of a part-single and part-two storey building that is surrounded by two and three storey houses. Along the northern boundary is a narrow public access footpath linking Amity Grove and Durham Road.

**Information source:** NHS information provided and council officer site visit.

**Current Use:** Medical clinic (D1 Use Class).

**Use suggested/organisation:** Residential (C3 Use Class) – Sutton and Merton PCT.

**Allocated use:** Community (D1 Use Class) or residential (C3 Use Class) if the community use is provided elsewhere.

Consultation Responses Summary

**Landowners/occupiers**

The NHS has provided the following information through several stages of public consultation.

- the site will be available for redevelopment within the next 3 – 7 years;
- the Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (those not subject to redevelopment in the Sites and Policies Plan) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments;
- Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust (PCT) will cease to exist from 01 April 2013 and will be replaced by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group Merton Partnership Health and Wellbeing Board and the Clinical which will replace the PCT for strategic health matters; and
- the NHS stated that delivery of the site would be left to a private sector party.

**Local residents/organisations**

Barrow R & K – any decision on development should reflect the residential character of the area. They would
encourage some form of private residential development of no more than four houses with a minimum height of two storeys and being sympathetic to the surrounding houses. Alternatively, if the ground floor could provide some form of medical service then the top could be developed into residential premises not more than three storeys in total. Any other form of business development would be opposed. Provision should be made for onsite parking as it is already limited in the area. They would oppose any form of social housing given the ample provision at 14 Amity Grove and the new Waitrose development on Coombe Lane.

Berriman A – has previously expressed views on other developments in the area and feels they have been ignored therefore no comments were provided.

Colebourne S – preference would be for a solely residential development.

Conservative Group – the site allocation should be for community/healthcare only.

Goddard D – has concerns with regard to future development of the site. The following statements/questions were raised:
- development should be of a similar scale and height to existing buildings and should not be increased;
- clarification should be provided on the type of uses enabled by an allocation for C3 residential use;
- what steps would be taken to minimise the impact of additional traffic;
- what steps would be taken to minimise the impact of additional noise;
- potential effects of construction such as noise, traffic, access and disruption; and
- what type of community use would be expected.

Neal P – new residential development should be private housing with architecture in keeping with the rest of the street, that being a Victorian feel as opposed to flats.

Sharp J – no particular view on the use of the site however any new structure should not exceed the height of the existing building and that the rear of the building should not protrude any further back on the site.

Think Future – the outdoor space seems to offer plenty of potential uses for children and families. It would be great for work free use (a dual use office/nursery environment) along with other community and business uses. Development at this location has the potential to add to the vibrancy and use of Raynes Park due to its proximity to other businesses, shops and transport links.

Statutory Agencies
NHS – support for the preferred use. The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms previous comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (excluding the subject site and others in the DPD) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments.

Others
No other consultation received.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Development should reflect the scale and form of the surrounding residential area – design related matters
Several representations were received from adjoining and nearby residents with specific regard to the scale of development which should be acceptable on site. Whilst the strategic allocation in the DPD does not specify the type of scale of development which should result, it is considered appropriate in this instance to provide guidelines. If the site is to be used for a mixed use community and residential, or solely residential purpose it is considered
appropriate that the building should have specific regard to the adjoining buildings. Redevelopment could comprise additional upper level floors or a redevelopment of the site to provide a logical extension to the existing terraces. This is considered appropriate. However it is acknowledges that the site is located within the town centre boundary therefore an exceptional design of a greater scale than the existing houses could be achieved. Design of any future development will be subject to planning permission and further, more detailed public consultation. It is noted that the building to the south is two storeys, however beyond this is a six storey office building. If the adjoining building could be included in a redevelopment, a larger scale development may be achievable and appropriate.

Use of the site
The site is considered suitable for community uses based on the nature of the existing service on the site and thus the precedent created for such uses on the site. However the NHS has advised that the site will be surplus to requirements in the near future (3 – 7 years) therefore the future of such uses on the site would require a new provider to purchase and establish it on the site. This is considered to be suitable (but may not be viable), therefore the allocation acknowledges the need for housing in the borough and the site is considered suitable to accommodate a mixed use development to increase the viability of a possible redevelopment. Council also acknowledges that an alternative D1 provider may not be able to locate on the site, therefore the allocation enables a solely residential development which is appropriate given the nature of the adjoining use. The site is also located within the town centre boundary therefore the potential exists to establish alternative uses in accordance with this overlay, but is sensitive to its edge of centre location. As a result, the site is considered suitable for a range of uses.

Some representations stated that the site should not be used for affordable housing. With regard to the type of residential development that will result, council cannot dictate the future ownership of the site or whether affordable housing is provided or not. Development will be required to comply with affordable housing policies at the time of development however it cannot be determined whether this is provided onsite or elsewhere.

The allocation of the site enables community uses to be established however doesn’t explicitly provide the ability for a solely community use to be established on site. Community use is the existing lawfully established use on the site therefore could be continued as such and specific allocation for the ongoing use of the site is not necessary. The allocation is not intended to restrict the site to any particular D1 use and this will be considered further as part of any planning permission for a change of use on the site.

The site is not allocated for business use however it is acknowledged that the site is located within the town centre boundary therefore such uses could be established (subject to meeting relevant policies).

Parking and traffic
The potential impact of additional parking and traffic created as a result of any redevelopment cannot be quantified until the scale and density of any redevelopment is known. It is considered that the site is not suitable for a high density residential development therefore a high parking or traffic demand is not likely. The site has a good level of accessibility to public transport and ultimately could be considered for a permit free development. However the existing development provides an element of onsite parking and this may have to be provided depending on the type of future use, or if permit free is not achievable. It is therefore considered that likely traffic impacts will be negligible, and parking demands will need to be considered when they can be quantified and assessed against the existing environment. These matters will be assessed further as part of any planning application to redevelop the site and would require an appropriate transport assessment.

Construction related issues
Several representations referred to potential construction related effects such as access and noise. These matters are considered relevant, but more so to a planning application as opposed to the strategic allocation. All potential effects will be considered and appropriately mitigated as part of the planning application process. The effects will be
temporary in nature and governed by planning conditions.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

**Scale and design related matters**
Specific matters regarding the bulk, location, scale and design will be taken into account as part of any planning application. It is considered that there are ultimately no barriers to implementation of design related matters and having regard to existing development in the vicinity, however, all future development is subject to planning permission which will ultimately determine the design of the site. Whilst there are no barriers to implementation of design controls, it cannot ultimately be precluded as part of the site allocation in the DPD as there is insufficient information to do so.

**Use of the site**
Several representations received stated people’s preferred use for the site and included solely community use, solely residential use, and business activities. Each use has been considered and the site is ultimately considered to have a substantial degree of flexibility for the following reasons, and is therefore suitable for a range of uses as a result:
- the site has an established D1 use and has operated for a substantial amount of time with this use. The site is therefore suitable for D1 (healthcare) use and the precedent has been set for ongoing D1 use;
- a majority of Amity Grove is of a residential nature and the surrounding environment has a residential feel to it. There is also an overwhelming need for housing in the borough. The site is therefore considered appropriate to accommodate residential uses; and
- the site is situated within the Raynes Park town centre boundary therefore a range of opportunities exist for various uses, including business use as suggested.

**Parking and traffic**
All parking and traffic related matters will be determined and implemented where appropriate as part of the planning application process. These matters cannot be appropriately determined at this stage as there is insufficient information to do so. Further information, which will be submitted as part of any planning application, regarding the use, parking and traffic related matters will be considered and implemented as planning conditions where appropriate.

**Construction**
All matters relating to construction activities on the site will be determined and considered as part of the planning application process. Any appropriate mitigation measures are typically imposed as conditions on any planning permission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Suitability - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for both continued/expanded D1 use as evidenced by the nature of the existing use on the site. In addition, based on the nature of the existing and surrounding environment being predominantly residential and the need for housing in the borough, the site is considered suitable for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site also benefits from being located within the town centre boundary which enables a range of uses to be established on site in accordance with existing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Availability - ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NHS has stated that the site is in their ownership and will be surplus to requirements in approximately 3 – 7 years. The site will therefore be available within the lifetime of the DPD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Information provided from NHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The viability of continued healthcare services is considered to be implicit based on the existing services operating on the site. The NHS is rationalising services and this site could become surplus to requirements. It is considered that the market would influence the viability of residential use if it were to be established on the site. It is considered that the site will be viable and an attractive development based on the location of the site and the potential to establish new residential uses for which there is demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic planning factors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is located within the Raynes Park town centre boundary and has good accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have any other issues been identified?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of spring 2013 the Amity Grove Clinic was accommodating additional services which have been relocated from the Nelson Hospital while it is under construction. The existing services will be relocated from Amity Grove to Nelson Hospital once it is rebuilt in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any development proposals should recognise and improve the public footpath adjacent to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating potential parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified that would otherwise not been taken into account as part of any planning application to develop the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative options/uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain is existing lawfully established use. Once</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the services are relocated from the site the NHS has advised it would be disposed of. It is unlikely to be pursued for continued healthcare services and the most commercial interest is likely to be from converting it to residential use. The council considers it more appropriate to iron out initial issues at this point in time with a strategic allocation, prior to the use being relocated.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for residential uses as an alternative which is considered the most appropriate use for the based on the nature of the surrounding environment and emerging policy.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Community, healthcare, residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capacity (if relevant): NHS has advised that the existing services are no longer needed on the site. There is capacity for housing in Merton. |

| Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown. |

| Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, >10 years |

| Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council |

| Potential occupiers: Residential, healthcare providers or community services, a range of potential town centre uses. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No barriers identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 41 – Kingston Road Opposite Lower Downs
Land between 424 & 448 Kingston Road
Raynes Park
SW20 8DX

Area: 0.11 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Michael McCarthy, 55a Onslow Gardens, South Kensington, London SW7 3QF. There is a strip of land along the western boundary which is currently unregistered but is the subject of an adverse possession application by JCDecaux and has been referred to the Adjudicator to HM Land Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant land with advertising hoardings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is a grassed area with advertising hoardings located on Kingston Road, opposite the junction with Lower Downs Road and Burstow Road, Wimbledon SW20. The site is located in a predominately residential area. Adjacent to the west of the site are two and three storey terraced houses. Adjacent to the north of the site are two storey terraced houses, two of which have ground floor commercial units. Two storey terraced houses are also located adjacent the site to the east. Adjacent to the south of the site is a large industrial premises and also two storey terraced housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Vacant land with advertising hoardings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential - The Wimbledon Society (local civic society) and JCDecaux Limited (previous owner).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

**Landowners/occupiers**

JCDecaux Limited (previous owner) – Correspondence was received from the owner and Solicitor acting on behalf of the owner clarifying the ownership of the site as JCDecaux Limited’s and the suggested use as residential.

**Local residents/organisations**

Apostles Residents Association – site has open space and visual importance and should be allocated as a small park. The site is also adjacent an existing awkward junction and vehicular access would be difficult and dangerous. Council planners have rejected a proposal nearby based on access and parking issues. Ownership may not JCDecaux’s but instead TfL’s as a successor to London Transport (Stage 3).
Conservative Group – preferred use was for the site to be used for education or community use.

Fischer P – site has open space and visual importance and should be allocated as a small park. The site is also adjacent an existing awkward junction and vehicular access would be difficult and dangerous. Council planners have rejected a proposal nearby based on access and parking issues. Also claim ownership as not being JCDecaux’s but TfL’s as a successor to London Transport (Stage 3).

Frost C – awkward junction and the open space nature of the site is required for sight visibility around the corner (Stage 3).

Hannam H – a representation made claiming ownership of part of the site (Stage 2).

Liberal Democrat Group – that the area could be “interesting for a pocket park given it is adjacent to a nature conservation area, the shape of the site, and the potential for detrimental traffic impacts”.

Maidment C – area has enough residential development. The site should be used to implement a roundabout because of the unsafe junction (Stage 2).

Maidment C – area has enough residential development. The site should be used to implement a roundabout because of the unsafe junction (Stage 3).

Plant J – site should be used for a park/open space. Also issues regarding an awkward road junction and road safety. They also refute the ownership of the site as being JCDecaux’s (Stage 3).

Wyatt L – primarily related to Site 74 (Southey Bowls Club) but indirectly refers to potential traffic and parking impacts (Stage 2).

Wynne A – objections due to traffic and a roundabout should be installed (Stage 3).

In addition to the Sites and Policies Plan consultation, an online petition was set up through Merton council’s website in opposition to residential development of the site and suggesting that the site should be used for the construction of a roundabout. The petition was set up on 28 January 2013 and concluded on 27 February 2013 which almost mimics the public consultation period for Stage 3 of the DPD. A total of 127 signatures were received in support of the petition.

**Statutory Agencies**

Environment Agency – there are “borehole well springs” adjacent the site, and a preliminary risk assessment for potential contamination due to the presence of a sensitive aquifer (minor aquifer) would be required during the planning application stage.

**Others**

No other consultation received.

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**Parking, traffic, access and road safety issues**

Numerous issues were raised from various parties which are generally be summarised as follows:

- Parking issues associated with development of the site;
• The existing on-street parking supply in the vicinity of the site is considered to be insufficient;
• Access to the site;
• The existing junction is dangerous, sight visibility along the road will be affected, site should be used for a roundabout; and
• The pedestrian crossing should be enhanced.

It is considered that an only an appropriate scale of residential development could be accommodated onsite which reflects the nature of the adjoining and surrounding terraced houses in the vicinity. The site is therefore only likely to accommodate a limited number of terraced houses. Approximately 4-8 units based on the site and surrounding area is considered appropriate, subject to site specific design. Onsite parking should be assessed at the time of planning application to determine whether safe ingress and egress can be achieved as part of redevelopment. Onsite parking should be provided if possible. If not, it is considered appropriate that the development possibly could be car free, or alternatively seek a parking permit for the surrounding CPZ’s (Merton council is also undergoing further consultation and research regarding new and further CPZ’s in the vicinity). Overall, the likelihood is that only a very few number of additional vehicles using the road network and placing additional demand on parking will result from allocation and development. Significant or measurable adverse impacts are therefore not anticipated.

With regard to traffic, access and road safety issues raised, overall the development will not result in a measurable or significant change to the existing environment. That is, the resulting vehicle movements generated from redevelopment would not be significant compared with the existing road network. No measurable traffic effects will result from redevelopment (subject to the provision of safe ingress and egress, if possible).

Several representations stated that the existing intersection is dangerous and should be reconfigured to provide a roundabout, which is likely to require land from the site adjoining the highway, i.e. the subject site. These claims were not supported by any evidence. Council has obtained accident data for the 5 years up until September 2012 and there was only one recorded injury causing accident crash according to the police data. The existing alignment and traffic measures at the junction are therefore considered to not require alteration from a transport planning perspective. The intersection has a signal controlled crossing for pedestrians which is also considered appropriate, suitable and safe for the environment.

Loss of open space
Numerous issues were raised from various parties which can generally be summarised as follows:
• Loss of open space; and
• The site should be considered for open space, a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), a park or generally protected in its current form.

There is no evidence to suggest that the site is of importance to nature conservation. The site was not considered for open space because it does not meet the criteria derived within the Development Plan Document which is guided by the National Planning Policy Framework and London Plan. Firstly, it is not publicly accessible (legally) and is in private ownership. Secondly, The area of “open space” on the site is approximately 620 m² which is considered to be small (<1000 m²) and too restrictive and thus a limited functional use as open space based on the criteria. Whilst the site might provide some visual amenity, it is in private ownership and would also not offer important opportunities for sport and recreation, thus fails to meet the criteria to be designated as open space.

There is also an overwhelming need for housing in Merton in order to meet housing targets set for Merton by the Mayor of London. Residential is therefore considered the most appropriate use for the site.

Site could be used as a school
The council commissioned research to provide school places and this site was assessed for its suitability as a school in
conjunction with sites to the south. It was found to be unsuitable on grounds of size, external space, traffic and noise in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton. Redevelopment of the site is not likely to place any significant pressure (which may or may not exist) on existing services due to the small scale of the development which is considered suitable for the site. In addition, any planning permission would require Section 106/CIL contributions to be made to offset effects of additional demand created.

There is also an overwhelming need for housing in Merton in order to meet housing targets set for Merton by the Mayor of London. Residential is therefore considered the most appropriate use for the site.

Site ownership
Several parties disputed the ownership of the site as JCDecaux’s including one adjoining owner who claimed to own the site. The freehold ownership of the site was subsequently sold by JCDecaux in mid 2013 and is now owned by Michael McCarthy. Council had received evidence and land registry information from the legal representatives of JCDecaux’s which confirms their freehold ownership of the site. There is a strip of land adjoining the western boundary which is currently unregistered but is the subject of an adverse possession claim by JCDecaux. Council has viewed the evidence in relation to this.

The petition
The council provided a response to the petition as follows:
“Dear Petitioner, thank you for your petition. Having considered your petition along side other responses to our consultation our Cabinet has recommended that this site should be allocated for residential use. We have undertaken accident and traffic surveys to ensure that the site can be safely developed and any approval for development would be subject to a detailed transport assessment to ensure safe access from Kingston Road. The Council will consider this recommendation at a meeting on 10 July 2013. Subject to the council’s decision, the site, along with the rest of the Sites and Policies Plan will be published for six week’s consultation between mid July and August 2013. Details of this can be found at from 17 July 2013
http://www.merton.gov.uk/environment/planning/planningpolicy/ldf/sites_policies_dpd.htm”

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

The only outstanding matters which need to be addressed relate to access, parking and traffic issues in and around the area. The matters regarding open space, schooling and ownership of the site have been appropriately dealt with. These matters will be a primary consideration during any application for planning permission on the site. An appropriate traffic assessment and determination by council officers would result. It is considered that this represents an appropriate method in which to address the issue. These matters cannot be accurately determined through a strategic allocation because the scale and form of development is not known. It is feasible that the site may not require vehicular access at all therefore access issues would not result. This can only be confirmed through site specific design to be submitted and considered as part of a planning application. For comparative purposes, a majority of the surrounding streets and locality do not have onsite parking or access. Only properties on Kingston Road to the west of the site have off-street parking. All of the properties on Kingston Road to the east of the site, Lower Downs Road opposite, and Bronson Road nearby do not have off-street parking.

The claims made by several residents are not supported by accident data for the site. In the 5 years up until September 2012 there was only one recorded injury causing accident on police records. The existing alignment and traffic measures at the junction are therefore considered appropriate and do not require alteration.

In summary, it is considered that the issues raised during consultation have been appropriately considered and addressed where possible, subject to site specific traffic and parking matters to be determined through the planning application process.
### Site Suitability - ISSUES

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**

The site is generally considered to be suitable for residential development based on the surrounding environment and prominence of residential uses in the vicinity. It has been suggested through representations that the site is also suitable for other uses such as open space, traffic improvements, school and commercial uses.

The primary issue is regarding traffic and parking related matters. Any future development should not be high density therefore the overall impact on the surrounding area will be minimal, however site specific mitigation measures will be required to address access to the site.

Residential is considered to be the most appropriate use of the site given the nature of the site, surrounding area and the need for housing in the borough.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Traffic and parking matters are most appropriately dealt with during the planning application phase once the scale and form of development is known. Any future development would be required to mitigate potential adverse effects of the proposal. It is considered that a suitable outcome should be determined during the planning process based on site specific design for parking and access.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is largely in the freehold ownership of Michael McCarthy. The evidence of freehold ownership was previously provided by JCDecaux, which has since been transferred to Michael McCarthy. There is a strip of land along the western boundary which is currently unregistered but is the subject of an adverse possession application by JCDecaux and has been referred to the Adjudicator to HM Land Registry. A decision on the application is due in October 2013.

Information source: Representations received from landowner and their Solicitor.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

The freehold ownership of a majority of the site has been clarified and provided to council. The only outstanding matter is a portion of land along the western boundary which is currently subject to a claim for adverse possession of the land by JCDecaux. The majority of the site is still available if the claim for adverse possession is not successful.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is currently vacant of development and it is considered that residential development of the site would be viable based on market evidence and demand for residential use. The site has recently been sold to a developer with the intention of delivering residential use on the site. The viability of development is considered to be implicit with the sale and intention of the new owner who has engaged pre-application discussions with the council.

Information source: Council determination based information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

It is not considered that there are any issues to the viability of the site.
### Strategic planning factors

The site fronts onto Kingston Road which is an existing cycle route and strategic route.

This site is in an area with good access to public transport services (PTAL 4).

The site is adjacent to a conservation area and also a nature conservation area on the opposite side of Kingston Road.

### Have any other issues been identified?

The site is situated on the inside of a relatively tight corner with two adjoining roads opposite. There is a busy through movement from Kingston Road into Lower Downs Road which passes through a restricted railway arch. Several schools are also situated to the north of the railway arch which contributes to local congestion at peak times. On the south side of the intersection is a signalled pedestrian/cycle crossing which links with a segregated cycle facility along The Chase. Designated cycle lanes are located on both sides of Kingston Road in the vicinity of the site.

To mitigate any detrimental traffic impacts servicing and access should be sited at the westernmost boundary of the site, subject to appropriate visibility being achieved, in particular for northwest bound traffic movements on Kingston Road. The potential to service/access the site via the private rear access to 448 – 458 Kingston Road (from Bronson Road) may be possible subject to appropriate legal agreements being put in place with the relevant land owners.

The accessibility of the site (PTAL 4) would support low levels of parking provision or permit free, subject to a controlled parking zone being in place on surrounding streets (currently being consulted on). This could be considered and addressed further as part of redevelopment.

The potential for vehicular access off Kingston Road is also limited due to potential safety impacts. Therefore any approval would be subject to a detailed transport assessment.

Due to the size, shape and nature of this corner site, a high quality design will be required to complement existing development in the vicinity. The density of new development should be similar to that of existing development as well as the restrictions on the provision of access to the site.

Protecting the residential amenity of those properties adjacent to or in the vicinity of the site.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified which act as a barrier to redevelopment.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site has been sold to a private investor therefore it is likely that a planning application will be submitted for the redevelopment on the site. Given current market conditions it is likely that this would comprise of residential and/or retail activities.

Alternative uses on the site – The council considers that residential is the only suitable use on the site given its size, shape, location, proximity to adjoining residential uses and restrictions on vehicular access to the site.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Residential (C3 Use Class).
**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown, subject to design at the planning application stage.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

There are no potential barriers to delivery, subject to an appropriate design being accepted by the council and mitigation of transport measures.
## Site Details

**Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description**

### Freeholder:
- Section 48a – Friends Life Assurance Society Limited, c/- Phillip Shalless, Axa Real Estate, 8th Floor, 155 Bishopsgate, London EC2M 3XJ.
- Section 48b – Friends Life Limited, c/- James Honeyman, Axa Real Estate, 8th Floor, 155 Bishopsgate, London EC2M 3XJ.

### Occupier:
- Section 48a – Apex House (vacant), Safestore and Racetech
- Section 48b – Vacant office and warehouse buildings (former Thales Avionics).

**Site description:** The site consists of large-scale industrial buildings ranging between two and five storey in height, and open parking areas. To the west is the A3 ‘Beverley Way’ dual carriageway and to the south is Bushey Road (A298). To the east of the site is a “Pets at Home” store and, beyond that, a primary school. To the north, on the opposite side of Bodnant Gardens, are two-storey houses.

Since January 2012 the site boundary was amended to exclude the “Pets at Home” store and to clarify that the landowners are pursuing separate schemes. Sections 48a and 48b are under separate ownership.

Section 48a consists of a vacant office 5 storey office to the southern end (Apex House), and warehouses. Section 48b consists of the vacant Art Deco former Thales Avionics offices with a warehouse and industrial unit to the rear.

**Information source:** Information submitted on behalf of owners and council officer site visits.

### Current Use:
- Section 48a: Offices (B1[a] Use Class: Apex House, vacant since before 2006); Storage and Distribution (B8 Use Class: currently occupied by Safestore); Light Industry (B1[c] Use Class, currently occupied by Racetech).
- Section 48b: Offices (B1[a] Use Class) on the former Thales Avionics (vacant since 2010).

**Use suggested/organisation:**
Section 48a: retail (A1 Use Class), to replace Apex House and Safestore (proposed by landowner Axa Real Estate). 

Section 48b: employment (B uses), bulky retail (A1 use class), sui generis (e.g. vehicle sales), community use (which could include education - D1 Use Class), leisure (D2 Use Class) and hotel (C1 Use Class) proposed by BNP Paribas on behalf of Ignis Asset Management.

Allocated use: An employment led mixed use scheme research and development (B1[b] Use Class), light industrial appropriate in a residential area (B1[c] Use Class), storage or distribution (B8 Use Classes) that may also include an appropriate mix of any of the following: bulky goods retail (A1 Use Class), car show room (sui generis Use Class) and school (D1 Use Class).

**Consultation Responses Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing correspondence from both agents has been received regarding suggested uses for the site, ownership, and information regarding interest in the sites from various parties. The most up-to-date representations are outlined below:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Life Assurance Society Limited c/- Axa Real Estate (Section 48a) – stated that as a result of the existing vacancy at Apex House and the lack of current and likely occupier demand for B use class development, Axa are exploring alternative development options for the site. The most suitable and deliverable option is to redevelop the site to provide a Next Home and Fashion Store. Axa therefore welcome the provision of A1 retail but disagree that this should be restricted to bulky goods on at least 70% of any retail floorspace. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is out of town and there should be controls to ensure that any scheme does not harm the town centre, it is inappropriate and unjustified to impose an arbitrary figure of 70%. Put simply, there is no evidence provided in the DPD for imposing such a restriction. Any such restrictions should be imposed through planning conditions where particular effects have been examined in a retail impact and sequential approach assessment. Therefore the preferred use should be amended to remove the reference to bulky goods retail and include “non food retail warehousing”. Several consequential amendments are also sought accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Life Limited c/- Axa Real Estate (current owner of Section 48b) – outlined that following the acquisition of the site there are no development plans for the site but are investigating the potential for a comprehensive redevelopment of Section 48b and the neighbouring property at 80 Bushey Road to potentially expand the existing retail offer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignis Asset Management (previous owner of Section 48b) – support in principle the allocation for a range of employment led uses, however it is considered too restrictive in so far as the policy seeks to secure an employment led scheme despite acknowledging that marketing has shown little to no interest in retaining the current office/light industrial use for the vacant areas of the site. It was suggested that preferred uses should also include leisure uses (D2 Use Class) and hotel (C1 Use Class) where it can be demonstrated that there is no harm to the vitality and viability of the town centres in the borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berriman A – no specific comments in relation to the DPD or the site were submitted. The representation was simply a case about council not taking into account considerations on previous consultation processes (not in regard to the DPD).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blossom Lower School and Upper House – general support for the allocation in relation to section 48b. However, it should be made clearer that school use is the preferred use and can be delivered independently. Given the sites location away from a designated town centre neither section 48a nor 48b appear to lend themselves to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Redevelopment for retail warehousing. Their suggested use for the site would provide a substantial amount of employment, a multi-use community facility, improvement to the site through landscaping and sensible reuse of the existing locally listed building. Reuse of an employment site for education purposes is also consistent with the NPPF.

Colebourne S – residential use is not suitable for the site.

Friends Life Limited (Axa Real Estate are also acting on their behalf) – Friends Life Limited are the owner of the land immediately adjoining the site to the east (80 Bushey Road) which was previously included in the draft allocation (Stage 2). The existing building is a first generation retail warehouse which is now dated, tired and beyond refurbishment. It is poorly configured and does not lend itself well to further subdivision. It is no longer fit for purpose and does not meet the needs of modern day retailing. There is a redevelopment break clause in the current lease in 2015 which can be exercised on redevelopment grounds. Any redevelopment would need to provide for the relocation of Pets at Home on market terms. Friends Life Limited’s aspirations are to expand and enhance the existing retail asset in terms of providing high quality retail accommodation that meets modern day needs. There is a strong need for additional floorspace in this location. Any redevelopment would predominantly seek to provide bulky goods retail for which there is clear demand.

**Statutory agencies**

Environment Agency – a small portion of the southwest corner of the site is in flood zone 3. A sequential test should be undertaken to ensure there is no alternative land at lower risk of flooding that can be developed prior to this site. A flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted as part of a planning application to ensure all sources of flooding are appropriately mitigated because the site is in flood zone 3 and a critical drainage area. A preliminary assessment for any potential groundwater contamination will also be required due to past uses on the site.

GLA – the site is identified in the London Plan as a designated SIL. Following liaison with LBM it is accepted by the GLA that under its current use it would not be recognised under current London Plan/SPG criteria as SIL. Further, the site would be considered for de-allocation in the future review of the London Plan. It is recommended that the site be identified as LSIA as this will help protect the existing activity and allow for a degree of control over future development.

London Borough of Merton Children, Schools and Families Department – site should be considered for use as a school due to size.

Mayors Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – scale of development may have an impact on the need for policing in the area. Development should therefore be required to comply with existing policy 8.2 in the London Plan.

**Others**

Conservative Group – the site should be for employment use only.

Costco Limited – site should be retained as LSIA and for this purpose only.

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site should be for A1 retail with no restriction on bulky goods</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is currently designated as a Locally Significant Industrial Site. There are existing and proposed policies which address the types of uses preferred and the restrictions on use in such areas. Industrial and employment led development is therefore preferred for the site. Council policy does not support A1 retail use in these locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
primarily because the site is an out-of-centre location therefore any retail element proposed will result in a risk to existing retail uses in town centres. This forms the basis for council imposing a restriction on the amount of bulky goods that should be provided as part of any A1 use. Any A1 use proposed on the site would require a retail impact assessment and sequential test to be undertaken to ensure there were no significant impact on existing town centres or retail nodes. Merton’s Employment and Economic Land Study 2010 identified the Bushey Road industrial area as good quality with potential uses including B1, B2 and B8. It was however noted as being average quality and a low deliverability for additional office space. The report reiterated that the site is an out-of-centre location.

Support for the allocated uses in principle but should also include leisure (D2 Use Class) and hotel use (C1 Use Class)
Both of these uses are more appropriately situated in or near town centre locations. The subject site is an out of centre location therefore is not considered suitable in accordance with existing and emerging policy. If either use was preferred on the site it is considered most appropriate for it to be considered on its merits against relevant policies with supporting evidence. Council does not have any evidence to suggest these uses would be appropriate on the site in light of existing and emerging policy.

Site is suitable for a school
Several representations stated that the site has the ability to provide school places. Council’s preferred use for the site has included provision for school use.

Site is not suitable for residential
Whilst residential use was stated as being a potential option to be included in a redevelopment of the site as part of Stage 2, it was removed during the Stage 3 consultation once the available site area was reduced and largely confined around the existing office/warehouse buildings. It was deemed that there was insufficient area in which to accommodate residential development in addition to the existing (and any possible additional) industrial uses. If residential was proposed, it is expected that this should only ever comprise a small area located away from the employment led uses on the site. Council would not support any substantial residential component for various reasons. Any residential development would be subject to planning controls to ensure any element of residential use would be suitable and appropriate for the site. This is expected to conform to the expectations contained within the representation.

Flood risk
It is acknowledged that a portion of the southwest corner of the site (mainly comprising Apex House in section 48a) is within flood zone 2 and 3. A site specific flood risk assessment will be required to be submitted with any planning application and will need to include a sequential test for alternative sites. It is anticipated that appropriate mitigation measures will be determined through the planning application phase.

The site should be used for employment purposes only
The site is an existing Locally Significant Industrial Area therefore employment uses are promoted and protected on the site. Two large buildings on the site have been vacant since 2010 and one of these since 2006. Marketing evidence has been provided to council which illustrates that there has been little to no demand for B uses on the site. Council is therefore allocating the site for potential alternative uses in order to bring the underutilised site back into operation. Council’s preference is for an employment led regeneration of the site, therefore a range of potentially employment generating uses is preferred. The NPPF also placed an emphasis on councils not providing blanket protection for underutilised employment sites. In accordance with recent guidance, council is allocating the site for potential alternative uses to provide regeneration or redevelopment opportunities. A blanket protection of this site for existing B uses is discouraged by national planning policy and therefore is considered appropriate, hence allocation for potential alternative uses. The site will remain a LSI A and this will help protect the existing employment led uses on the site and enable a suitable degree of control over future development. This will ensure an emphasis is placed on employment led use on the site if it ends up as mixed use.
Adjoining land should be included in the allocation
The adjoining land to the east comprising the building and car park area surrounding Pets at Home and Topps Tiles was included in the site allocation through Stage 2 consultation. Following a meeting with the owners of the site (at that point in time), they advised that there was a long term lease in place (beyond 2020) and thus it was resolved to remove this area of land from the allocation because it was not available and thus not deliverable within the lifetime of the Sites and Policies Plan. The representation was received as part of Stage 3 from the owners of the site (and through a different representative acting on their behalf) stating that a redevelopment break clause exists in the lease and that redevelopment is desired for A1 use. As outlined above, council is not in a position to promote solely A1 use on this LSIS and out-of-centre location. Any A1 provision on this site that would be supported would only be an expansion or enhancement of the existing uses. An expansion of the existing use on the site also does not require a strategic allocation and is more appropriately considered as part of a planning application.

Potential impact on policing needs
The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this representation refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The allocation does not preclude the ability to establish community uses on the site. This is considered an appropriate measure of accounting for additional community space if needed. If any redevelopment is proposed it will be subject to a s106 agreement and possible CIL charges which will also take into account mitigation measure for any such impacts.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Site should be for A1 retail with no restriction on bulky goods
For the reasons outlined above the site will not be allocated solely for A1 use and will continue to promote a preference for A1 bulky goods if any A1 is provided. It is considered that this is a barrier to implementation of the suggestions made in the relevant representations.

Site is suitable for a school
The allocation includes the ability for school use therefore the matter is considered to have been appropriately implemented.

The site should be used for employment purposes only
Blanket protection of solely employment use on the site is discouraged under current national planning guidance therefore it is not proposed to protect this site solely for B uses, which marketing evidence has suggested are not viable on parts of the site. This is considered a barrier to implementation of the suggestions made in the relevant representations.

Adjoining land should be included in the allocation
Based on the information received the adjoining land will not be included within the allocation. The primary reason being that the availability is questionable and the only information provided to the council to date suggests an expansion of the existing use is desired, which does not require a strategic allocation.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?
The site is considered suitable for a range of uses including employment led uses, school and bulky goods retail based on the site being a LSIS and marketing evidence provided to council. The site is relatively large and has the potential for a substantial mixed use regeneration of the site to include a range of uses. In contrast, it has been identified that large amounts of A1 (excluding bulky goods retail) or residential uses are not considered suitable on the site. It is not
apparent that there are any site suitability issues with regard to any of the preferred uses.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by owners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site suitability for the existing or proposed development suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 48a is owned by Friends Life Assurance Society Limited who has confirmed their intention to develop the site. They have negotiated a break clause in the existing lease for the building comprising Safestore and are working toward a similar agreement with Racetech. The site is in freehold ownership of Friends Life Assurance Society and Apex House is vacant. A majority of the site is therefore available and the owner is working toward ensuring the entire site is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 48b is owned by Friends Life Limited who has confirmed their freehold ownership of the site. The buildings on the site are currently vacant. The entire site is therefore available for allocation and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst the site is in separate ownership it is allocated as one site with the intention that the owners work together in regenerating the site. It is acknowledged that even if this does not occur, both the land parcels will have allocations for new uses which aim to bring the sites back into operational employment led developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Information provided by respective landowners and their representatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The only issue is that Racetech currently has a long term lease on the building at the rear (north) of section 48a. The landowner is actively investigating the alteration of this lease to ensure the entire site is available. The owner has advised they are preparing a planning application for a Next Home and Fashion store which can be accommodated on the remainder of the site, excluding the area occupied by Racetech. This is considered acceptable in this instance as a majority of the site is available for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no other issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing evidence provided by the owners illustrated that there is very little commercial interest in continuing the B1 uses on the site and no interest in the office space. Apex House, a relatively large office building on section 48a has been vacant since approximately 2006. The building at 84-86 Bushey Road comprising office and warehouse floorspace has been vacant since 2010. The agents acting on behalf of the owners have received interest from various parties including bulky goods retailers, builders’ merchants, fashion retailers, car dealers, education, community and assembly type uses (most for occupier, some for purchase). None have progressed with a formal offer on either site to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is apparent from the information provided that B1 uses (B1[a]) in particular are not viable on the site either for occupation or redevelopment. The site has also had limited interest from other B uses. The allocation therefore provides a range of uses on the site and anticipates developers to approach the council with viable mixed use developments as opposed to large bulky occupiers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strategic planning factors**

This whole site is identified as a ‘Locally Significant Industrial Site’ in Merton’s Core Strategy 2011. The site is in close proximity to the Strategic Road Network (A3 and A298 and a number of flyovers). It is in an area with low accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 2). Parts of the site are within a Critical Drainage Area, with only the southwest corner of section 48a, Apex House, within flood zones 2 and 3.

The building at 84-86 Bushey Road (section 48b) with the clock tower is locally listed.

Adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site is a Green Corridor.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Any retail development proposed on the site will be restricted to providing at least 70% of retail floorspace as ‘bulky goods’ for sale on the premises, in order to avoid undue harm to the viability of Wimbledon town centre and other surrounding centres.

Due to the site’s location relative to the A3 road, a high quality design is necessary that will be responsive to the on-site and off-site uses and respect the locally listed building.

Careful scrutiny of access and junction arrangements needed to minimise impacts on movement, congestion and road safety in particular wider impacts on strategic road network (TLRN). Transport assessments must consider the potential effects on the whole site. Poor permeability and accessibility by public transport. Infrastructure/service improvements expected to support comprehensive re-developments.

This section of the A3 is identified on the Department for Transport’s noise map. Both existing and generated noise impacts will be considered in any proposal.

Proposals must protect the amenity of the adjacent houses and school.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

The above measures will be considered as part of the planning application process once a site specific development proposal is known.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the various buildings and uses would retain their existing lawfully established uses. The planning application that is currently being considered on Site 48a would also continue. A majority of the buildings on the site are vacant and have been for an extended period of time. The site is likely to continue in its current state.
Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of uses considered appropriate for the site and its designation as an LSIS. No other uses are considered appropriate on the site without further evidence.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> A range of potential uses including industrial/warehouse uses, bulky goods retail, car showroom, school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (if relevant):</strong> Unknown. Market demand for allocated uses will determine capacity for any future use or change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:</strong> Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s):</strong> 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</strong> Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong> Unknown but there is known interest from Next.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The two owners working together on issues such as transportation to provide a sustainable outcome for the site as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 74 – Southey Bowling Club
Southey Bowling Club
559 Kingston Road
Raynes Park
SW20 8SF

Area: 0.54 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Southey Bowling Club, 559 Kingston Road, Raynes Park SW20 8SF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Southey Bowling Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site, whilst irregular in shape, is well proportioned. It is currently occupied by a bowling green with associated single storey timber structures to the east of the site. The western part of the site is occupied by an open hardstanding carpark for approximately 20 cars. A single storey brick clubhouse lies in the westernmost corner of the site. Vehicular access to the site is via a long narrow driveway entry from Lower Downs Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gardens of two storey residential terraces surround the site on all sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Owner and council site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Bowling club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential and bowling club – Kossway Ltd on behalf of Southey Bowling Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Bowls club, residential and open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

**Landowners/occupiers**

Kossway’s (on behalf of the bowling club) submitted the desire to develop the site to include some residential aspect to fund new investment in the club. For the future of the club to be secured it is necessary that the site be developed to release the equity required to build a new facility.

The ownership has been clarified with regard to freehold ownership of the site, the rights to access and the fact that the existing covenant on the title is not restrictive for the type of development envisaged.

The club wishes to retain the existing bowling facility and green on the site. The club seeks to redevelop part of the site for residential use to provide the necessary funding for a new clubhouse. It is envisaged that the clubhouse could
also be used for other community activities.

It was also confirmed by the club that there is an appointed development committee acting on behalf of the club in conjunction with Kossways Limited and the representations made by P Biddlecomb and J Brownsmead do not represent those of the club.

**Local residents/organisations**

Apostles Residents Association – the representation only requested an extension to the consultation period for this site (Stage 2a).

Apostles Residents Association – it is unsustainable to continue proposing residential development on private open space. This places additional need on both private and public transport which in turn increases energy consumption and pollution. Residential use is therefore unacceptable. Even if only part of the site is developed it is unsuitable based on access for service and emergency vehicles. Vehicular access to the site is also restricted. It is unsure how the bowling green could be retained and protected. If there is to be a change of use it should be to public open space and/or community use (Stage 3).

Ashmead J – objection to any development as his property and rear yard backs onto the bowling club. Views will be blocked, eyesore, traffic concerns, saleability of property affected.

Barnes – objection due to lack of infrastructure noting capacity at local GP and lack of parking already evident. If these matters can be addressed then she would be in favour.

Biddlecombe (Hon Secretary of the bowling club) – refers to restrictive covenants on land regarding use, the original decision to redevelopment wasn’t a majority and was never suggested to be solely residential.

Boothroyd-Brooks – object to loss of privacy and overlooking, parking, existing access to the site is too narrow.

Brownsmead – restrictive covenant on land regarding use, entrance is not suitable for emergency services, access is owned by adjoining landowners, traffic concerns, loss of peace and tranquillity, and residents formed a committee in 2006 which opposed development.

Colebourne – a small residential development would be suitable comprising semi-detached or town houses, as opposed to flats.

Collini – objection to redevelopment, no reasons or justification given.

Conservative Group – preferred use is as a sports club only. There is also reference to residents’ advice that the site can be used for sports purposes only.

Fischer P – submits that the redevelopment in unsustainable and will result in additional numbers of residents having to commute, to fewer recreation facilities, public or private. This increases travel by car or public transport and thus energy consumption and pollution. Redevelopment should be for public open space and/or community use. Vehicular access to the site is width restricted and will be inappropriate for residential use both on servicing and emergency access grounds (Stage 2a and Stage 3).

Frost P&C – access width restrictions; Lower Downs Road is already busy and often congested; servicing (rubbish) would be difficult; parking overspill into adjoining roads; Dundonald school expansion will remove another existing bowling club therefore there may be greater demand for Southey; there are limited facilities for older people; local
schools already at capacity; noise and loss of light; loss of amenity (Stage 2a and Stage 3).

Hopkins B – objection due to overlooking impact on adjoining properties, spoiling the western aspect from properties on Lower Downs Road, lack of amenities such as schools and doctor’s surgeries’, there are other suitable areas for residential development in the vicinity, lack of suitable vehicular access, noise, loss of parking for the bowling club, additional traffic (Stage 3).

Kho L – bought their house on Lower Downs Road because of the privacy afforded by the adjoining bowling club. Any development will result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties through noise and activity. The roads are already too congested. Any 2 storey development will spoil the outlook and reduce the privacy of residents. Potential community use of the bowling club could lead to noise disruption in the evenings (Stage 3).

McFarlane – objection to development, no reasons or justification given.

Mitchell – loss of privacy; overbearing in aspect and character amongst the 1930’s uniform terraced houses; parking concerns.

Murray – house backs on to bowling club; loss of character and open space; access and increased traffic at site entry and also junction of Lower Downs Road with Kingston Road; not a majority of club members support redevelopment.

Plant J – objection to housing, site has vehicle access restrictions and a deficiency in open space. Site should be public open space and/or community use (Stage 3).

Siegle – house backs onto bowling club; requests details on development; access concerns pre, during and post development; any new residential development would make the area overcrowded (reworded); loss of green space and leisure area; loss of amenity and quality of life; parking.

Than E – objection to any change of use. Suggested use would impact surrounding residents – there is only one narrow vehicle access to the site. There is a lack of parking onsite and more congestion on surrounding roads. Any conjoint community use would result in additional noise pollution (Stage 3).

Tipper – opposition as development will be detrimental to adjoining landowners; parking; overlooking from future buildings with loss of privacy and increased noise.

Watts L – objection due to historic reasons (formed in 1886); listed in UDP as Urban Green Space; restricted access (Stage 2a).

Watts L – objection to residential development due to lack of access, traffic (Stage 3).

Wyatt L – reference to covenant regarding use; congestion, traffic and parking; too much development in general area; emergency access; loss of peace for surrounding landowners; loss of bowling green.

Wimbledon Society – defined as open space in draft proposals map; introduction of housing would be contrary to policies that protect open space; instead of housing consideration could be given to enhancing the present indoor accommodation to provide a wider social/recreational amenity.

**Statutory Agencies**

GLA – support for council’s preferred use.
Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design (SBD) principles.

Others
Sport England – oppose loss of playing fields/sporting areas; prevent the loss of sporting facilities; oppose redevelopment unless equivalent or better facilities are provided in a suitable location (unless genuinely redundant); generically protecting places where sports exist.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Parking, traffic, access and road safety issues
Numerous issues were raised from various parties which can generally be summarised as follows:

- Parking issues associated with bowling club events and construction pre and post development;
- The existing on-street parking supply in the vicinity of the site is considered to already be insufficient;
- The access to the site is too narrow and too close to the intersection with Kingston Road; and
- Access for emergency vehicles to the site.

The bowling clubs intention is to redevelop the car park portion of the site which currently provides space for approximately 35 vehicles. The bowling club has approximately 200 members and caters for events of up to 400 people, but much smaller events on a regular basis. It is therefore clear that the bowling club does not provide parking for all vehicles likely to access the site. The club intends to remain on site in the same capacity and develop the car park area for residential use. The actual effects relate to displacement of the existing parking provided on site and the demand created from any residential units created. It is considered that some provision for onsite parking in any redevelopment should be provided for the residential units and club as much as possible. Other vehicles would either be displaced onto the surrounding road network or have to find alternative methods of accessing the site (such as public transport, car sharing etc). A maximum of 35 vehicles would be displaced and no change to existing traffic patterns would result (i.e. the change in number of vehicle movements is negligible and the only increase would relate to the residential units). Any displacement of car parking from the site would need to be mitigated. It is possible that funding from the club for consideration of a CPZ may be appropriate and/or the implementation of an appropriate travel plan.

With regard to traffic, access and road safety issues raised, overall the development will not result in a measurable change to the existing environment. The addition of some residential units is not going to generate measurable impacts on the surrounding or wider road network. The bowling club will be retained in its current capacity therefore the status quo will remain.

Regarding access to the site, the existing access is approximately 3 m wide adjacent the houses on Lower Downs Road, but is of sufficient width for emergency vehicles. It also represents the existing situation and ultimately would not change significantly following any redevelopment of the site. For example, the car park at present is used temporarily parking area for council transport vehicles including 20 seat buses. There is unrestricted visibility along the access so any conflict between oncoming traffic would be temporary and minor in nature.

Loss of open space, overlooking, privacy, daylight
Numerous issues were raised from various parties which can generally be summarised as follows:

- Loss of open space from surrounding residential properties;
- Potential daylight, privacy and overlooking issues;
- The site is designated open space; and
- Potential noise effects.

Firstly, the site was incorrectly draughted during the Stage 2a consultation with an open space designation on the
site. This was corrected and removed as part of Stage 3 consultation. However, following this, members made a decision that the existing bowling green should be designated as open space. This is reflected in the allocation. The issues raised regarding a loss of open space from adjoining properties is not considered to be an issue as it has not been designated as such. The level of protected open space as part of the allocation is being increased. The site is privately owned and it is a luxury that adjoining owners have an open space aspect across the site. It is deemed to be a perceived open space and not a right in this instance.

Potential effects relating to daylighting, privacy and overlooking cannot be defined until the building bulk and location is known. It is considered that the site only has capacity for a limited number of residential units, of which one primary consideration would be maintaining an appropriate separation from adjoining properties. A suitable separation to ensure there were no adverse effects of daylighting, overlooking and noise would need to be achieved. As a result, it is considered that only a small portion of the site in the vicinity of the existing car park is suitable for residential development. This restriction on a suitable location for residential development, coupled with appropriate mitigation regarding design matters at the time a planning application is made is considered sufficient to ensure the potential effects resulting from development are no more than minor.

Some concerns were also raised regarding the potential dual use including a redeveloped club house being used for community purposes also. The existing club house is already available for this purpose therefore it will not change. If the size or location of the club house was to change, the actual impacts of this change would need to be quantified and considered appropriately. The extent of such development is unknown at this point in time, however it is considered that it can be taken into account as part of the planning application and appropriate mitigation measures implemented.

Lack of infrastructure
Several representations referred to a lack of infrastructure in the area, predominantly for schools and healthcare facilities. Redevelopment of the site is not likely to place any significant additional pressure (which may or may not exist) on existing services due to the small scale of the development which is considered suitable for the site. In addition, any planning permission would require Section 106/CIL contributions to be made to offset adverse effects of additional demand created.

Impact on property values
No evidence was submitted to suggest that redevelopment of the site would negatively impact on property values in the vicinity. The value of the property is unlikely to be significantly affected by the small scale development envisaged and is also not a relevant planning consideration to be taken into account by council.

Availability of the site and access to the site
Several representations stated that there were restrictive covenants on the site preventing any such development and that access to the site was not legally available to any successors in title. Council sought clarification regarding these matters as a result. The bowling club has confirmed that they sought legal advice regarding the matter, and that the current proposal to redevelop a portion of the site does not conflict with any covenant, and that appropriate legal access to the site and any redeveloped portion is available without restriction.

Loss of sport/leisure activity
Several representations were made concerning the loss of the sporting/leisure activity which exists on site. Since these representations were made, it has been clarified by the club that it intends to remain on site in its current capacity. It is considered that there is no material effect or loss of any sporting/leisure facility. With reference to the loss of the nearby Dundonald bowling club through a recent planning application, it is understood that that club had approximately 13 members at the time of closure therefore a significant influx of members (and thus users of the site) to Southey Bowling Club as claimed will not result.
Secured by Design principles
Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through the planning application phase.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
Overall, the actual scale of development is considered to be minor and would relate to a small number of residential units possible on the site. It is therefore considered that access, traffic, congestion and road safety issues raised will not change to a measurable degree as a result of any redevelopment. The site is only suitable for a small scale redevelopment therefore any additional traffic movements and the resulting impacts will be negligible when compared to the existing receiving environment. Council acknowledges that further investigation will need to be done regarding potential parking impacts generated from any redevelopment. Any shortage in parking compared to the existing situation will need to be appropriately mitigated. It is therefore considered any actual and potential adverse effects resulting from redevelopment can be appropriately mitigated at the time of development.

Similarly with regard to open space concerns raised, the site is not of any public value therefore no loss of open space to the wider community will result. The bowling green itself on the site will become designated open space which provides additional protection to the green area. The concerns would only be overcome if the site was retained in its current state. It is considered that the site can only reasonably accommodate a relatively small scale of development in order to ensure adjoining properties perception of open space are retained as much as possible through appropriate separation distances and detailed design regarding siting and form of future buildings.

Issues relating to demand on existing infrastructure will be addressed through the planning application process and will be subject to future s106/CIL payments which will ensure any additional impacts are appropriately mitigated.

Site Suitability - ISSUES
Site suitability – have any issues been identified?
The site is considered suitable for retention of the bowling club use with the addition of a small scale residential development in the western portion of the site. There are no physical constraints to development of the site. Redevelopment of the site should be compatible and of a similar scale to the surrounding residential area.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?
No issues have been identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES
Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?
Bowling club representatives stated that they have obtained legal advice through their development partners regarding the site availability. They have stated that the site is in freehold ownership and that there are no barriers to having unrestricted access either currently or following any redevelopment of the site.

Information source: Information provided from owner.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?
There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.
### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The bowling club has engaged a development partner to work toward the delivery of the project. The club and their development partner, Kossway’s, are actively pursuing redevelopment therefore it is considered that the site is viable for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding viability of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

- The site has moderate accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 3).
- The site is occupied as a bowls club. The site is surrounded by residential properties.
- The bowling green is designated as open space and should not be built on.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

- The site is occupied by a bowls club which has circa 200 members. Southey bowling club wish to redevelop part of the car park to fund a new clubhouse on the site, improve the bowling club facilities and secure the financial future of the club.
- There should be no loss of sporting facilities for which there is demand.
- Redevelopment proposals should protect the residential amenity of the surrounding occupiers, especially with regard to privacy.
- Redevelopment proposals may need to consider secondary access to the site.
- Mitigating parking, traffic and road safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There will be no loss of the sporting facility as it is proposed to be retained in its current capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The club has advised that they are currently involved in discussions with the council highways team regarding ingress and egress from the site. It is understood that these discussions have also included the potential for a second access to the site. Whilst it may prove beneficial to the operation of the site, it is not considered vital to redevelopment of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Alternative options/uses

- Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its current use as a bowling club. Any proposal to redevelop the site would be determined via a planning application. If the site was not allocated in the plan then the open space criteria would render the entire site as open space, including the car park and club house which would restrict the expansion options desired by the club.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is surrounded by residential uses on all sides and has a singular point of vehicle access. Excluding the designated uses (bowling club, residential and open space), the site is only considered
potentially suitable for some community uses (D1). The council has not received any evidence to suggest alternative uses for the site.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Residential, bowls club, open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for housing in Merton. The bowling club will be retained in its current capacity.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):**
- 0 – 5 years
- 5 – 10 years
- >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential, Southey Bowling Club.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale of development being acceptable to residents and approved through the planning application process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 77 – 26 Bushey Road
Raynes Park Service Station
26 Bushey Road
Raynes Park
SW20 8LW

Area: 0.33 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Wellsborough Developments Limited, 131-133 Red Lion Road, Surbiton, Surrey KT6 7RQ. There are numerous leaseholders on the site who are all on one month rolling leases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Various users associated with the motoring industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is long and narrow, with a single point of entry from Bushey Road. The site contains a disused service station toward the Bushey Road entrance which is currently being utilised as a hand car wash. Behind the service station are smaller commercial units generally occupied by small vehicle repair related businesses. The site is generally surrounded on both eastern and western boundaries by the rear gardens of two storey residential properties. To the north of the site is a long narrow warehouse utilised as an image processing and data storage facility accessed via Kingston Road. To the south of the site on the opposite side of Bushey Road is a place of worship, and a parade of retail shops with residential dwellings above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Agent provided details at call for sites stage and site visit by council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Vehicle repair, maintenance, sales and valet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Residential – Kingsley Nicholas &amp; Ward on behalf of Rightway Corporation Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

- Most buildings on the site are beyond economic repair and some units have been demolished.
- Planning permission was obtained (following appeals) for a new B1 use/development comprising 11 units however it lapsed during an extended marketing period because there was little to no interest.
The owner has received numerous interest regarding residential development on the site. Residential development would result in significantly lower traffic volumes compared to the existing use of the site.

Local residents/organisations

Apostles Residents Association – the representation only requested an extension to the consultation period for this site (Stage 2a).

Apostles Residents Association – it is unsustainable to continue proposing residential development on private open space. This places additional need on both private and public transport which in turn increases energy consumption and pollution. Residential use is therefore unacceptable. There is demand for industrial uses on the site as evidenced by existing occupancy. The primary consideration if it is to change should be to community use or open space. If there is to be a change of use to housing it should have heights to eaves or ridgelines no greater than the adjacent housing on Bronson and Kingston Roads, no flat roof development should be allowed and all development should be family homes with gardens similar to the Apostles streets. Higher density is unacceptable. (Stage 3).

Barnes – objection due to lack of infrastructure, in particular parking and GP surgeries.

Colebourne – the site is too restrictive in size and shape for residential development and it should include land along Kingston Road also.

Conservative Group – use should be retained or could be a school. A second pedestrian access should also be provided from Lower Downs Road/Kingston Road junction (Site 41).

Dove – adjacent landowner who opposes development. Issues with overcrowding, noise, space, privacy, sunlight, parking, traffic.

Fischer P – submits that the redevelopment in unsustainable and will result in additional numbers of residents having to commute, to fewer recreation facilities, public or private. This increases travel by car or public transport and thus energy consumption and pollution. Redevelopment should be for public open space and/or community use. Vehicular access to the site is width restricted and will be inappropriate for residential use both on servicing and emergency access grounds (Stage 2a and Stage 3).

Gregory – (generic regarding Raynes Park) concern about additional housing without provision for additional infrastructure such as drainage, schools, health, open space, and parking.

Jones – oppose due to understanding that site was to be retained for commercial use and not residential. If developed for residential use it will be too imposing and overlook properties on Bronson Road. Loss of established trees. Lack of additional infrastructure to support housing.

Lund & Campion – objection due to overshadowing, blocking light, impeding the view of trees, construction impacts.

Marti – objection due to overcrowding, parking, traffic and safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity. Access issues from Bushey Road. Overlooking into rear yard. Increase in traffic will cause more noise and pollution. Area is prone to flooding. Potential health risk from former petrol station.

McGowan – opposition due to impact on their property. Impact on sunlight, design not in keeping with existing Victorian terraced housing.
Plant J – objection to housing due to demand for industrial land uses such as this site. If there is a change of use it should be for community use including public open space to rectify the current deficiency.

Quod – support for allocation for residential use as it accords to development plan policy at both local and strategic levels. The existing buildings on the site are time-expired and there is no demand for the existing premises. There is no justification not to proceed with council’s preferred use.

Rajagopalan – concerns relating to height of potential development and privacy effects, daylight and sunlight, parking.

Wimbledon Society – unsuited to housing due to size and shape, privacy of neighbouring properties. Provides opportunity for small scale commercial/studio type business which is less likely to cause disturbance to adjoining residential properties with noise and smell. Frontage to Bushey Road could be higher.

Wyatt – comments mainly in relation to Southey Bowling Club (Site 74) and refers to site 77 as being additional development putting additional pressure on the area.

Statutory Agencies
No consultation received.

Others
Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design (SBD) principles.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**The site is unsuitable for residential development**

The site is considered suitable for residential development based on the following reasons:

- There is an overwhelming demand for housing in the borough which is considered to outweigh the benefits of continued B1 use on this site;
- The surrounding area is characterised by residential development;
- Permission was granted for 11 industrial units which lapsed due to a lack of demand to implement the development. Redevelopment for continued B1 use has been proven to not be viable through marketing evidence and the failure to implement the approved redevelopment for B1 use;
- Continued B1 use is not desirable by council as evidenced by the refusal to grant planning permission which was only granted on appeal; and
- The existing tenants on the site are all operating on one month rolling leases which can be terminated and vacated at short notice. This is considered to contribute significant to the high occupancy as it is likely to draw demand for very low rents only.

**Potential effects on adjoining properties such as privacy, overlooking, shadowing/daylighting**

Numerous issues were raised from various parties which can generally be summarised as follows:

- Loss of open space from surrounding residential properties;
- Potential daylight, privacy and overlooking issues;
- The site is designated open space; and
- Potential noise effects.

The site is not considered to positively contribute to open space given that it comprises a developed site with B1 light industrial uses active on the site. The perception of open space relates to the fact that the existing buildings are...
single storey and views can be obtained over top of the existing buildings from adjoining properties. There was an existing planning permission, which has since lapsed, for a redevelopment of the site to provide an enhanced B1 service. The permission enabled 11 two storey industrial units located adjacent the eastern boundary. It is considered that there is a precedent regarding the appeal granted on the site (with regard to bulk and massing only) which is considered relevant in this case. However, the bulk and location of buildings are not known at this point in time. It is more appropriate for matters such as the loss of open space, daylighting, shadowing, overlooking and privacy to be considered through the planning application process when effects on adjoining properties can be quantified. It is considered that the site only has capacity for a limited number of residential units, of which one primary consideration would be maintaining an appropriate separation from adjoining properties. A suitable separation to ensure there were no adverse effects of daylighting, overlooking and noise would need to be achieved. For comparative purposes, the surrounding apostles residents association area has a density of approximately 59.35 units per ha. Converting this to the subject site would result in the site being able to accommodate 19.5 units, ignoring design aspects at this point in time.

**Parking, traffic and access**
The site currently accommodates a range of B1 uses with varying needs for vehicular access. Overall it is considered that redevelopment for an appropriately scaled residential development will reduce the total number of vehicles movements into and out of the site. Subject to the provision of appropriate access, onsite parking and manoeuvring, it is considered that the potential effects of redevelopment on parking, traffic and access will be reduced compared to the existing situation.

**Noise**
The site currently has existing B1 light industrial uses operating from it. It is considered that noise emanating from uses permitted on the site would be higher than if it were redeveloped for residential use. Potential noise impacts are likely to be reduced as a result of redevelopment. The precedent of the lapsed planning permission is also considered relevant in this case which provided for an expanded B1 development. Actual and potential noise effects will also be taken into account as part of a planning application to redevelop the site in order to mitigate potential effects as much as possible.

**Loss of trees on the site**
None of the trees are protected and the site is not in a conservation area. The trees can therefore be removed as of right either in their current form or as part of any redevelopment. This matter is not considered relevant as a result. It is expected that redevelopment for residential use should be able to provide an element of both private amenity and open space which could contribute to green space, including the provision of tree planting or the retention of existing trees.

**Design**
Specific design matters for any future development on the site will be assessed at the planning application stage. It is not appropriate to dictate design measures as part of a strategic allocation. However, it is considered that regard will need to be had to the nature of the surrounding Victorian terraced housing which is prevalent in the area.

**Contamination on the site**
The site may have potential contamination issues due to the extent of B1 uses associated with the motoring industry and the existence of a former petrol station on the site. Appropriate resting and remediation will be required as part of redevelopment to ensure there are no risks to human occupation or residential development.

**Lack of infrastructure such as schools, GP surgeries, open space**
Several representations referred to a lack of infrastructure in the area, predominantly for schools and healthcare facilities. The following matters are considered relevant and have been taken into account when considering the
potential effects of additional demand created by development:

- The site was assessed in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton for its suitability as a school but was rejected on grounds of size, access and contamination issues;
- As part of the Stage 3 consultation, a representation was received from the NHS South West London which stated: “The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms previous comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites ... to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments”;
- In addition, any planning permission would require Section 106/CIL contributions to be made to offset effects of additional demand created.

It is therefore considered that appropriate mechanisms are in place to ensure that additional demand on services is appropriately taken into account as part of redevelopment.

The site should be allocated for a school

The site was assessed in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton for its suitability as a school but was rejected on grounds of size, access and contamination issues.

Secured by Design principles

Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through the planning application phase.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

It is considered highly likely that the following matters will be required to be taken into account and appropriately mitigated through the planning application phase:

- Site specific design of future development having regard to the surrounding environment and amenity of adjoining properties;
- Potential access, traffic and parking effects;
- Potential noise effects;
- Potential daylighting, shadowing and overlooking effects;
- Remediation of existing contamination;
- Adherence to Secured by Design principles; and
- The site has been considered not suitable for a school or ongoing employment use.

It is considered there will be appropriate implementation of mitigation measures regarding the above.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

Generally speaking the site is considered to be suitable for residential use. The site is surrounded by residential development and the need for additional housing in the borough is well documented. Appropriate access and residential development could reasonably be provided on the site. Some issues will need to be addressed such as remediation of any contaminated soil on site and removal of the existing occupiers on site.

Aside from this, no significant site suitability constraints have been identified.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability that restrict possible residential development.
### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The agent acting on behalf of the owner has stated that it is in freehold ownership and is available for redevelopment.

Information source: Representations and meeting with landowner’s agent.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The potential costs associated with rendering the site suitable for residential use, for example remediation of the potential contamination.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

The owner is aware of the various issues the site faces for residential development. From a viability perspective the major concern is the remediation required to render the site suitable for residential use and the associated cost. The owner has had a preliminary site contamination report undertaken and is aware of the issues. The owner still considers the site suitable and thus viability is presumed to be implicit with this undertaking. Council has also been involved in a pre-application meeting with another party who seeks to develop it for residential use. This also provides evidence and support for the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site is likely to continue in the short term with the existing B use classes operating on the site.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is a former petrol station and currently in a relatively poor state. The site had planning permission to be redeveloped for B use classes however this lapsed due to a lack of interest from occupiers. These uses are therefore not considered to have any longevity on the site. The demand from current occupiers is related to the cheap letting rates offered by short term contracts. The size and shape of the site restrict the range of potential uses and it has been determined not suitable for a school accordingly. Being an out of centre location, most A use classes are also not suitable. The site could therefore be suitable for alternative C and D uses compatible with the residential nature the area located away from any town centre. The council has not been provided with evidence from the owners to suggest such uses would be viable however (with the exception of C3).

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site has a 10 year planning history relating to its redevelopment for light industry. The site had planning permission for eleven light industrial units, granted on appeal, which lapsed in 2011.

Part of the southern section of the site is susceptible to surface water flooding.
The site has a poor access to public transport services (PTAL 2).

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Site access arrangements require careful scrutiny/improvement.

Mitigating potential parking, traffic and safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Parts of the site are contaminated by its previous use as a petrol station and ongoing use for vehicle repairs. Development proposals will need to decontaminate the site.

Protecting the residential amenity of adjacent properties through sensitive design.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with surface water flooding.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

An appropriate transport assessment will be required for any redevelopment based on the nature of the existing access to Bushey Road. Key issues required to be addressed in the design of any development and transport assessment will be parking demand, traffic impact effects, mitigation measures for the entrances, and conflicts with other accesses/roads.

Residential amenity of adjacent properties will be addressed through the planning application phase.

The planning application will also need to address the issue of surface water flooding and incorporate suitable mitigation as a result.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

**Uses:** Residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is substantial need for housing in Merton.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):**

- **0 – 5 years**
- **5 – 10 years**
- **>10 years**

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Residential.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 01 – “P3” Hartfield Road Car Park
66-84 Hartfield Road
Wimbledon
SW19

Area: 0.45 ha

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: London Borough of Merton.

Occupier: Vacant – current use is a pay and display car park.

Site description: This site comprises a surface car park and is adjacent to the Sir Cyril Black Way bus interchange. There is dual pedestrian access to the car park from The Broadway and Sir Cyril Black Way and vehicular access is obtained from Hartfield Road.

To the north are retail units fronting Wimbledon Broadway (including Morrison’s supermarket, TK Maxx and Robert Dyas) and residential units. Nearby are a wide range of town centre type uses including commercial, office, café and restaurants, leisure, recreation and residential uses.

The site is located within the Wimbledon town centre boundary and the surrounding buildings have a range of building heights, from tall commercial premises to the north to the two-storey residential houses in Ashbourne Terrace to the east.

Information source: Council officers.

Current use: Car park.

Use suggested/organisation:
Commercial (Retail) – Morrison’s PLC
Community and public hall activities – Wimbledon Society
Mixed use residential and commercial with associated car parking– LB Merton
Major cultural development with appropriate supporting and community uses – Wimbledon Music Civitas Group

Allocated use: Any of the following or an appropriate mix of town centre type uses such as retail (A1 Use Class), café and restaurants (A3 Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), cultural, leisure and entertainment (D2 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class) and hotel (C1 Use Class). The site may incorporate residential development (C3 Use Class) on upper floors.
## Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Landowners/occupiers</strong></th>
<th>No representation received following call for sites.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local residents/organisations</strong></td>
<td>Liberal Democrat Group – agree that cumulative impacts on town centre parking must be considered if this site and nearby Site 28 (Wimbledon Theatre car park) are both developed. Previous plans for an underground multi-storey car park on this site and the removal of all parking at Site 28 would have resulted in a sizable portion of Wimbledon’s town centre parking being concentrated around an already congested one way system. The group is sympathetic to suggestions to use either site for community and public hall use. However, full consideration must be taken of the needs of the groups that would use such a space, e.g. Wimbledon Choral Society’s needs would be different to Wimbledon Opera Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merriman D – objection to the proposals other than for community and public hall activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morrisons Supermarkets Plc – general support for the allocation and the inclusion of retail use in council’s preferred use, however requests that the site is reserved for expansion of the existing store as it represents the only realistic opportunity to expand their store. It also requests amendment to the allocation to provide the opportunity to extend the existing Morrisons store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas B – if development is considered for the site it should be more in keeping with its surroundings as opposed to the monstrosity that was planned for the site in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whelan D – site should be retained as a car park. If in years to come the demand for parking reduces the site should be left as open space. They do not want the whole town centre built over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wimbledon E Hillside Residents Association – general comments regarding the DPD and areas of Wimbledon as a whole Representation does not specifically relate to the subject site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wimbledon Society – allocation should include provision for the bus station and reinstatement of the old civic hall. The future of the site should be formally linked with Site 28. If a proper performance site is provided it is unlikely that it would be practical to include residential use due to noise and general activity associated with such a use. Whether public parking is to be provided as part of redevelopment should be left open for later discussion when parking facilities for the whole town centre have been studied. The site could also incorporate the town centre combined heat and power scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory agencies</strong></td>
<td>English Heritage – the site seems more likely to be uncertain for the historic environment given the Core Strategy’s position in respect of tall buildings in Wimbledon Town Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLA – the bus stand on Sir Cyril Black Way is an important asset and must be protected from any potential development if bus services in the area are to be adequately provided. The draft allocation does not acknowledge the importance of the bus stand. TfL requests appropriate protection of the bus stand needs to be referred to unless a suitable alternative can be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service – development of the site may have an impact on policing needs. It was recommended that the site allocation be amended to include for community facilities such as policing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Molten Real Estate – sought clarification on the preferred use regarding “an appropriate mix of ...” and the intention of the wording, believing it states that all of the preferred uses must be included. The allocation should provide for offices. The site should be developed for a large floor plate office development.

The John Innes Society – wants consideration of the fact that existing open level surface car parks provide an “open to the sky” ambience in an otherwise overbearingly dense built up environment and views across to the dome of Wimbledon Theatre. The allocation should be subject to the provision of existing facilities elsewhere.

ThinkFuture – support for the suggested use of a major cultural development with appropriate supporting and community uses. Also supports other town centre uses but not large leisure chains. The site, in conjunction with Site 28, could strengthen Merton’s position as a creative hub and offer the world’s tourists a world class standard of entertainment.

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site should be allocated solely for cultural/community/public hall use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several representations were received suggesting that the entire site should be used for and limited to use for cultural, community or public hall type activities. Whilst the site was suggested as being suitable for such uses, no information regarding deliverability has been provided to the council therefore this cannot be supported within the Sites and Policies Plan. Wimbledon Town Centre is also currently served by three theatres, The Polka Theatre, New Wimbledon Theatre and Wimbledon College of Arts all of which are available for rent. It is considered that there is sufficient capacity within these existing theatres for existing demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on the site’s town centre location, restricting the use to one or two alternatives will unduly restrict the value and viability of the site to establish and grow the site within the town centre. It is considered most appropriate that a suitable town centre mixed-use development should be enabled on the site which would be largely driven by market demands to determine the most appropriate and profitable use of the land. It is considered that a range of town centre uses would contribute more positively to the vibrancy of the town centre. Taking into account the information above, the allocation does not preclude any cultural, community, or public hall use from being developed or promoted on the site, which is considered appropriate. If demand was sufficient and such a scheme was viable, there is no reason why it couldn’t be developed for that purpose. The allocation is considered to provide a suitable mechanism for delivering a potential range of uses which would benefit the town centre. The allocation is considered to also provide a suitable mechanism to deliver such uses on site, if they are viable and deliverable, even though anecdotal evidence suggests they are not viable and demand does not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of town centre parking/site should be retained as a car park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A parking survey in Wimbledon was undertaken in June 2012 and a technical report was provided regarding both on street and off street parking in the town centre. The survey concluded that the car park on the subject site was at capacity during weekend peak shopping hours, during week day peak hours, and later on in the evening. It is the busiest car park in Wimbledon. However, the survey also showed that overall there was an oversupply of parking in Wimbledon town centre and that even with the removal of the car parking from the subject site and that of Site 28 (P4), there would still be sufficient parking available within the town centre. At the time of redevelopment (likely post 2019), an assessment must be carried out to determine the cumulative impact of any potential loss of publicly available parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of offices/office building development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site allocation enables the provision of offices within any redevelopment of the site. It is known that there is demand for office space in Wimbledon town centre. Whether offices were included as part of any development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would be subject to viability testing in conjunction with the redevelopment of the site. Whilst the preference is for a suitable mixed use development to complement the town centre location, the allocation does not preclude an office based development. There is nothing in the allocation to preclude such use of the site, if the demand exists.

Site should be used for the expansion of the adjoining Morrisons supermarket
The site allocation does not preclude the expansion of the Morrisons supermarket. The site is considered appropriate for A1 retail use based on its town centre location. As stated above, the final use of the site will be subject to viability testing and subject to design as part of a planning brief to be developed for the site. It is considered that no action is necessary as the allocation enables such use of the site. Future ownership cannot be dictated by the plan however it is the council’s intention to prepare a planning brief for the site and dispose of the site on the open market.

Development should be in keeping with its surroundings
Any redevelopment of the site would be required to have specific regarding to the nature of the site and surrounding uses. The site is located within the town centre but has relatively unique boundaries with various uses such as offices, retail and residential. Specific regard would need to be had to council’s Tall Buildings Background Paper 2010 in particular.

Indicative massing plans have been draughted for the planning brief which takes into account the nature of the site and surrounding area. The massing plans have specific regard to the adjoining residential properties in Ashbourne Terrace and building heights along Hartfield Road and Sir Cyril Black Way in the vicinity of the site. Further investigation in this regard will be done through the development of the planning brief to ensure an appropriate scale of development is delivered on site.

Provision of the bus stand
The bus stand which is located at the eastern end of the site is occupied by London Buses. There is no lease in place securing London Buses to this site. The bus stand was removed from the area allocated for redevelopment there will be retained in its current capacity. The future of the bus stand area may be revisited as part of the planning brief.

Impact on policing needs
The potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The representation states that the allocation should be amended to include community uses. The allocation includes the potential to establish D1 uses on the site therefore it is considered that the concerns have been appropriately taken into account. In contrast, the most recent correspondence from the Metropolitan Police Service stated that a comprehensive review of policing needs in the borough has been undertaken and includes provision for sites allocated in the plan, and that no new policing needs have been identified as a result. As part of any redevelopment, the site would be subject to s106/CIL payments which can take into account infrastructure needs.

Development should be linked with Site 28
The following information states why it is considered that the two sites should not be formally linked together for delivery:

- The subject site has restrictive covenants in place until 2019 and the redevelopment is sought within the five year timeframe following this;
- Site 28 can be suitably delivered in the short term (prior to 2019) and enhance the profile of Wimbledon town centre and the frontage along The Broadway without being restricted by legal restrictions on development of the subject site;
- The subject site is proposed to be delivered through a planning brief to be developed by council. Site 28 will be delivered through a development brief with greater flexibility for a future owner/developer;
- The sites are physically separated from each other therefore practical obstructions exist to developing the
The only inherent link between the sites is the cumulative impact of town centre parking. It has been appropriately surveyed and acknowledged that further investigations are required in respect of the impact on town centre parking prior to development of either site; Site 28 is considered to be within the ‘cultural area’ of The Broadway identified in the Core Strategy whereas the subject site is not; and Cultural use of the subject site is not likely to be viable however could be complemented with Site 28 if necessary.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

**Site should be allocated solely for cultural/community/public hall use**

Regarding the representations received stating that the site should be used for cultural or community type uses only, it is not considered appropriate or logical to allocate the site solely for this use. This would unduly restrict the viability of a relatively large town centre site to be developed with a range of town centre uses which could enhance the profile of Wimbledon town centre. It is considered appropriate that the allocation provides for these uses to be established on site. If such a use is viable, even in conjunction with alternative uses, there is nothing in the allocation which prevents this from occurring. Whether the use is implemented will entirely depend on the viability of such a scheme. Council is providing sufficient avenues for such uses to be established through this allocation in the DPD. There are no barriers to implementation of such uses on the subject site. It is therefore considered that no action is necessary as the allocation enables such uses to be established.

**Loss of town centre parking/site should be retained as a car park**

It is acknowledged that the site represents the busiest car park in Wimbledon town centre. It is therefore acknowledged that redevelopment will have to have substantial regard to town centre parking provision as part of redevelopment. Preliminary studies suggest that underground parking could be provided on the site as part of redevelopment however the need to provide underground parking may affect the viability of development. It is considered that this is most appropriately resolved through the planning brief being developed for the site. There is sufficient town centre parking capacity even when considering the loss of parking on the subject site and The Broadway car park, however it is acknowledged that further investigation is required, particularly as demand for parking will emanate beyond the redevelopment of the subject site. It is considered that appropriate measures will be implemented to ensure appropriate mitigation of potential parking demands generated on the site and overall demand for the town centre.

**Offices – not precluded, subject to viability. No barriers to implementation**

The allocation provides for office use to be established on site. If offices are viable, even in conjunction with alternative uses, there is nothing in the allocation which prevents them from being established. Whether offices are implemented or not will entirely depend on the viability of a future scheme. Council is providing sufficient avenues for offices to be established through this allocation in the DPD. There are no barriers to implementation of office use on the subject site.

**Development in keeping with surroundings**

Design considerations as part of any redevelopment will be paramount in the final delivery of the site. The site is unique in that it borders a range of building uses and building heights within the town centre. Indicative massing plans have been drafted as part of the work being contributed to the draft planning brief. The draft plans have had specific regard to the sensitive nature of adjoining properties in Ashbourne Terrace and Sir Cyril Black Way, but also recognise the relatively highly developed nature and height of buildings along Hartfield Road and adjoining the site to the north. It is considered highly likely that specific regard will be had to the nature of adjoining sites and the surrounding area as part of the design and approval of the site. There are no barriers to implementation of such
measures to protect the amenity and other aspects of adjoining areas.

**Provision of the bus stand**
The suggested amendments have been implemented as the bus stand area on Sir Cyril Black Way has been removed from the area allocated for development.

**Impact on policing needs**
The potential impact on policing needs will be considered as part of the planning brief and any subsequent planning application to be submitted for redevelopment of the site. It is therefore considered that regard will be had to the potential impact on policing needs and mitigated accordingly.

**Development should be linked with Site 28**
As outlined above it is not considered suitable or appropriate to formally link the development of the two town centre sites for various reasons. It is therefore considered inappropriate to formally link the development of the site, therefore no such measures will be implemented.

---

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for a range of town centre uses based on its location in Wimbledon town centre and the definition of town centre type uses in Merton’s adopted Core Planning Strategy 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding the suitability of the site for town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is subject to an existing legal agreement dated 25th January 1999 between the Council and Friends Provident which requires the owner of the subject site to provide a public car park on the site of no less than 150 spaces. Should the car park be redeveloped this requirement can be suspended for six months during which time 50 spaces should be provided. If this is not possible, then financial compensation (of an as yet undetermined amount) is likely to be incurred. This agreement expires on 25th January 2019. For this reason, the site is not available for redevelopment until following the expiry of this agreement (unless agreed otherwise). The development timeframe is therefore considered to be 2019 – 2024. It is anticipated that the planning brief and planning permissions would have been consulted on and determined by this stage therefore enabling a sufficient window of development within the lifetime of the Sites and Policies Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not apparent that the site could be developed within the confines of the agreement without financial compensation, which may affect viability. It is considered more appropriate to delay development of the site until the agreement has expired and is no longer applicable. The site is still available for development within the lifetime of the DPD even taking into account the restriction of the existing agreement. This will allow sufficient time to develop a planning brief for the site and consult on it prior to adoption of a planning brief and disposal of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.
## Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viability will be explored in greater detail as part of the planning brief to be developed for the site. The site will be disposed of on the open market and ultimately the sale price will dictate the viability of the site. If the site is sold to a developer then viability for redevelopment is considered implicit. Detailed viability investigations will be undertaken during the preparation of the planning brief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any issues regarding viability will be considered and resolved as part of the planning brief to be prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is located within the central shopping area of Wimbledon town centre. The pedestrian route between the car park and The Broadway falls within the Wimbledon Broadway conservation area. There is a range of building heights and differing built character adjacent to the site.

The site is in an area with excellent accessibility to public transport (PTAL 6b). Hartfield Road and Sir Cyril Black Way suffer from congestion at peak times. A small part of the southern corner of the site is within a critical drainage area.

An expanded area including this site was allocated in Merton’s Unitary Development Plan 2003 for a mix of uses including arts, cultural, community, shopping and hotel.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

This site is located adjacent to the primary shopping area, core shopping area and secondary shopping area at different points along the boundary, therefore an active frontage should be provided on the ground floor where possible.

In a mixed use development residential uses should be on the upper floors.

Core Strategy Policy CS14 makes reference to the appropriateness of tall buildings in Wimbledon town centre. In this case the areas adjacent the site to the south and west are sensitive to tall buildings. Regard will also need to be given to the adjoining conservation area and the proximity to the New Wimbledon Theatre which is a grade II listed building.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

Pedestrian access between Hartfield Road, Sir Cyril Black Way and The Broadway should be retained and enhanced.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The planning brief to be developed and consulted on will address most of the issues raised above including:  
  - Reference and adherence to the Tall Building Background Paper;  
  - The final mix of uses within the redevelopment;  
  - The cumulative loss of town centre parking (if any) in associated with the Wimbledon Theatre Car Park (Site 28); and  
  - Other parking, access and traffic related matters. |

Suitable mitigation related to the critical drainage area will be more appropriately determined through the planning application phase. This is considered to be a minor issue due to the small portion of the site covered by the critical...
Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would be retained as a car park. Council’s property team has undertaken an asset review and considered that due to there being sufficient town centre parking and viability reasons, the site is available for disposal. It is therefore considered that this option has been assessed by the property department and that retaining the site as a car park is not appropriate in this instance.

Alternative uses on the site – based on the town centre location, the allocation includes a wide range of uses suitable for the site. It is considered that there are no suitable alternative uses for the site given the range included in the allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> A mixed use development of appropriate town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (if relevant):</strong> Capacity for town centre uses will depend on market demand. There is demand for housing in Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:</strong> Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s):</strong> 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</strong> Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong> Various.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent barriers to development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 22 – Patrick Doody
Pelham Road
Wimbledon
SW19 1NX

Area: 0.12 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> NHS Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust, 120 The Broadway, London SW19 1RH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> NHS – Patrick Doody Clinic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site consists of a part single and part two storey health centre building. The site is surrounded by two storey houses but on the southern side of Pelham Road are three storey blocks of flats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> NHS information provided and council officer site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Health Centre (D1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Health Centre (D1 Use Class) and Dwellings (C3 Use Class) – Sutton and Merton PCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> A healthcare (D1 Use Class) led mixed use scheme with some residential (C3 Use Class) or solely residential (C3 Use Class) if the community service is discontinued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

The NHS has provided the following information through several stages of public consultation.

- the site will be available for redevelopment within the next 3 – 7 years;
- the Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites (those not subject to redevelopment in the Sites and Policies Plan) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments;
- the Patrick Doody centre is desirable for ongoing healthcare/GP services and the provision of residential use during all stages of the public consultation;
- Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust (PCT) will cease to exist from 01 April 2013 and will be replaced by the Merton Clinical Commissioning Group Merton Partnership Health and Wellbeing Board and the Clinical which will replace the PCT for strategic health matters;
- the NHS stated that delivery of the site would occur in conjunction with private sector/CIL funding where possible; and
the NHS has also confirmed that the Patrick Doody clinic is currently accepting additional capacity whilst the Nelson Hospital is undergoing redevelopment.

Local residents/organisations

Chedumbrum L – the Patrick Doody clinic should be retained in its current state. Better marketing of the facilities might enhance revenue streams without losing the buildings themselves.

Conservative Group – the site allocation should be for healthcare or residential, not both.

Craig J – the clinic is very well used and should be retained as is.

Goldstein P – prior to purchasing an adjoining house in 2011 contact was made with council and the NHS who stated there were no pending orders for development on the site. Development will damage the lifestyle and value of the property and others on Pelham Road. Also states that there is a lack of NHS clinics. Construction impacts would result in noise and distraction. Can sympathise with a sensitive expansion of the clinic but it should not be extended upwards or have residential use.

Goldstein D (partner of above) – surprised to learn that the nearby Grade II listed buildings are more of a consideration. Does not agree that provision of residential use in a mixed use development will contribute positively to security and a safer environment. Surgeries are not a target for burglaries and they are not open on weekends. Parking is already congested on Pelham Road.

MacNab W – it is a valuable centre in a good location with good public transport links. The centre has a range of services of particular value to the nearby elderly persons home and young population. Any development must be carefully worked out architecturally to suit the conservation area and the adjoining small Victorian houses.

Pigott S – objection to a change of use unless it is accompanied by a change in controlled hours and residents’ only permits, or an appropriate level of onsite parking is provided. There are already existing parking concerns in the vicinity.

Robinson L – (generic comments regarding the greater area and other sites) objection due to increase in traffic and resulting effects. There are already parking pressures in the area. Also states that there is a lack of supporting infrastructure for additional residential uses, namely schools and doctors surgeries. New flats are likely to “date” quickly and damage the character of the area. Flats will also result in an increase in rubbish and pollution.

Shaw J – objection to residential use. Parking issues will result. The existing centre offers a valuable service and it would be a shame if the services were reduced.

Statutory Agencies

NHS – support for preferred use. The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms previous comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites that are (excluding the subject site and others) to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments.

Others

No other consultation received.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

Objection to residential use/the existing use should be retain
The NHS has confirmed to council that the site will be surplus to requirements and available for potential redevelopment within a 3-7 year timeframe. The site is currently accommodating additional services from the Nelson Hospital which is being redeveloped. It is beyond the council’s control to enforce the retention of the existing uses on the site because the site is owned by the NHS. However, the allocation enables the provision of new or continuing healthcare services (D1 Use Class) on the site. The council acknowledges that an appropriate mixed use development may be able to be designed, and is not opposed to this in principal. This is particularly relevant if the existing service closes or relocates.

If the NHS vacates and/or disposes of the site, it is considered unlikely to be suitable for continued use due to a lack of alternative providers of such uses and the NHS considers there is sufficient capacity in existing services. However, the allocation provides for ongoing D1 use therefore enabling this to occur, if viable. If an alternative D1 use is not possible on the site, redevelopment for residential purposes is considered the most appropriate use based on the nature of the surrounding area and the need for housing in the borough.

**Potential effects on adjoining properties**

Issues were raised from an adjoining property owner regarding potential noise impacts associated with construction and redevelopment for residential use. It is acknowledged that potential effects from construction may result from any future redevelopment of the site. It is considered appropriate to determine the actual and potential effects during the planning application phase where when the scale and form of development will be known. It is anticipated that council would impose appropriate conditions regarding the mitigation of noise, dust, construction traffic and other related matters on any future permission. This is standard practice and will ensure any potential effects are mitigated to an appropriate level.

It was also submitted that any redevelopment of the site should not increase the envelope of the existing building. Potential effects of any change to the built form cannot be quantified at this point in time as part of the site allocation. It is acknowledged and accepted however that bulk, location and design of any future buildings will be a primary consideration of any planning application to redevelop the site. These processes are commonplace through the planning phase to ensure that significant adverse effects on adjoining property do not result.

**Parking and traffic**

It is acknowledged that the site and surrounding area is sensitive to new development and potential effects on existing parking demand. This is particularly relevant when considering nearby council car parks on The Broadway and Hartfield Road are also being allocated within the Sites and Policies Plan. It is considered that if the site is redeveloped or continued for the existing healthcare use then provision should be made where possible to retain some parking on site. However, the site has a PTAL 6a rating with good public transport links. It is therefore considered appropriate that any future development could be considered for permit free development as a result. This will be determined as part of any future planning application to redevelop the site. Redevelopment is not likely to generate a significant amount of traffic, particularly if the development is permit free.

**Future development should be architecturally sensitive to adjoining development**

It is acknowledged that any redevelopment of the site will have to consider various design aspects in order to achieve an acceptable proposal. The following matters are considered relevant:

- the subject site is not in a Conservation Area (as stated in one representation) and the nearest Conservation Area is approximately 200 m;
- development will need to respect the setting of the Grade II listed building situated opposite the site;
- acknowledge the existing terraced housing on both sides of the site on Pelham Road;
- avoid impacts on properties to the rear of the site on Griffiths Road; and
- if a mix use development is proposed, residential uses should be on upper floors and it should facilitate the provision of well-designed community uses on lower floors.
Potential effects on land value
No evidence was provided in the representation that quantified the actual or potential effects on land values in the vicinity. It is also noted that it is not a relevant planning consideration.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
There are potential barriers to implementation of the site being retained for healthcare/community use and thus not used for residential purposes. This is due to the site being in NHS ownership who has stated that the site will be surplus to requirements in the near future. If the site was not allocated for potential alternative use following termination of the services on the site, the site would become vacant and the future would be uncertain. Provision is therefore made for ongoing D1 uses which are considered appropriate based on existing and historic use of the site, however the allocation recognises that this is unlikely to be feasible or viable, therefore the most appropriate alternative use is residential. Based on the information available it is considered that including a residential allocation will at least ensure the future of the site following termination of NHS services. This is deemed a more appropriate use of the site than to risk it becoming vacant and a potential security and environmental health risk to owners and neighbours in the vicinity.

The actual and potential effects on all adjoining properties will need to be quantified and assessed accordingly once the scale and type of any redevelopment is known. This is most appropriately determined and considered as part of any planning application to redevelop the site or for a change of use. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of appropriate mitigation measures of future development on adjoining properties. It is not envisaged that if the site was redeveloped for residential use that the effects would be materially different from the existing use of the site. It is considered that if the site is redeveloped then a logical extension to the existing terrace may be appropriate whether it is a mixed use or solely residential development. Regard would need to be given to the nature of the existing residential character in the vicinity of the site. Planning permission could be refused if an the design is not considered suitable.

Similarly, parking and traffic related matters will need to be considered when the scale and type of development is known. Depending on the future use of the site, the provision of some onsite parking may be appropriate. However it is acknowledged that the site has a PTAL 6a rating therefore redevelopment could be considered for a permit free development at the time a planning application is made. It is considered that all concerns regarding parking and traffic in the area will be taken into account through the planning application phase.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered suitable for both continued/expanded D1 use as evidenced by the nature of the existing use on the site. In addition, based on the nature of the existing and surrounding environment being predominantly residential, the site is considered suitable for residential purposes. The site also benefits from a PTAL 6a rating which also aides its suitability for residential purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Site visit by council officers, council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site suitability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


The NHS has stated that the site is in their ownership and will be surplus to requirements in approximately 3 – 7 years. The site will therefore be available within the lifetime of the Sites and Policies Plan.

Information source: Information provided from NHS.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The viability of continued healthcare services is considered to be implicit based on the existing services operating on the site. The NHS is rationalising services and this site could become surplus to requirements. It is considered that the market would influence the viability of any alternative use to be established on the site. It is considered that the site will be viable and an attractive development based on the location of the site and the potential to establish a high quality development in SW19 for which there is demand in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downing House (a.k.a. Pelham High School), on the opposite side of Pelham Road is a grade II listed building. The site is within an area with an excellent level of access to public transport (PTAL 6a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential loss of health facilities (existing services could however be provided at the proposed Local Care Centre at the Nelson Hospital).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the residential amenity of the adjacent properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of uses on site including residential will facilitate the provision of well designed community uses on lower floors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of uses that occupies the building for 24 hours has benefits in terms of community safety within the site and on the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of spring 2013, the clinic was accommodating additional services which have been relocated from the Nelson Hospital while it is redeveloped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The NHS has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity within existing services when taking into account the loss of services at the Patrick Doody clinic. The site is currently accommodating additional services whilst the Nelson Hospital is redeveloped however this is a temporary situation.
The setting of the listed building will be taken into account as part of any planning application to redevelop the site. If a mixed use development is proposed these matters should be taken into account and determined through the planning application phase.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain existing lawfully established use. Once the services are relocated from the site the NHS has advised it would be disposed of. It is unlikely to be pursued for continued healthcare services and the most commercial interest is likely to be from converting it to residential use. The council considers it more appropriate to iron out initial issues at this point in time with a strategic allocation, prior to the use being relocated.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for residential uses as an alternative which is considered the most appropriate use for the based on the nature of the surrounding environment and emerging policy.

---

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> Community, healthcare, residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (if relevant):</strong> NHS has advised that the existing services will not be needed on the site once the local care centre is operational. There is capacity for housing in Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:</strong> Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s):</strong> 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:</strong> Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong> Residential, healthcare providers or community services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

Achieving a suitable design for any redevelopment which acknowledges the listed building and adjoining properties.
General Information

Site 28 – “P4” Land Adjoining Wimbledon Theatre
111-127 The Broadway
Wimbledon
SW19 1QG

Area: 0.21 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> The London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Vacant – current use is a surface car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> This site is a surface car park located off The Broadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining the site boundary to the west is the New Wimbledon Theatre. To the south of the site is the South Wimbledon Community Club and offices. Adjacent the site to the north are mixed use commercial and residential developments. The site is predominately surrounded by buildings ranging in height from two to four storeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This site is located in the Wimbledon town centre boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current use:</strong> Car park (Sui Generis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Business use (B1) – London Borough of Merton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major cultural development with appropriate supporting and community uses – Wimbledon Music Civitas Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Any of the following or an appropriate mix of town centre type uses such as retail (A1 Use Class), café and restaurants (A3 Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), cultural, leisure and entertainment (D2 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class) and hotel (C1 Use Class). The site may incorporate residential development (C3 Use Class) on upper floors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consultation Responses Summary

### Landowners/occupiers

No representation received following the call for sites stage.

### Local residents/organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bell Hammer</td>
<td>preferred use for the site should be offices and that there is demand for quality new office space in Wimbledon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedumbrum L</td>
<td>site should be retained in its current capacity as a car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colebourne S</td>
<td>Wimbledon town centre would benefit from the site being developed to match the height and massing opposite. However, parking for the theatre and the Sainsbury’s across the road will be a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group</td>
<td>the site should be retained as a car park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Democrat Group</td>
<td>cumulative impacts on town centre parking must be considered if this site and nearby Site 01 (P3 Hartfield Road Car Park) are both developed. The group is sympathetic to suggestions to use the site for community and public hall use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacNab D</td>
<td>the site is a valuable car park resource for Wimbledon town centre. Any more development would be out of keeping with the surrounding area along The Broadway. A saturation point has been reached with regard to entertainment venues. Any building will detract from the views of the adjoining Wimbledon Theatre. Development would result in an increase in noise and air pollution from traffic (considers the site a sink).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigott S</td>
<td>objection to any residential/retail use unless it is accompanied by an increase in controlled parking hours in the neighbourhood controlled parking zone 4F after 1800 hours when evening theatre users use the parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson L</td>
<td>objection due to increase in traffic and resulting effects. Loss of parking and affect on surrounding streets. There are already substantial pressures on the adjoining streets due to theatre users. A loss of the car park would compound existing issues. Also states that there is a lack of supporting infrastructure for additional residential uses, namely schools and doctors surgeries. New flats are likely to “date” quickly and damage the character of the area. Flats will also result in an increase in rubbish and pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw J</td>
<td>objection due to loss of town centre parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whelan D</td>
<td>site should be retained as a car park. If in years to come the demand for parking reduces the site should be left as open space. They do not want the whole town centre built over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchelow C</td>
<td>objection due to loss of town centre parking. Also states that high rise buildings will affect the character of the existing area. The provision of residential use will result in additional traffic congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon E Hillside Residents Association</td>
<td>general comments regarding the DPD and areas of Wimbledon as a whole. The representation does not specifically relate to the subject site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Society</td>
<td>the future of the site should be formally linked with Site 01. This is essential for the provision of a public cultural hall and leisure facility as a replacement for the old Civic Hall. If one site is developed without such a provision the other must be able to provide this space. If a proper performance site is provided it is unlikely that it would be practical to include residential use due to noise and general activity associated with such a use. Whether public parking is to be provided as part of redevelopment should be left open for later discussion when parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilities for the whole town centre have been studied. The site could also incorporate the town centre combined heat and power scheme.

**Statutory agencies**

English Heritage – the site would benefit from more regard being given to the impact of the adjoining listed building and that any proposed cultural use should support development that is sympathetic to the heritage asset’s significance. Additional concerns were raised as part of Stage 3 regarding the reference to the Tall Building Background Paper. The inclusion of the site as being appropriate for a tall building should be justified.

Sport England – statement noting that the site allocation includes the provision for leisure uses.

**Others**

South Molten Real Estate – objection to the inclusion of the reference to active street frontages which normally translates to A1, A3, A4 or A5 uses and considers that Wimbledon town centre has an oversupply of such uses. The prominence of these uses has degraded Wimbledon over time and also reduces the value of office developments. Active street frontages should consider offices at ground floor level.

ThinkFuture – support for mix of town centre uses. Also supports other town centre uses but not large leisure chains. It would be great to include some form of performance arts/exhibition space which could also be used by the local community. The site, in conjunction with Site 01, could strengthen Merton’s position as a creative hub and offer the world’s tourists a world class standard of entertainment.

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

*Site should be allocated for cultural/community/public hall use*

Several representations were received suggesting that the entire site should be used for and limited to use for cultural, community or public hall type activities. No available means of delivering these suggested uses currently exist and there is no known commercial interest in funding these uses for the site. Wimbledon Town Centre is also currently served by three theatres, The Polka Theatre, Wimbledon Theatre and Wimbledon College of Arts all of which are available for rent. It is considered that there is sufficient capacity within these existing theatres for existing demand. This was supported in other representations made as well as formally identified during a Borough Plan Advisory Committee of 21 May 2012 regarding the site.

Based on the site’s town centre location, restricting the use to one or two alternatives will unduly restrict the value and viability of the site to establish and grow the site within the town centre. It is considered most appropriate that a suitable town centre mixed-use development should be enabled on the site which would be largely driven by market demands to determine the most appropriate, profitable and efficient use of the land. It is considered that a range of town centre uses would contribute more positively to the vibrancy of the town centre. Taking into account the information above, the allocation does not preclude any cultural, community, or public hall use from being developed or promoted on the site, which is considered appropriate. If demand was sufficient and such a scheme was viable, there is no reason why it couldn’t be developed for that purpose. The allocation is considered to provide a suitable mechanism for delivering a potential range of uses which would benefit the town centre. The allocation is considered to also provide a suitable mechanism to deliver such uses on site, if they are viable and deliverable, even though anecdotal evidence suggests they are not viable and demand does not exist.

*Loss of town centre parking/site should be retained as a car park*

A parking survey in Wimbledon was undertaken in June 2012 regarding both on street and off street parking in the area. The survey concluded that the car park was typically busy and it was often at greater than 90% capacity during
the peak periods during the week and on Saturday’s. A majority of all stays were for less than one hour. It is therefore evident that this is a valuable car park due to its high use and location in Wimbledon Town Centre. Based on this information, parking needs for any redevelopment should be considered and provided onsite or nearby (i.e. within a five minute walk) where possible.

Indicative massing and feasibility studies (undertaken as part of a draft development brief) suggest that it is possible to provide up to two levels of underground parking which could provide up to 70 spaces within a redeveloped site. This would be sufficient to cater for at least the existing parking capacity that would otherwise be lost from the site. The provision of underground parking will be considered as part of a development package at the time a planning application is submitted. Further investigation will be required to investigate parking demand in accordance with viable uses for the site during the development brief to be prepared for the site. Any resulting changes to the amount of parking provided on the site or potential alteration to existing CPZ’s will also be investigated as part of the development brief.

Provision of offices/office building development
The site allocation enables the provision of offices within any redevelopment of the site. It is known that there is demand for quality new office space in Wimbledon town centre. Whether offices were included as part of any development would be subject to viability testing in conjunction with the redevelopment of the site. Whilst the preference is for a suitable mixed use development to complement the town centre location, the allocation does not preclude an office based development. There is nothing in the allocation to preclude such use of the site, if the demand exists.

Development should be in keeping with its surroundings
Any redevelopment of the site would be required to have specific regard to the nature of the site and surrounding uses. The site is located within the town centre but has relatively unique boundaries with office, retail, residential uses and the Grade II listed Wimbledon Theatre. Specific regard would need to be had to council’s Tall Buildings Background Paper 2010 in particular which outlines the site as being sensitive to tall buildings.

Indicative massing plans have been draughted which take into account the nature of the site and surrounding area as part of the development brief. The massing plans have specific regard to the adjoining theatre, office, retail and residential properties along The Broadway and in the vicinity of the site. Further investigation in this regard will be done through the development of the development brief to ensure an appropriate scale of development is delivered on site.

It was also raised that the site is not suitable for tall buildings. The allocation refers to the Core Planning Strategy Policy CS14 which has regard to Merton’s Tall Buildings Background Paper 2010. It states Wimbledon Town Centre as being appropriate for tall buildings. However, it goes on to illustrate that the subject site is sensitive to tall buildings for various reasons, but including the fact it is adjoining the Wimbledon Theatre and that tall buildings would be more appropriately clustered either to the west or east along The Broadway in the vicinity of other existing tall buildings. The allocation does not promote tall buildings on the site as suggested.

Lack of supporting infrastructure for new residential development, particularly schools and doctors surgeries
Several representations referred to a lack of infrastructure in the area, predominantly for schools and healthcare facilities. The following matters are considered relevant and have been taken into account when considering the potential effects of additional demand created by development:

- The site was assessed in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton for its suitability as a school but was rejected on grounds of size and external space requirements;
- As part of the Stage 3 consultation, a representation was received from the NHS South West London which stated:
“The Primary Care advisor has reviewed all sites and confirms previous comments that there is sufficient capacity in existing sites ... to meet primary healthcare demand from new housing developments”;

- In addition, any planning permission would require Section 106/CIL contributions to be made to offset effects of additional demand created.

**Development should be linked with Site 01**

The following information states why it is considered that the two sites should not be formally linked together for delivery:

- Site 01 has restrictive covenants in place until 2019 and the redevelopment on the subject site is desired for 2013 – 2017;
- The subject site is not reliant on Site 01 for delivery;
- The subject site is proposed to be delivered through a development brief which will have more input from future owners/developers. Site 01 will be delivered through a planning brief;
- The sites are physically separated from each other therefore practical obstructions exist to developing the sites together;
- The only inherent link between the sites is the cumulative impact of town centre parking. It has been appropriately surveyed and acknowledged that further investigations are required in respect of the impact on town centre parking prior to development; and
- The subject site is considered to be within the cultural area of The Broadway whereas the Site 01 is not.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

**Site should be allocated solely for cultural/community/public hall use**

Regarding the representations received stating that the site should be used for cultural or community type uses only, it is not considered appropriate or logical to solely allocate the site for this use. This would unduly restrict the viability of a relatively large town centre site to be developed with a range of town centre uses which could enhance the profile of Wimbledon town centre. It is considered appropriate that the allocation provides for these uses to be established on site. If such a use is viable, even in conjunction with alternative uses, there is nothing in the allocation which prevents this from occurring. Whether the use is implemented will entirely depend on the viability of such a scheme. Council is providing sufficient avenues for such uses to be established through the allocation in the DPD. There are no barriers to implementation of such uses on the subject site.

**Loss of town centre parking/site should be retained as a car park**

It is acknowledged that the site is a busy car park in Wimbledon town centre. It is therefore acknowledged that redevelopment may have to provide some or all of the require parking provision as part of redevelopment. It is considered appropriate that the parking capacity and demand in the town centre should be assessed collectively where possible in conjunction with Site 01 and other developments in the town centre (for example Site 01 may provide enough that would otherwise be lost from both sites). Preliminary studies suggest that underground parking could be provided on the site as part of redevelopment however the need to provide underground parking may affect the viability of development. It is considered that this is most appropriately resolved through the development brief being prepared for the site. There are no apparent barriers regarding the overall provision of parking in the town centre, however it is acknowledged that further investigation is required, particularly as demand for parking could possibly emanate beyond the redevelopment of the subject site. It is considered that redevelopment will result need to address and/or mitigate any loss of town centre parking. This is considered an appropriate mechanism of implementing and maintaining necessary demand for town centre parking.

**Provision of offices/office building development**

The allocation enables office uses to be established on site. If offices are viable, even in conjunction with alternative uses, there is nothing in the allocation which prevents them from being established. Whether offices are
implemented or not will entirely depend on the viability and demand of a future scheme. Council is providing sufficient avenues for offices to be established through this allocation in the DPD. There are no barriers to implementation of office use on the subject site.

**Development should be in keeping with surroundings**

Design considerations as part of any redevelopment will be paramount in the final delivery of the site for various reasons. The site is unique in that it borders a range of uses and building heights within the town centre. Indicative massing plans have been drafted as part of the work being contributed to the draft development brief. The draft plans have had specific regard to the sensitive nature of adjoining properties in Palmerston Road, Russell Road and The Broadway. It is considered highly likely that specific regard will be had to the nature of adjoining sites and the surrounding area as part of the design and approval of the site. There are no barriers to implementation of such measures to protect the amenity and other aspects of adjoining areas whilst recognising that the site is located in the town centre.

**Lack of supporting infrastructure for new residential development, particularly schools and doctors surgeries**

The provision for additional infrastructure required as a result of development will be determined and implemented as part of a planning application to redevelop the site. A planning application for redevelopment would be subject to the appropriate s106/CIL agreement depending on when it is made. It is considered highly likely that these matters will be taken into account and implemented.

**Development should be linked with Site 01**

As outlined above it is not considered suitable or appropriate to formally link the development of the two town centre sites for various reasons. It is considered appropriate and acknowledged that a collective study will be required with regard to town centre parking.

---

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for a range of town centre uses based on its location in Wimbledon town centre and the definition of town centre type uses in Merton’s adopted Core Planning Strategy 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding the suitability of the site for town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

---

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in the freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. There is a licence to allow use by the tenant of 105 – 109 The Broadway of a strip of the car park for fire escape purposes. This licence can be ended at any time but this action could render the property at 105 – 109 The Broadway unusable. It is therefore anticipated this requirement will be physically accommodated as part of any new development. Otherwise there is no restriction to the availability of the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding the site availability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

It is considered that a viable development will be conceivable on the site based on the fact it is relatively large, vacant and situated within Wimbledon town centre. The allocation also includes residential use which will aid development viability.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of future development.

Other Issues

Strategic planning factors

The adjoining New Wimbledon Theatre is a grade II listed building.

The site is situated within Wimbledon’s secondary shopping frontage and is located within the main shopping area of Wimbledon.

The site is in an area with excellent accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 6b).

A very small portion of the site on the south western extent is in a critical drainage area.

Have any other issues been identified?

The site boundary is adjoined to the west by the grade II listed building, New Wimbledon Theatre, and therefore development proposals will need to be sensitively designed to demonstrate how they conserve and enhance the significance of the New Wimbledon Theatre.

Core Strategy Policy CS14 makes reference to the appropriateness of tall buildings in Wimbledon town centre, however in this case the height, scale and massing of any development must relate sensitively to the adjacent New Wimbledon Theatre.

This site is located within close proximity to the central shopping area in Wimbledon and therefore may be appropriate for a mix of uses to help provide an active street frontage.

Although large vehicles servicing the theatre frequently operate from the street, this is inappropriate activity in a constrained residential street. As a result these operations can cause problems for residents. Increased on-street servicing activities would further impact on traffic movement and road safety, on site provision is therefore required.

There are road safety issues associated with the Russell Road junction. Remedial action is therefore required to mitigate against these problems together with issues relating to neighbourhood parking, picking up/setting down of patrons, traffic and road safety impacts.

Following the closure of the car park and whilst traffic patterns settle, some local streets might experience localised problems as patrons seek on-street spaces. However, overall the total number of trips in adjoining side streets should reduce as patrons find new alternatives. The council may therefore wish to secure monitoring data following closure of the site from future developers.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.
Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The development brief to be developed and consulted on will address most of the issues raised above including:

- Reference and adherence to the Tall Buildings Background Paper;
- A suitable design which conserves and enhances the setting of the Wimbledon Theatre
- The cumulative loss of town centre parking (if any) in association with the Hartfield Road Car Park (Site 01); and
- Other parking, access and traffic related matters.

Suitable mitigation related to the Critical Drainage Area will be more appropriately determined through the planning application phase. This is considered to be a minor issue due to the small portion of the site covered by the critical drainage area.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use in the interim. The council has determined that the site is surplus to requirements and will be released to the market and disposed accordingly. It is likely that the site would be developed in accordance with emerging policy for town centres. The council considers it more appropriate to provide a strategic planning direction for future development to ensure certainty around the types of uses and form of development to occur on the site.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of uses considered appropriate in the town centre location in accordance with local and national policy and guidance.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: A mixed use development of appropriate town centre uses.

Capacity (if relevant): Capacity for town centre uses will depend on market demand. There is demand for housing in Merton.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council

Potential occupiers: Various.

What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?

No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 31 – Wimbledon Community Centre
28 St George’s Road
Wimbledon
SW19 4DP

Area: 0.06 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freeholder: London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupier: The site is vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site description: This site is currently vacant and contained the former Wimbledon community centre (D1 Use Class) which was vacated during 2012 and demolished in summer 2013. It is surrounded to the east by four to five storey mixed use buildings (commercial/offices), to the west by four storey offices and to the south by office buildings ranging from five to nine storeys in height. The site is located within the town centre boundary and adjoins commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use: Vacant. The community centre closed in September 2012. The existing building was demolished in mid 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use suggested/organisation: Mix of community, business and residential – London Borough of Merton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, community and leisure use – Wimbledon Community Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocated use: Any of the following or an appropriate mix of town centre type uses such as community (D1 Use Class), retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class) and residential (C3 Use Class). An alternative option for the site could be a hotel (C1 Use Class).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council – No representation was received from the owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Community Association (previous occupier) – representation made during Stage 2 stating their preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
uses would be for a mix of community (D1), commercial (A2) and financial and business (B1). A further representation as part of the pre-submission consultation stated their intention to find a new premises within central Wimbledon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ThinkFuture – support for the suggested uses by council as it is not considered an appropriate location for a community centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Molten Real Estate – considers that reference to requiring active street frontages as part of any redevelopment should not be required because there is already an oversupply of these uses on the street frontage in Wimbledon. Active street frontages should be deemed to be achieved by permitting offices at ground floor level provided some other means (such as glazed curtain walling to the ground floor) are adopted (e.g. the IPD building on The Broadway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Society – if the site is redeveloped, there should be an undertaking that the provision of a full range of replacement community facilities should be provided on a nearby site. The site could also be included as part of the town centre combined heat and power scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the Conservative Group’s preferred use was for the site to be retained solely for community use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?**

**The allocated use for the site**

Of the few representations received, most related to the use of the site. A mix of opinions were received including support for community uses on the site, opposition to community uses on the site, and a preference for A2, B1 and D1 type uses on site. The existing community centre closed because it was sparsely used and the building was in poor condition. The existing uses were accommodated in other nearby facilities which imply the site is surplus to requirements as a community centre. This evidence proves the existing building was not suitable for ongoing community uses. There has also been no net loss of community activities as a result. However, the site is still considered an appropriate location for community uses as it has good access to public transport and is located in the town centre. The allocation therefore includes D1 uses. The site is appropriate for a range of uses given its town centre location and the allocation reflects this. It is therefore considered that each of the representations have been given appropriate regard and are taken into account in the allocation.

**Providing and active frontage**

This site is located in the Wimbledon Town Centre. It is considered that active street frontages are not solely restricted to certain uses as stated in the correspondence. This provision is included in the site issues description so any future developer is aware that any future ground floor building/occupier should appropriately address the street frontage given its location in the town centre. New development should contribute positively to the character of the street.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**
The allocation enables a range of uses to be provided on site, including community uses. The site may be re-established solely as a community centre although it would be subject to viability. Community uses could be accommodated on the site in conjunction with other uses. This is considered appropriate in the circumstances where redevelopment could potentially provide a vibrant mixed use development in this town centre location. Any new development should provide an active frontage in order to contribute positively to the character of the street.

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

#### Site suitability – have any issues been identified?

The site is located in the Wimbledon Town Centre where there is demand for a range of uses. The site is considered suitable for a variety of uses as a result. The existing building is in a dilapidated condition and a planning application has been submitted to demolish the existing building and for temporary use as a car park.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

There are no issues identified regarding site suitability. The site is suitable for a range of uses being situated in Wimbledon town centre.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

#### Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

The site is in freehold ownership of the London Borough of Merton. A planning application has been submitted which incorporates demolition of the existing building and a temporary change of use to a surface car park. The site will be considered further during this time and is likely to be disposed of or redeveloped following temporary use as a car park.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?

There are no issues identified regarding the availability of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

#### Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?

Viability for the redevelopment proposal will be investigated further following allocation. It is possible that the site could come forward for redevelopment in conjunction with other allocated sites such as the Wimbledon Library. It is anticipated that there will be a substantial amount of demand for a vacant site within Wimbledon Town Centre with an allocation for a possible range of uses.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Viability needs to be investigated further however it is the intention of council to pursue redevelopment of this site. The proposal for temporary use as a car park will make productive use of a currently vacant site until redevelopment. There are no issues identified that suggest redevelopment is not viable.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues
### Strategic planning factors

The site is located in the Wimbledon town centre boundary and adjoins the core shopping area.

The site is in an area with excellent accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 6b) with access to The Broadway via St Georges Road and Wimbledon Hill Road.

Part of the eastern portion of the site is within a critical drainage area.

A temporary planning application was approved in May 2013 to demolish the existing building and install a temporary surface public car park on the site. This will expire in May 2016.

### Have any other issued been identified?

The site is council owned and has been vacant since November 2012. The community uses have been relocated therefore a net loss of the facility has not resulted.

Any new permanent proposal should provide an active street frontage to contribute towards the vibrancy and vitality of the town centre.

In a mixed use development, residential uses should be on upper floors.

Protecting the amenity of occupiers adjacent to the site.

Parking and servicing impacts on traffic movement, congestion and road safety needs to be appropriately controlled and mitigated.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures can be determined at the time of application for planning permission for the above matters.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would retain its existing lawfully established use in the interim in conjunction with the approved planning permission. The council has determined that the site is surplus to requirements and will be released to the market and disposed accordingly. It is likely that the site would be developed in accordance with emerging policy for town centres if disposed of this way. The council considers it more appropriate to provide a strategic planning direction for future development to ensure certainty around the types of uses and form of development to occur on the site. This will provide guidance on development that would not be achieved if the site was simply released to the market and then brought forward via a planning application.

Alternative uses on the site – The allocation provides for a range of uses considered appropriate in the town centre location in accordance with local and national policy and guidance.

### Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

**Uses:** A range of town centre uses and residential.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for housing in Merton. Capacity for town centre uses to be developed on site.
will be determined by market demand.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Various.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified site?**

No potential barriers have been identified with regard to delivery of the site.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 37 – Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium
Plough Lane
Tooting
SW17 0BL

Area: 5.29 ha

Site Details

Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description

Freeholder: GRA Limited, Wimbledon Stadium, Plough Lane, London SW17 0BL.
Volante Limited, 46-76 Summerstown, London SW17 0BH.

Occupier: Wimbledon greyhound stadium, Christopher’s Squash and Fitness Club, G & J Auto Services, hand car wash, Simon’s Café and Diner, Volante Limited, Elite Motorcycle Training, Whitgift Hire and a weekly car boot sale in the car park area.

Site description: Approximately two thirds of the site is dominated by the Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium, the remainder of the site is a car park with some commercial and industrial uses. The buildings on the eastern boundary are in separate ownership and contain a light industrial use (Volante) and Elite motorcycle training fronting Summerstown. The building in the southeast corner contains a food establishment. The site also accommodates Christopher’s Squash and Fitness Club within the stadium buildings and a hand car wash access from and adjacent Copper Mill Lane. Weekly car boot sales are also operated from the car park.

The site adjoins an industrial estate along the northern and eastern boundary. To the south of the site in Merton on the other side of Plough Lane is an industrial estate. Running along the western boundary of the site is a large operational electricity substation owned by National Grid.

Information source: Council officers.

Current use: Various including greyhound stadium (D2 Use Class) and car park (sui generis).

Use suggested/organisation:

Stage 2 (January 2012):
Residential-led mixed use scheme - Savills L&P ltd on behalf of Greyhound Racing Association Ltd

Stage 2a (June 2012)
Retain greyhound use of site with enabling large foodstore - Drivers Jonas Deloitte on behalf of Hume Consulting Ltd

Football stadium with associated leisure and retail activities - AFC Wimbledon

Stage 3 (January 2013)
10,000-15,000 seat football stadium and associated community / leisure facilities, circa 450-500 residential units and a substantial retail store - Greyhound Racing Association Ltd in discussions with AFC Wimbledon.

An enhanced greyhound stadium, enhanced squash/leisure facility, with enabling retail and residential development - Hume Consulting Ltd

New light industrial and warehousing development, relocation of development from other sites including existing industry and warehousing, leisure facilities, school use – Wimbledon Park Residents Association

Allocated use: Intensification of sporting activity (D2 Use Class) with supporting enabling development. Developments that facilitate more sporting activity may be enabled by more viable uses, subject to meeting planning policy, evidence and consultation.

This site must be delivered via a site-specific planning brief (Supplementary Planning Document) to ensure the delivery of sporting intensification and six weeks of community consultation on proposals.

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2 – with respect to the comments made in relation to the site allocation (ignoring reference to comments related to policies and the sustainability appraisal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The area was contained in previous drafts of the London Plan as being specifically referred to as suitable for brownfield intensification and an area for intensification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The London Plan was adopted (later in July 2011) and states that the Colliers Wood/South Wimbledon Area of Intensification “contains a range of major opportunities for intensification including South Wimbledon and Colliers Wood”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flood risk - It is considered that LB Merton should take a flexible approach to addressing flood risk at the Stadium site given the AfI’s objectives and in the absence of a significant history of flooding. Consideration should also be given to the advice of PPS25 that urban flood plains should be treated differently to those in rural areas. By designing the redevelopment of the Stadium site to be resilient to flooding and incorporating sustainable drainage techniques a strong case can be made to develop a scheme that will be safe for its occupants and will not increase fluvial flood risk, whilst contributing to a reduction to the existing risk of surface water flooding within the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing need - PPS3 states that Local Authorities should deliver “a sufficient quantity of housing taking into account need and demand and seeking to improve choice”. This is also reflected in the Government’s draft NPPF which indicates the importance a presumption in favour of new development which meets housing demand and results in economic growth for an area. The other major site within the AfI is Wimbledon Greyhound Stadium (a significant 5.29 hectares in area). The site therefore represents a unique opportunity to realise the development potential which has been identified in the London Plan for almost a decade. It is the largest brownfield site identified within the Site and Policies DPD and the only one in the AfI considered to have the critical mass to deliver a genuine mix of housing (including affordable) in addition to significant socio-economic improvements and public realm improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The socio-economic and environmental benefits of a residentially led, mixed use scheme in comparison to intensification of sporting activity / Industrial use . Firstly, it is worth highlighting that greyhound racing is not a sport. The current use is not a sporting use but rather leisure. The Council’s aspiration for the “intensification of sporting activity” is therefore questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition to the above comments, LB Merton’s preferred use is strongly objected to and the evidence supporting their recommendations is not considered robust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2a:
• Following recent discussions with your Authority and AFC Wimbledon, both of whom have outlined their
desire to relocate a modern stadium within Merton, we seek the incorporation of the following description of development into future iterations of the Sites and Policies DPD:

“The comprehensive redevelopment of the greyhound stadium to accommodate a new 10,000-15,000 seater football stadium and associated community / leisure facilities, circa 450 -500 residential units, and a substantial retail store.”

• Significant background work in terms of flooding, highways and other capacity issues have been undertaken in developing this proposal. The scheme will be developed in the coming months following further detailed technical work and consultation with LB Merton, LB Wandsworth, AFC Wimbledon, EA, other statutory consultees and local residents / groups.

• The relocation of a football stadium on the site will generate a significant number of full time and permanent jobs (pre and post construction) and generate millions of pounds of supplier spending per annum, much of which will of benefit to the local area. Spending by home and away fans during visits to the new stadium will also generate significant spending per season for the local economy, boosting trade for local businesses (crucial in these tough economic times).

• This accords with the NPPF which states that “the Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. Planning should operate to encourage and not act as an impediment to sustainable growth. Therefore significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.”

Stage 3 – a presentation was made by the GRA but no written information was submitted by the GRA during the consultation phase. The presentation changed their view to be supportive of the allocation for sporting intensification and outlined their proposal for a 10,000-15,000 seat football stadium and associated community/leisure facilities, circa 450-500 residential units and a substantial retail store – GRA Ltd in discussions with AFC Wimbledon.

Christopher’s Squash and Fitness Club – The representation provided a detailed summary of the history and operation of the facility as background information. The following points were considered to be key matters raised:

• believe that the continuation of Christopher’s Squash and Fitness Club on the Wimbledon Stadium site is an essential pre-condition for the development of the site and this can happen with either of the two options being proposed – but only if it is recognised by both the planning authority and the developers.

• we would hope that with the council’s support and in recognition of central government priorities; Merton Council policy objectives and Planning Regulations, a replacement facility will be provided that provides access to fitness and active sport for all local people and a community resource for events such as wedding receptions and funeral wakes.

• The facilities are also used for weddings celebrations and funeral wakes as well as the provision of daily classes for elderly people – making it a community asset for many local residents. In addition we also have a fully qualified physiotherapist/nurse providing sports injury clinic and treatment for other, quasi-medical purposes.

• We remain silent on the preferred development solution for the Wimbledon Stadium site and the purpose of our submission is to try to recognise that, on the site, we want to protect a valuable community asset that meets the needs of many local people;

• We would like this recognised and protected in any proposals the council may determine for its preferred use of the site and we believe that the failure of this being recognised to date is a serious weakness and needs to be rectified as soon as possible.

Local residents/organisations
AFC Wimbledon – the Wimbledon greyhound stadium site represents the best opportunity for AFC Wimbledon to return to the borough. The club undertook a study of sites in and around the borough in 2011. Of a list of 18 initial sites, the subject site was considered the best and most viable option to meet their desired needs of a 12,000 seat stadium with the ability to expand to a 22,000 seat stadium. The site search criteria included matters such as public
sector support, current use of land and property, regeneration capacity, access, appeal to public/private sectors and brand development. Redevelopment should be a mixed-use proposal with a strong and well thought out business plan for growth. AFC Wimbledon will liaise with LBM and the Environment Agency regarding flood risk issues on the site. Information regarding the phasing and establishment of the stadium was also provided, along with a statement that transport and access would be subject to a comprehensive study which would accompany a planning application. The suggested uses for the site included sporting intensification (D2 use class), hotel and conference centre (C1 use class), residential (C3 use class), education (D1 use class) and amenity retail (A1 use class) in various capacities.

Brown S – concern at the loss of the greyhound stadium and stock cars as it is the only site to have such events in southwest London. General support for an enhanced greyhound and stock car stadium with better retail. The extra traffic and footfall from a football stadium is not welcome as the area is already at a standstill during rush hour and weekends, and there is a lack of public transport. The road systems are not good enough and don’t like the idea of flats in the area as there are already enough flats in the area. Would prefer more 1-2 bedroom homes with gardens.

Colebourne S – favours the site retaining a primarily sporting use. Any increased development must reserve space either at ground level or subsurface for enhanced transport links.

Laverty M – objection to football stadium due to traffic, congestion and parking related matters which already exist in the area. Also object to a supermarket as there is a good selection of small local shops and a new Waitrose just opened up nearby.

Merton Conservative Group – site should be for sporting use.

Merton Liberal Democrat Group – The surrounding area has changed greatly within the last decade, with the large development of flats on Durnsford Road. As such, the area is no longer predominantly industrial. We do not support the use of the site for industry due to its proximity to residential properties and local road capacity. We feel it would be a great shame to lose the sporting heritage of the site.

Merriman D – support for proposals to bring AFC Wimbledon back to Plough Lane.

Rabagliati A – support for sporting intensification. The crucial aim should be to maintain and enhance high profile sporting activities within the borough. Specifically this means finding a home for AFC Wimbledon as well as maintaining where possible facilities for greyhound and associated motor sports racing.

Sisson A – possibility of improving access from Summerstown to Wimbledon Park tube station. The lack of crossings over the River Wandle makes this difficult. Should consider a footbridge over the river linking Riverside, Weir Road and combined with a set of steps at the western end of Archway Close to ascend over the railway lines.

Whelan D – delighted to see the support for retention of a greyhound stadium and stock car racing facility. The description of the site is negative. There is one bus route which passes the stadium and others which run along Garratt Lane which is only a few minutes walk away. Also the site to the south of the stadium site is described as “industrial”. I think “retail” would be a better description. It is those retail outlets which cause most of the traffic congestion in the area, which is a good reason for not allowing any further retail or housing development there.

Wimbledon Park Residents Association (Stage 2a) – the site is in a flood plain and has limited transport infrastructure. As such there are a limited number of developments that can be built on the site that are consistent with national and local planning policies. Its development as an open space with playing fields and tennis courts for schools and local residents is a use which is compatible with, and supported by, such policies. The use of site 37 for light industrial is supported by many national and local policies but it is not completely consistent with the flood risk the site carries. However, the development of significant residential housing or retail on all, or part of the site, is
inconsistent with national and local polices, as is the building of a major stadium. Hence, while we support the site designation of sporting intensification or light industrial for site 37, it is important that the council makes clear that it will abide by national and local policies and the consequences they imply for site 37. Other uses such as residential and retail are not suitable however light industrial could be accommodated. There are also numerous transport issues which are inconsistent with policy.

Wimbledon Park Residents Association (Stage 3) - The revised preferred use for site 37 mentions unspecified enabling developments for sporting intensification but no longer includes light industrial or warehousing. However, the enabling developments suggested so far are inconsistent with Merton’s own planning policies and research commissioned by Merton provides no reason to exclude light industrial and warehousing. As such we request that mention of enabling developments be deleted and light industry and warehousing be reinstated. Two examples of how the site could be developed were also provided. The allocation is not consistent with the Core Strategy. Any residential or retail development is not suitable in the functional flood plan. The site should be considered for school.

Wimbledon Society (Stage 2a) – This is an iconic site for sport, not just locally but London-wide and nationally. The unimaginative way in which the similarly very distinctive Football ground in Plough Lane was lost, and replaced by development that failed to relate to that site’s past, should be a salutary lesson, and not repeated. Local distinctiveness strongly suggests that a major Stadium/sports venue should be retained on the site. Policies on the protection and promotion of sports and recreation also indicate this, as indeed should the Olympic legacy concept. Policies on restricting retail uses to established centres should preclude retail. Because of the limitations of its location in the flood plain, no housing would be either sensible or appropriate. Adjoining the site there is a very significant amount of local employment floorspace, much of it in LB Wandsworth. Accordingly, the suggested uses by the site owners, should not be accepted. The Council’s preferred uses should say that the major user should be a sports stadium type venue, to preserve the sporting heritage, with additional community facilities and perhaps some employment uses.

Wimbledon Society (Stage 3) – The Council’s references to future uses (under “further research”) are not supported. Significant retail on this site, being far from any town centre, would be quite contrary to plan policy, would not pass the sequential test process, and should not therefore be accepted. Being within the functional flood plain, no housing whatever would be appropriate for this site. The Environment Agency is quoted as saying that, in relation to housing, it “does not believe that any mitigating measures can address the issues associated with the functional floodplain”. By contrast, the provision of some modern office/creative businesses, light industrial, employment and depot facilities on a site of this type should be considered: there is a major grouping of such uses adjoining (mostly in LB Wandsworth). There is an opportunity here for relocating some industrial users from other local sites in Merton, which could then be freed up and utilised for housing or school etc. If the sporting heritage of the Plough Lane area is to be properly planned for, a new pedestrian route should be sought to link (for example) Durnsford Road with Riverside Road in Wandsworth. This would improve accessibility, supplementing what would probably be the main pedestrian access to the site from the north, Earlsfield being the closest mainline station.

Statutory agencies

Environment Agency (Stage 2a):
- due to the site being located within the functional flood plain residential use is not suitable and no mitigation is possible.
- London Borough of Merton adopted Core Strategy (July 2012) policy CS 16 Flood Risk Management indicates the willingness of the borough to work with the Environment Agency, landowners and developers, based on the findings of the most recent Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and other plans, to manage and reduce flood risk from all sources of flooding. Paragraph 24.4 states inter alia.
- Development is also relevant as the site is part of the Wandle Valley catchment plan.
- A culvert runs across the northeast corner of the site.
- Development should not prevent future river restoration. Secondary Aquifer, no SPZ. Industrial setting. Will require Phase 1 Assessment for contamination potential, and Phase II Investigation if contamination known or suspected.
Environment Agency (Stage 3):

- We have been involved with pre-application discussions with both the council and consultants concerning the development of this site for a mixed use development incorporating a new football stadium which would be enabled through the building of new residential units on site.
- We support the redevelopment of the existing greyhound stadium into that of a football stadium on a like for like footprint as it does not result in an increase in vulnerability.
- For the development of the wider site to be acceptable the sustainability benefits to the borough need to be demonstrated and it be stated that they in this case outweigh the sites designation of functional floodplain designation.
- Any inclusion community / leisure facilities or residential needed to enable the building of the football stadium should be kept to a minimum. It should be demonstrated the all new built footprint does not lead to loss in flood storage, impeded flood flows or lead to a risk of flooding on or off site. Any application for the development should include a full drainage scheme for the whole site.
- A Sequential Test should be undertaken to ensure there is no reasonable alternative land at lower flood risk that can be developed prior to this site. If not, any proposed uses must be appropriate for the degree of flood risk at the site. If so, a Flood Risk Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application to make sure, all sources of flooding, including fluvial, are considered and sufficiently mitigated for because the site is in FZ3b and a critical drainage area. The Flood Risk Assessment should also consider the treatment of the nonmain rivers that pass through the site and the site’s drainage such that off-site flood risk is sufficiently reduced and SUDS incorporated.
- Biodiversity - We encourage the de-culverting of rivers for flood risk and biodiversity reasons. Therefore, the possible de-culverting of the non-main rivers on-site should be considered.
- Groundwater Protection - A preliminary risk assessment of any contamination on site will be needed to be submitted with any planning application due to the past, potentially contaminating, uses on site.

GLA (Stage 2a) – no issue, support council’s preferred use.

GLA (Stage 3) – further discussion is welcomed in relation to the Wimbledon greyhound stadium site in order to bring a document forward that is in line with national guidance and the London Plan. The suggested use of the site for substantial out of centre retail causes strategic policy concern and would not be in conformity with London Plan policy. The loss of the greyhound stadium use would also raise strategic policy concerns.

London Borough of Merton Children Schools and Families department – the site should be considered for its suitability to provide school places.

London Borough of Wandsworth - The Council generally supports Merton Council’s preferred use of continuing sporting activity (D2 use). Intensification of this use is supported in principle insofar as it could meet the needs of a growing population, including Wandsworth residents. The degree of intensification would be subject to appropriate mitigation measures, including improved public transport and parking restraint, as the site has a low PTAL rating and could give rise to traffic problems within Wandsworth. Similarly large/intensive outdoor sports facilities that provide for visitors/stadia could also create problems with traffic/parking. If a more intensive indoor sport use is proposed, it should be acknowledged that this would be subject to impact testing as it is in an out-of centre location. Other town centre uses, including large retail development would not be considered appropriate in this out-of-centre location, as they could give rise to trade draw from Tooting town centre and traffic generation. Any development of the site should also take into consideration the allocated waste site located to the west of the Greyhound Stadium. Future joint working to explore flood risk alleviation is welcomed as part of the duties of the Flood and Water Management Act.

Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime/Metropolitan Police Service (Stage 2/2a) – development of the site may have an impact on policing needs. It was recommended that the site allocation be amended to include for community
facilities such as policing.

Metropolitan Police Service – the site is acknowledged as referring to secured by design principles.

National Grid (Stage 2 and 3) – National Grid owns and operates the Wimbledon substation which is adjacent to the site. Whilst National Grid does not object to future development in the area surrounding the substation, they emphasise the importance of the substation to the efficient operation of the electricity transmission network. The site is therefore operational land and there may need to be further essentially utility development at the site in future. The site has existing operational noise sources. Effects such as this may have an impact on future occupiers of the site and National Grid requests that this impact is taken into consideration when considering development close to this site.

Others


Gelbart E & L - I have a particularly strong opinion on this site as it is the only car boot site available in the area. Since the development of Merton Abbey Mills into flats we lost one of the best car boot areas in south London. The council may consider such schemes to be financially non-profitable however, it presents a recycling opportunity and in these current financially difficult times is of great interest and importance to local people.

Hume Consulting Ltd (Stage 2a):

- general support for the allocation.
- Welcomed the reference to their proposal for an enhanced greyhound racing facility with associated community and leisure facilities, with analysis of suitable enabling development, deemed to be food retail use.
- Physical regeneration of the site will lead to an increase in jobs and act as a catalyst for regeneration in the wider area.

Hume Consulting Ltd (Stage 3):

- Revised proposals were submitted outlining their designs for establishing a new greyhound stadium on the site along with residential, retail, car park (for St George’s hospital) and associated sport and leisure facilities (including Christopher’s Squash and Fitness Club).
- Evidence was submitted to suggest that potential flood risk, transportation and retail impacts could be appropriately considered and mitigated as part of development.

South Molten Real Estate – the allocation should include retail (A1 with any restrictions) and car dealerships (sui generis). The latter use is much and unreasonably maligned. A good quality manufacturer or franchisee provides an institutionally acceptable covenant, quality buildings, a business that provides a high ratio of employment (including skilled ‘blue collar’) to floor area and a relatively benign impact on the transport network.

Sport England – support for sporting use within allocation.

Waitrose Limited (Stage 2a) – The site is being proposed for retail use in the DPD by Drivers Jonas DeLoitte on behalf of Hume Consulting Ltd. The DPD notes that the site is within the functional floodplain and has poor public transport accessibility. The DPD also states that the Council’s preferred use for the site is Class B1(c), B2, B8 and / or D2 use. Whilst not explicitly referred to in the emerging DPD, the submitted representations refer to a foodstore being suitable as enabling development for the wider retention / enhancement of the stadium. The site is in an out-of-centre location and no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test, as required by the NPPF (paragraph 23). Given the poor accessibility of the site, a sequential assessment should be undertaken of Town Centre, edge-of-centre and then out-of-centre sites in accessible locations. In the absence of a defined retail need (for non-central sites) and a sequential assessment of alternative sites against the NPPF criteria,
the proposed allocation of the site for a foodstore fails the tests of soundness (NPPF paragraph 182), in that it is not justified and is not consistent with national policy. Waitrose therefore requests that the site should not be allocated for convenience retail use and should only be allocated in accordance with the Council’s preferred use of Class B1(c), B2, B8 and / or D2 use. Only on this basis will the plan be sound.

Waitrose Limited (Stage 3) - Waitrose remains concerned that the Site is being promoted for a large scale foodstore. Given the out-of-centre location of the Site in retail policy terms, the Plan should not be seen as supporting such development where there is no identified need, a sequential assessment has not been undertaken and the Town Centre impact effects of the scheme have not been assessed. Waitrose therefore requests that, should the Council consider that the Site be allocated for development including a foodstore, any application is still required to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF sequential and retail impact tests (NPPF paragraphs 24 and 26). Without the inclusion of this requirement, and for the reasons set out in our previous representations, any retail allocation on the Site would not comply with NPPF paragraph 23. The Plan would not therefore be considered sound against NPPF paragraph 182 as it would not be justified against the evidence base and would not be consistent with national policy. It is therefore recommended that the following wording be incorporated into any site specific policy: “Any retail development on the Site will be required to demonstrate compliance with the NPPF sequential and retail impact tests.”

Wimbledon Greyhound Owners Association – support for the retention of a greyhound stadium on the site.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

| Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns? |
| Allocated use – sporting intensification |

Firstly, it needs to be clarified that the allocated use changed following the Stage 2 consultation from “Intensification of sporting activity (D2 Use Class) or Industrial (B1[c], B2 Use Class) and warehousing (B8 Use Class) on cessation of a sporting use)” to its current allocation as outlined above. The removal of B uses from the allocation referred to research across both LBM and beyond regarding the lack of demand for B uses. Any representations received in relation to B uses on the site have been disregarded accordingly as no evidence was provided by any party to suggest the council’s own evidence base was incorrect. The allocation was therefore retained as sporting intensification with supporting enabling development (abridged).

There is a substantial amount of both support and opposition to the allocated use which is to be expected by the very nature of the proposals submitted by the landowners and other interested parties. The council is adopting a flexible approach to the delivery of the site to optimise the regeneration potential of the site and wider area. The scale of development proposed on the site ranges from retention of the existing greyhound stadium, provision for new sporting uses such as tennis clubs, through to a new football/greyhound stadium with enabling development. Of evidence available to the council to date, LBM understands that employment led redevelopment on the site (either as a primary or enabling use) would not be viable, and that a larger stadium development will require food retail and or/residential use to ensure a stadium development was viable. For this reason and to ensure a robust delivery mechanism is in place for the site, it will be delivered by a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, planning brief) which will be subject to more detailed testing on design, evidence and consultation regarding proposed uses on the site, as well as availability, suitability and viability of any uses. This flexibility accords with the NPPF in seeking to obtain the most sustainable and appropriate form of regeneration on the site, which is considered dilapidated and underutilised by the council and its current owners. It is considered that there will be sufficient policy elements in place through national guidance, the London Plan, LBM’s Core Planning Strategy and the emerging Sites and Policies Plan to determine the appropriateness of any enabling uses on the site.

Support for allocation
- Support for sporting intensification
- Support for football stadium
- Support for AFC Wimbledon (the site occupier is not a relevant planning consideration)
- Support for residential use
- Support for retail
- Support for greyhound stadium
- Support for greyhound racing (not a relevant planning consideration)

Opposition to allocation
- Opposition to sporting intensification
- Opposition to football stadium
- Opposition to residential use
- Opposition to retail
- Opposition to greyhound stadium
- Opposition to greyhound racing (animal welfare, not a planning consideration)

Allocated use – enabling development
Firstly, it is clarified that a number of respondents misinterpreted the draft allocation document and were of the understanding that the site was allocated for residential and/or retail use. This is not the case. The site is allocated solely for sporting intensification. The council acknowledges that several degrees of sporting intensification have been proposed by various parties, and that information provided by those parties suggesting larger stadium uses for sporting intensification requires a more viable enabling development. Sporting uses on their own are seldom viable and hence require some form of enabling development. Any use proposed outside sporting intensification will be subject to policy, evidence and consultation as stated in the allocation. Existing national and local policy suggests that out of centre retail use is typically not acceptable.

With specific reference to the representation made by the GLA, the retail element was a suggested use not an allocated use as outlined above. The allocation states that any retail proposed on the site would be subject to policy, as emphasised by the GLA. LBM support this position. LBM have also clarified with the GLA that greyhound use is not a strategic policy concern as suggested in the representation.

Allocated use – alternative options suggested
Various alternative uses were suggested as being more appropriate on the site. Each use is addressed separately below:

- Industrial/warehouse – it is widely known and evidenced in Merton’s Employment and Economic Land Study 2010 that there is little to no demand for such uses in greater London, and particularly in Merton. This use is therefore not considered suitable for the site.
- Employment/office – refer above. Offices would not be supported in this location by existing and emerging policy.
- School – The site’s potential for a primary school was assessed in an external report commissioned by the London Borough of Merton but was rejected on grounds of size and suitability.
- Loss of the car boot sale – the car boot sale currently operating on the site is subject to an existing agreement between the landowner and the operator. This use cannot be protected strategically by the council and could be terminated at any point in time.
- Retail – retail use would typically not be suitable in this out of centre location as evidenced by national and local planning policy.
- Sui generis (car dealership) – proposals for sui generis uses are considered on their merits and are typically not included in planning policy or site allocations. No information has been submitted by the owners or interested parties to suggest that this use is suitable or viable on the site. It is not considered appropriate in this instance to allocate the site for such use given that no evidence has been provided to suggest it is viable in particular.

None of the above uses were formally submitted to the council for consideration as part of the Sites and Policies 203
Flood risk
As outlined above, the Environment Agency made representations at both Stage 2a and 3 of the consultation process. For clarification, the correspondence received as part of the Stage 3 consultation refers to the current proposals submitted for the site for sporting intensification and any enabling development on the site. The representation received as part of Stage 3 follows independent meetings between LBM and the Environment Agency, the site owners and the Environment Agency and Hume Consulting representatives and the Environment Agency. The Stage 2a representation is therefore not referred to further in relation to this site allocation.

The representation outlined the support for sporting intensification. They also acknowledge that if any alternative uses are proposed on the site they will be subject to meeting national and local planning policy with regard to flood risk. This accords to the position held by LBM and is reflected in the allocation as a result. For the development of the wider site to be acceptable the sustainability benefits to the borough need to be demonstrated and it be stated that they in this case outweigh the sites designation of functional floodplain designation, with an appropriate site specific flood risk assessment taking into account the sequential test and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. LBM supports this position.

Provision of existing uses on the site
Representations were received from one occupier and one user of the site in addition to the majority site owner. The existing squash and fitness club on the site expressed their desire to remain on the site. This squash and fitness club is considered to be in accordance with the allocation of sporting intensification and therefore the council deems it appropriate to include provision for such a facility in any redevelopment proposal. The allocation therefore has the provision in accordance with the representation.

With respect to the car boot sale, as stated above the car boot sale currently operating on the site is subject to an existing agreement between the landowner and the operator. This use cannot be protected strategically by the council and could be terminated at any point in time. It is also considered not necessary to include a strategic allocation for such a use, given that it already legally operates from the site.

Traffic, parking, congestion, public transport related issues
The council acknowledges that any redevelopment for the site will have to have regard to traffic, parking, congestion, and public transport related matters. This is reflected within the allocation as a result. The next phase of addressing these issues will be a primary consideration of the planning brief to be prepared for the site and subsequent planning application. All these issues are identified in the allocation as being potential known issues that would need to be addressed as part of the physical regeneration of the site.

In addition, enhanced pedestrian access to and from the site was suggested such as pedestrian and cycle links over River Wandle, through Weir Road to Wimbledon Park tube. Depending on the scale of development proposed, if a high footfall generating use results this is considered a potentially suitable mitigation measure to be included as part of a site travel plan. It would also enhance the accessibility to the site and surrounding area. This would be subject to relevant s106/CIL payments to be determined at the time a planning application was decided.

Area for intensification – London Plan
The reference to the site being specifically identified as an Area for Intensification in the London Plan is incorrect and made in the early stages of the plan preparation. There is no specific reference to the site in the final London Plan 2011. The area referred to is South Wimbledon and Colliers Wood which is not considered to include the subject site.

Potential impact on policing needs
It was submitted that the potential exists for additional development on the site to impact on policing needs in the area. It is unknown if this refers to infrastructure and space requirements or actual police numbers. The representation states that the allocation should be amended to include community uses. More recent correspondence received from the Metropolitan Police Service, received separately to the consultation on the Sites and Policies Plan, stated that a London wide review of policing services has been undertaken and no new sites are needed in Merton. Further liaison with the police service will be undertaken as part of the planning brief to be prepared for the regeneration of the site. In addition, as part of any redevelopment, the site would be subject to s106/CIL payments which can take into account infrastructure needs.

Acknowledgement and reference to adjoining National Grid infrastructure
The adjoining National Grid substation has been referred to within the allocation and will be a primary consideration as part of any redevelopment of the site. It is considered that appropriate regard has been had to the infrastructure within the site allocation.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Allocated use – sporting intensification
Following evidence, research and discussions with landowners and parties with a vested interest, sporting intensification is considered the most appropriate use for the site. No other use has been submitted as being appropriate for the site with the exception of the enabling uses suggested by interested parties, such as residential and retailing. The council does not have sufficient evidence to suggest these uses are suitable on the site therefore will not be allocated accordingly.
Can state why others are considered not appropriate.
Never received detailed information or serious interest regarding alternative uses.
There are no measures that could be implemented to avoid objection to the allocation of the site without removing it from the Sites and Policies Plan.

Allocated use – enabling development
The site is not being allocated for any alternative use. If a proposal was brought forward for an alternative use it would be subject to evidence, policy and consultation. It is therefore considered that appropriate implementation measures already exist if any such proposal is made.

Allocated use – alternative options suggested
There are barriers to allocating the site for the uses outlined above. Refer to the comments above.

Flood risk
Appropriate flood risk matters will be taken into account in due course. It is considered that there are no barriers to implementation of appropriate flood risk mitigation.

Provision of existing uses on the site
It is considered that provision for existing uses is provided as much as possible within the strategic allocation for the site.

Traffic, parking, congestion, public transport related issues
It is considered that appropriate implementation measures will be put into place to ensure appropriate mitigation of all traffic, parking and associated issues.

Area for intensification – London Plan
As stated above, it is considered that the site is not located within the Area for Intensification as specified in the London Plan or the Core Strategy.
Potential impact on policing needs

The potential impact on policing needs will be considered as part of the planning brief and any subsequent planning application to be submitted for redevelopment of the site. It is therefore considered that regard will be had to the potential impact on policing needs and mitigated accordingly.

Acknowledgement and reference to adjoining National Grid infrastructure

This is adequately taken into account as part of the allocation and will be considered further within the planning brief and subsequent planning application in consultation with National Grid.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for sports intensification which is considered appropriate given the existing use operating on the site. Any other use will be subject to meeting policy, evidence and consultation due to the nature of the issues on the site including flood risk, contamination, transportation and the sites’ location adjacent to the borough boundary with Wandsworth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding the suitability of the site, subject to suitable evidence being provided regarding the final mix of uses proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of the site is owned by GRA Ltd who support the allocation and have provided plans to redevelop the site as mentioned above. This land is therefore considered available. The portion of land adjacent the eastern boundary owned by Volante Ltd has not expressed an interest to redevelop their site. So far, discussions between the owners and other parties have not progressed regarding this portion of the site. The council seeks to prepare a masterplan for the entire site. Presently this portion is not available however in accordance with the Core Strategy council will investigate all options for delivering the entire site together. The council will investigate necessary measures to deliver the site in accordance with the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site will be delivered via a site specific planning brief to be prepared. This will involve detailed discussions with owners and leaseholders on how the site will be delivered. If necessary and justified, the council can use Compulsory Purchase Orders to obtain the ownership needed to deliver the site in accordance with the strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viability will be explored in greater detail as part of the planning brief to be developed for the site. Both the parties who have submitted proposals for the site provided confidential viability information to support the development proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Any issues regarding viability will be considered and resolved as part of the planning brief to be prepared and in further liaison with the site proposals.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

#### Strategic planning factors

The site and its surrounds are within the functional floodplain of the River Wandle (Flood Zone 3b). The majority of the site is within a critical drainage area for surface water flooding.

The site is surrounded on all sides by strategic industrial locations. To the north and east of the site is Summerstown Road strategic industrial location (London Borough of Wandsworth), which includes a waste management site to the northwest. To the south and west is part of Durnsford Road/Plough Lane strategic industrial location (London Borough of Merton).

The site has poor/moderate accessibility to public transport (PTAL 2/3). The road network, railway lines, river and utilities infrastructure in the wider area limit opportunities for improving access to and around the site.

The entire site lies within an archaeological priority zone.

National Grid has identified that the operational substation adjacent to the west of the site may need to have further utility development beyond 2012 to maintain essential electricity transmission to homes and businesses. National Grid has also advised that this is unlikely to extend into the boundary of this site.

#### Have any other issues been identified?

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the functional floodplain and with the critical drainage area to minimise flood risk for future occupiers and the potential for water pollution from the site. A flood risk assessment should also consider the treatment of the non-main rivers that pass through the site and incorporate sustainable drainage systems into development proposals.

Redevelopment proposals should take account of the electricity substation to the west of the site to minimise the effects on amenity of future occupiers.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Facilitating improved accessibility including improving bus infrastructure, walking and cycling facilities. Resolving road network capacity, movement and safety concerns. Site access arrangements require careful scrutiny/improvement.

The proximity of the waste management site to the north west.

A squash and fitness club exists on the site. Proposals should include the provision for an equivalent or enhanced squash and fitness club as part of sporting intensification.

There is currently identified need for school places across south London. Residential development would be expected to deliver the necessary school places, healthcare and other associated infrastructure.

Thames Water have assessed the water/wastewater capacity locally and has identified that there may be insufficient water supply and/or wastewater capacity to service new development on this site. In accordance with Policy DM F2, applicants should discuss with Thames Water how capacity will be provided.

### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

All the matters above will be explored in detail as part of the planning brief to be prepared for the site.
Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would be retained with its current uses. It is known that the existing stadium is in a poor state of repair and is no longer fit for purpose. It is likely that a development proposal for redevelopment or alternative uses would be put forward on the site.

Alternative uses on the site – The site currently has a range of uses operating on it. The site is considered suitable to accommodate a range of uses primarily based on its size. The site is situated in an out of centre location which would generally render it not suitable for town centre type uses such as offices, retail use or hotels.

---

**Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses: Sporting intensification and potential enabling uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (if relevant): The council is aware of demand and capacity for substantial sporting intensification on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s): 0 – 5 years, 5 – 10 years, &gt;10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner, council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential occupiers: Various.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining a suitable scheme and single ownership prior to completing a planning brief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 62 – Wimbledon YMCA
190-200 & 220-224 The Broadway
Wimbledon
London
SW19 1RY

Area: 0.36 ha

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> YMCA, c/o Savills, Landsdowne House 57 Berkeley Square, London W1J 6ER. Andy Redfearn, YMCA, 200 The Broadway, Wimbledon SW19 1RY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Occupier:** YMCA. |

**Site description:** The site is comprised of Connexions, YMCA and the former Millers Catering Equipment (vacant corner site). There are a wide range of uses currently on this site including a youth advice centre with hostel space, gym sports hall, café, retail and commercial units.

The current buildings on site range up to eight storeys, with seven storeys fronting The Broadway.

The site is located within Wimbledon town centre. To the east the site adjoins mixed use developments comprising retail, offices and residential uses. The southern side of The Broadway opposite the site has a range of building heights up to six storeys. The site is bounded on the east by Trinity Road. To the north of the site is the Conservative Club and residential development, generally comprising two to three storey semi detached houses.

**Information source:** Agent provided landowner information.

**Current use:** YMCA with hostel space, gym, sports hall, café, retail, commercial and Wimbledon Conservative Club.

**Use suggested/organisation:** Hostel, Residential, Retail, Café, Restaurant, Health and Fitness Suite, Crèche and New Public Spaces – Savills (consultants) representing ORION and YMCA.

**Allocated use:** A suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial and professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants and cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), leisure/sporting uses (D2 Use Class), hostel (Sui Generis Use Class) and residential (including hotel, C3 and C1 Use Class).
Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No representation received since call for sites stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local residents/organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colebourne S – support for mixed use redevelopment of this site and Highlands House (site 63) with perhaps sports use on the ground floor. Building heights should be in line with other local buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriman D – “objects to the proposals other than that jointly proposed by ORION and YMCA”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think Future – support for the suggested and preferred uses. Would also like to promote the Work Free concept where people work locally whilst their child is looked after. Would also encourage setting aside a safe outdoor play area for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimbledon Society – the preferred uses should major on community, leisure, culture and hostel/hotel. It is an important site in the “Wimbledon Way” pedestrian route and is also within the cultural quarter. It should therefore have arts type uses that reinforce this route with active frontages containing the appropriate cultural supporting activities. A deeply set back public space, facing south and perhaps partly glazed over, would enhance the Wimbledon Way route and mirror the “Piazza” to the west of the site. The height should be no greater than the CIPD building opposite to avoid creating a canyon effect. There should be no traffic entrance from The Broadway to avoid breaking up the active frontage or the Wimbledon Way. Potential site for incorporation in the town CHP scheme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No consultation received.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Group – the site should be used for community and leisure purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport England – the site could include sports facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mix of uses/appropriate uses to provide on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the uses suggested above in the representations received are included in the allocated use. The suggestion to include facilities such as indoor sport and recreation and cultural activities have been acknowledged and included as a result. The allocation provides a range of uses for various reasons considered appropriate for the site and location, including (but not limited to):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is situated in Wimbledon town centre therefore is suitable for a range of potential uses. It is desirable to have an appropriate mixed use development comprising a range of uses as allocated above considered as part of a planning application;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is situated in the ‘cultural quarter’ identified in the Core Planning Strategy which has reference to the nature of uses in the vicinity of the site including several theatres, centres and community/cultural related uses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is a prominent corner site where a range of uses can be provided;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site may be appropriate for tall buildings (see below);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The site is relatively large for a town centre site therefore has an elevated degree of development potential;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An active frontage should be provided for any future use of the ground floor;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- There has been no objection to any particular use of the site.

**Building height**
The Sites and Policies DPD does not go as far as specifying the desired building height, or minimum or maximum standards because there is insufficient information available to determine appropriate limits for development. The Sites and Policies DPD will guide future development toward the existing Core Planning Strategy Policies, in particular CS14, and the Merton Tall Building Background Paper 2010. Future development and detailed design related matters will be considered further when a planning application is submitted for redevelopment of the site.

**Access**
Council agrees with the representations made that the access to the site should be provided from Trinity Road and not The Broadway. This is specified in the allocation.

*The development should only be undertaken by Orion and the YMCA*
The site is currently proposed to be delivered by YMCA as the owners in conjunction with Orion, the appointed development partner.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?
There were no issues raised that are required to be overcome. The inclusion of D2 uses has been acknowledged and the allocated use for the site amended accordingly.

**Site Suitability - ISSUES**

**Site suitability – have any issues been identified?**
The site is considered to be suitable for mixed use redevelopment based on its location in Wimbledon Town Centre and the nature of existing uses on and surrounding the site.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**
No issues have been identified regarding site suitability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Site Availability - ISSUES**

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**
The site is in freehold ownership and the owner has advised that the entire site is available for redevelopment.

Information source: Information provided to council on behalf of owner.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**
No issues have been identified regarding the site availability.

Information source: Determination by council officers based on information provided by landowner’s agent.

**Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES**

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**
The site is being actively considered for redevelopment by the owner and a development partner. The owner is willing and able to submit a planning application for redevelopment in the near future. The owner intends to redevelop the site as soon as possible which implies appropriate viability testing has been investigated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No issues have been identified regarding site viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic planning factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is located within Wimbledon town centre boundary although it is not situated in the main shopping area of Wimbledon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a significant corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is in an area with excellent accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 6a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As well as The Broadway, the buildings on site are particularly visible from the South Park Gardens conservation area to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portions of the northern end of the site are within a critical drainage area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have any other issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This site is a corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway and also acts as the eastern gateway to Wimbledon town centre, therefore redevelopment of exemplary design quality is a must. The ground floor should have an active frontage, respecting the dual aspect and corner site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public space would be welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals should consider the amenity of neighbouring residential uses to the north of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing facilities should be provided on site to minimise impacts on traffic movement, congestion and road safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigating and managing the impacts of parking on neighbourhood and local amenity will need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the critical drainage area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate mitigation measures regarding the above matters will be taken into account during the planning application phase once the quantum of development is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative options/uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its current uses. Any redevelopment proposal would be ad hoc and considered on its merits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative uses on the site – the site is situated within Wimbledon town centre. The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses to be established. Any alternative use would be subject to meeting policy, evidence and consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses:</strong> likely mixed use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity (if relevant):** Unknown. Dependent on market demands for typical town centre uses.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** Unknown.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Delivery timeframe(s) specified by:** Agent/owner; council

**Potential occupiers:** Various.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No potential barriers to delivery have been identified.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 63 – 165-171 The Broadway
Highlands House
165-171 The Broadway
Wimbledon
SW19 1NE

Area: 0.16 ha

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
© Crown Copyright
London Borough of Merton: 100019259
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Freeholder:** BFL Management Ltd, c/o Savills, Landsdowne House 57 Berkeley Square, London W1J 6ER.  
Ian Stone, BFL Management Limited, 189-193 Earls Court Road, London SW5 9AN. |
| **Occumier:** Majestic Wine Warehouse (ground floor). Combination of offices with unknown tenants and vacant offices above. |
| **Site description:** The site is occupied by a mix of retail and offices within a building that has a maximum height of seven storeys. The upper floors of the building are currently set back from the street line in a podium-block format. |
| The site is a corner site between The Broadway and Southey Road. To the south of the site are residential terraces. On the opposite side of The Broadway are similar mixed use developments with a range of building heights from three to six storeys. |
| The site is located within Wimbledon town centre and is adjacent to mixed use developments of retail, offices and residential uses. |
| **Information source:** Agent provided landowner information. |
| **Current use:** Commercial and office uses. |
| **Use suggested/organisation:** Retail, restaurant, residential, community use – Savills (consultants) representing ORION and BFL Management LTD. |
| **Allocated use:** A suitable mix of retail (A1 Use Class), financial & professional services (A2 Use Class), restaurants & cafes (A3 Use Class), drinking establishments (A4 Use Class), offices (B1[a] Use Class), community (D1 Use Class), sporting/leisure use (D2 Use Class) and residential uses (including hotel, C3 & C1 Use Class). |
### Consultation Responses Summary

#### Landowners/occupiers

No representation received following call for sites.

#### Local residents/organisations

Coelbourne S – support for mixed use redevelopment of this site and Wimbledon YMCA (site 62) with perhaps sports related uses on the ground floor. Building heights should be in line with other local buildings.

MacNab W – redeveloping this site in addition to the adjoining site to the west would be out of scale for the area.

South Molten Real Estate – considers that reference to requiring active street frontages as part of any redevelopment should not be required because there is already an oversupply of these uses on the street frontage in Wimbledon. Active street frontages should be deemed to be achieved by permitting offices at ground floor level provided some other means (such as glazed curtain walling to the ground floor) are adopted (e.g the CIPD building on The Broadway).

Think Future – support for the preferred uses. Would also like to promote the Work Free concept where people work locally whilst their child is looked after, particularly if a safe outdoor play area for children can be included as part of redevelopment.

Wimbledon Society: –
- the site is in the culture zone therefore preferred uses should include culture and the arts.
- the height should be no greater than the CIPD building opposite to avoid creating a canyon effect, particularly as the site is on the southern side of The Broadway and could result in shadowing effects. A new building should also maintain the existing gap to the adjoining building to the west. The northern elevation should be parallel to the CIPD building.
- Tree planting in the forecourt area should be encouraged.
- The scale of development must respect the scale of the housing to the south.
- There should be no traffic entrance from The Broadway to avoid breaking up an active frontage. There is potential for shared service entrance from Southey Road.
- Potential site for incorporation in the town CHP scheme.

#### Statutory agencies

No consultation received.

#### Others

Conservative Group – the site should be used for retail and office use only.

### Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

#### Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

**Scale, bulk and location of development on the site and related matters**

Generally speaking, the quantum of development is not being dictated by the allocation of the site in the Sites and Policies DPD. This is because it is more appropriately determined through the planning application phase based on interpretation of the policy. To specify design limits or restrictions would be pre-empting the adopted policies themselves. However, regard can be given to the issues raised as part of the public consultation process and comments provided accordingly.

The building line of any new development is most appropriately considered during the planning application phase.
New development should acknowledge and have regard to the existing building line along the street, noting that the existing building on the site is set back from Southey Road and neighbouring buildings above the second storey and is set back further than adjoining buildings along The Broadway. Appropriate regard will be required to be given to the adjoining residential uses adjacent to the southern boundary of the site. It is also noted that a planning application has recently been refused for a hotel on the adjoining site to the west with one of the key reasons being design related. This confirms that any future development of the site will need to be a high quality and appropriate scale design which complements the surrounding area and Wimbledon town centre.

An active frontage should not be provided, or can be provided through other suitable use of the site
The site is located in the Wimbledon town centre. It is considered that active street frontages are not solely restricted to certain uses as stated in the correspondence. This provision is included in the site issues description to ensure any future owner/developer is aware that any future ground floor building/occupier should appropriately address the street frontage given its prominent corner location in the town centre.

Preferred use should include culture and the arts/preferred use should be for retail and office only
Culture and the arts related uses are considered appropriate in this location therefore the site allocation has been amended following receipt of the representations. The allocation includes D2 Use Class.

Regarding retail and office use, these uses are provided in the allocation therefore enabling an enhanced mixed use development which may include such uses. It is not considered appropriate to unduly restrict the use of the site solely to retail and offices when no such evidence exists for doing so.

Tree planting should be encouraged
This will be subject to detailed design during the planning application phase of development. It is neither encouraged nor discouraged as part of the site allocation. There are existing street trees along the frontage of The Broadway in front of the site.

Vehicle access should be provided from Southey Road only
Council agrees that access should not be provided from The Broadway. Access from The Broadway would not be supported either from a policy perspective or transportation perspective. It would most likely result in a disjointed road frontage along The Broadway if access was provided there as well as result in access impacts of servicing due to the narrow and congested nature of The Broadway. It is acknowledged that access would be most appropriately obtained, and thus retained, from Southey Road.

Potential for inclusion within a town CHP scheme
Further investigation is required with regard to CHP schemes in the borough. No sites are specifically identified as requiring a CHP scheme. The provision of CHP will be undertaken further exclusive of the Sites and Policies DPD.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

Scale, bulk and location of development on the site and related matters
Scale, bulk, location and other design related matters will be taken into account and implemented where appropriate as part of the planning application phase. Where possible, various aspects have been included and considered as part of the Sites and Policies Plan, however this deliberately does not apply to detailed or site specific design matters.

An active frontage should not be provided, or can be provided through other suitable use of the site
It is a policy requirement for an active frontage to be required therefore a barrier exists to the implantation of this measure.
Preferred use should include culture and the arts/preferred use should be for retail and office only
The allocated use includes these uses among others in order to provide a degree of flexibility associated with this prominent corner site. This accords with the NPPF and the final mix of uses will be subject to evidence, policy and consultation prior to and during the planning application phase of development.

Tree planting should be encouraged
Tree planting will be encouraged in line with council policy.

Vehicle access should be provided from Southey Road only
The allocation requires vehicle access to be from Southey Road only.

Potential for inclusion within a town CHP scheme
The potential for a town CHP scheme will be in line with council policy.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is considered to be suitable for mixed use redevelopment based on its location in Wimbledon Town Centre and the nature of existing uses on and surrounding the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding site suitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Availability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is in freehold ownership and the owner has advised that the entire site is available for redevelopment. Council should seek confirmation from the owner regarding the lease arrangements on the site for the existing occupiers (Majestic Wine Warehouse and offices above) for assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Information provided to council on behalf of owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no issues identified regarding site availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Determination by council officers based on information provided by landowner’s agent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site is being actively considered for redevelopment. The owner is willing and able to submit a planning application for redevelopment in the near future. The owner intends to develop the site as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no apparent issues regarding site viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Strategic planning factors

The site is located in the town centre boundary although it is not situated in the main shopping area of Wimbledon.

This is a significant corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway.

The site is in an area with an excellent accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 6a).

Part of the site is within a critical drainage area.

## Have any other issues been identified?

This site is a corner site with an active frontage facing onto The Broadway so redevelopment of exemplary design would be welcomed. The ground floor should have an active frontage, respecting the dual aspect and corner site.

Redevelopment should provide high quality office space on upper floors.

In a mixed use development residential uses should be on the upper floors.

Servicing facilities should be provided on site to minimise impacts on traffic movement, congestion and road safety. Mitigate and manage impacts of parking on neighbourhood and local amenity.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

Appropriate mitigation measures regarding the above matters will be taken into account during the planning application phase.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

## Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its current uses. Any redevelopment proposal would be ad hoc and considered on its merits at the time a planning application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is situated within Wimbledon town centre. The allocation provides for a range of town centre type uses to be established which are consistent with the Core Strategy and emerging policy for town centres. Any alternative use would be subject to meeting policy, evidence and consultation. There is no evidence to suggest that any alternative uses would be viable or comply with policy for the site.

## Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uses</strong>: Likely mixed use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity (if relevant)</strong>: Unknown. Dependent on market demands for typical town centre uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Typical site area and building floor areas, if known</strong>: Unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery timeframe(s) specified by</strong>: Agent/owner; council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential occupiers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 64 – 12a Ravensbury Terrace
12a Ravensbury Terrace
London
SW18 4RL

Area: 0.1 ha

Location Map

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Michael Stone, Beech Green Park, Beech Green Lane, Withyham, East Sussex TN7 4DB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Thomson Reuters (FindLaw UK).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is situated adjacent the northern borough boundary with the London Borough of Wandsworth and also adjoins to the River Wandle along the eastern boundary. Immediately to the south of the site is 12 Ravensbury Terrace, a three storey building which has recently been renovated and is occupied by creative businesses including an architecture firm. Further south is a neighbouring site proposal, Haslemere Industrial Estate at 20 Ravensbury Terrace (Site 70). West of the site are predominantly small residential terraces. To the north is a culverted watercourse, which drains to the River Wandle, with a workshop beyond. The site is within a 5 minute walk to Earlsfield station which is situated less than 400 m northeast of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Agent provided information and council officer site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Office and vacant warehouse use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested / organisation:</strong> Residential (C3 Use Class) and office (B1[a] Use Class) – Planning Potential (consultants) representing M. Stone (site owner).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated use:</strong> Office and residential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Responses Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landowners/occupiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Potential (on behalf of M Stone) – want to expand the existing built form on the site for a mixed use development comprising offices and residential use. The landowner has support for expansion from the current occupier (Thomson Reuters) who is also likely to expand into increased office space. The existing occupier has invested more than £100,000 refurbishing the site and has grown significantly in the last 5 years. They wish to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
continually grow and establish their business on the site following redevelopment.

The owner has also provided a flood risk assessment and other information to council to support the deliverability of this site.

**Local residents/organisations**

Colebourne S – expansion should not compromise the railway line.

Wimbledon Society: –
- The existing use should be retained and building not demolished, claiming a loss of employment land;
- There should also be no housing on the site;
- There are various statements regarding the building on the site however this is incorrect and refers to the adjoining site at 12 Ravensbury Terrace.
- the adjoining building could be a candidate for a local listing;
- the river at this point has a special natural and sylvan character with green banks;
- setting the building back from the waters edge would enhance the green character and the creation of a riverside walk should be considered;
- consideration could be given to a new pedestrian/cycle bridge across the river;
- given the proximity to Earlsfield Station the suggested PTAL rating seems too low;
- given that the site is within the functional flood plain the site is not suitable for residential development, offices and creative industries would be appropriate.

**Statutory agencies**

Environment Agency – the site is within the functional floodplain and a critical drainage area. The site is not suitable for residential development as a result. Redevelopment will also require a phase I assessment for potential contamination.

GLA – the site is safeguarded for Crossrail2 and should be treated as such.

Metropolitan Police – the site refers to Secured by Design principles within the Sustainability Appraisal.

London Borough of Wandsworth – want some form of caveat (or equivalent) to ensure preferred or future uses would include sufficient mitigation measures to avoid any conflicts with the adjoining industrial uses which could prejudice continuing industrial use/viability of the industrial uses within the Wandsworth Locally Significant Industrial Area. They also state concerns regarding traffic generation from future development/intensification and are aware of the possible width narrowing measures.

**Others**

Conservative Group – the site should be for office use only and the boundary adjacent the river should be cleared to create a walkway to join the Wandle Trail.

English Heritage – want clarification on the site having been assessed as slightly negative in respect of the historic environment objective in the Sustainability Appraisal. English Heritage could not locate any reference to heritage assets in this location.

Natural England – would like to comment on potential green infrastructure opportunities.

**Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development should not compromise the railway line or the safeguarded land</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reference to land being safeguarded for Crossrail2 was incorrect and the area is situated to the south of the site. The land adjoining the site is not identified as part of any known transport proposal. The Wandle River forms the entire boundary along the site therefore use for rail is not likely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The site is in the functional flood plain and therefore not suitable for residential use**
It is acknowledged that the site is identified within the functional flood plan (flood zone 3b). Some representations were received stated that the site was only suitable for offices or similar uses as a result. The owner and their agents have prepared a draft site specific flood risk assessment which reflects a proposed development for the site. The report identified mitigation measures for the identified development, noting that no planning application has been submitted. A copy of the report has been provided to the Environment Agency and the site discussed with them and council officers. The Environment Agency stated that residential development could be provided on the site provided it was elevated a sufficient level above the required flood level (plus freeboard) and that safe ingress and egress during an event could be achieved, among other mitigation measures (including a sequential test and impact assessment). The development assessed comprised a redeveloped office provision on the ground floor and no net increase in built form situated in the flood plain, with more office and residential development situated on upper floors. Subject to appropriate mitigation measures, it is considered that residential development could be provided on site. The proposal would provide an enhanced and increased office facility with supporting residential development. The employment provision on the site would therefore be increased which is considered to be a positive factor. Excluding the immediately adjacent land, the site is considered suitable for residential development based on the predominantly residential nature of the area and the proximity to Earlsfield and public transport.

**A pedestrian/cycle link should be provided over the river**
A pedestrian/cycle bridge is the subject of current investigations being undertaken by the London Borough of Merton and the London Borough of Wandsworth. The area over and adjacent the culvert on the northern boundary of the site has been identified as possibly being appropriate. This work is being undertaken independent of the Sites and Policies DPD. The allocation does not preclude a crossing from being established in the future. There are buildings along the entire boundary of the site with the river, therefore they would be required to be removed if any crossing was to be provided through the site. There is no onus or requirement on the site owner to provide such a facility there it is not considered appropriate to have formal regard to a river crossing in the Sites and Policies DPD.

**The adjoining riverbank/corridor should be enhanced and a walkway provided. Potential also exists for green infrastructure to be provided**
Based on the nature of existing development located on both banks of the river and to the north and south of the site, it is not considered that the provision exists in which to establish a walkway along the river in this location. As part of preliminary designs undertaken by the landowner their proposal would include the riverbank being opened up and enhanced. This is voluntary work to be undertaken by the owner as part of redevelopment of the site. There are existing buildings located on the site and immediately to the south which are built up to the edge of the river which effectively contribute to being flood barriers.

The site doesn’t really lend itself to green infrastructure opportunities due to the size and nature of existing development on the site. However, in draft plans prepared for the site development the landowner does wish to redevelop the edge of the site with the river to enhance and make it user friendly for site users. There doesn’t appear to be any existing trail along the Wandle River adjoining the site therefore a walkway would not lead anywhere.

**Historic assets on the site**
The comments referring to the Sustainability Appraisal state that Site 70 (Haslemere Industrial Estate) has
archaeological heritage. Neither the Sustainability Appraisal nor the Sites and Policies DPD refer to this site as having archaeological significance. It is therefore considered to be a mistake in the representation.

**Potential impact on the adjoining industrial area in Wandsworth**

There is no evidence to suggest that expansion of the office use on the site will have any actual or potential affects on the adjoining locally significant industrial area. It is considered that conflicting uses are not likely to impact neighbouring LSIA due to the suggested use being B1[a] for the site. There is approximately 460 m$^2$ of additional office space proposed at this point in time and 9 residential units totalling approximately 546 m$^2$. Regarding the width restriction, it was resolved at a committee meeting on 23 April 2013 by the London Borough of Wandsworth not to implement a width restriction but undertake ongoing investigations regarding heavy goods vehicles using the streets which provide access to the site.

**What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?**

**Development should not compromise the railway line or the safeguarded land**

It is considered that the development is unlikely to result in any direct impact on the nearby railway lines or safeguarded land. It is not considered that there are any barriers that are required to be overcome.

**The site is in the functional flood plain and therefore not suitable for residential use**

Following discussions with the owner and Environment Agency, any development proposed on the site will be required to undertake an appropriate site specific Flood Risk Assessment which will include a sequential test and determination of suitable mitigation measures.

**A pedestrian/cycle link should be provided over the river**

It is not considered that there are any barriers to implementation of the request, however it is considered that it should be undertaken independently of the Sites and Policies DPD.

**The adjoining riverbank/corridor should be enhanced and a walkway provided. Potential also exists for green infrastructure to be provided**

The owner has advised that they intend to enhance the river edge along the boundary of the site as part of redeveloping the site. Following further research it is considered unlikely that a walkway is capable of being established along this section of the river due to existing development up to the river edge both north and south of the site.

**Historic assets on the site**

These matters will be considered further as part of the Sustainability Appraisal.

**Potential impact on the adjoining industrial area in Wandsworth**

These matters will be considered at the time a planning application is submitted. The London Borough of Wandsworth will also have further opportunity to comment on a planning application at that point in time.

In summary, there are no major barriers raised from representations that otherwise cannot be assessed and dealt with accordingly during the planning process.

---

### Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no relevant issues regarding site suitability. Both the owner and occupier support expansion of office use on the site and upper level residential uses are considered appropriate. The site is therefore considered appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for these uses as a result. Mitigation measures regarding flood risk will need to be accurately determined and implemented.

Information source: Council officer determined based on information provided from landowner and meeting with Environment Agency representatives.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

Refer above. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment will be prepared and submitted as part of any planning application to redevelop the site. This process will determine appropriate improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The site is in freehold ownership of Michael Stone according to the planning consultant. The landowner and occupier have both stated that the site is available for redevelopment without restriction.

Information source: Landowner, landowner’s consultant.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

No issues have been identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Have any other issues been identified?**

The landowner has engaged a planning consultation and a reasonable amount of background information to date regarding the redevelopment of the site. The landowner believes the site is viable for the preferred use. The willingness to undertake the development as soon as possible illustrates the viability of the site for the owner. It is understood that a planning application is imminent.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

No issues have been identified regarding the viability of the site. The landowner is willing and able to redevelop the site and has provided sufficient evidence to support this.

Information source: Council determination based on landowner involvement and evidence provided.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is in an area with moderate accessibility to public transport services (PTAL 3).

The site and its surrounds are within the functional floodplain of the River Wandle (Flood Zone 3b).

The eastern boundary of the site is designated as a site of importance for nature conservation and green corridor.

**Have any other issues been identified?**

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the functional floodplain to minimise flood risk for future occupiers and the potential for water pollution from the site.
Continuing employment uses associated with the site and the neighbouring sites.

Mitigating potential parking, traffic and safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Protecting the amenity of those properties adjacent to, or in the vicinity of the site, including access to the adjoining businesses to the south of the site.

Impact of any development proposal on protected species, biodiversity and the adjacent green corridor.

Transport proposal 24TN identifies a potential pedestrian/cycle bridge crossing the River Wandle in the vicinity of the site as part of the Wandle Trail.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

It is considered that appropriate measures for the above issues can be determined and implemented during the planning application phase.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

**Alternative options/uses**

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its office use. Any redevelopment proposal would be ad hoc and considered on its merits at the time a planning application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is situated at the northern extent of a contiguous area of employment led uses. The site is currently used for offices but could be considered for other B use classes suitable in a residential area. There is no evidence to suggest that there is demand for additional employment space in Merton, therefore additional employment are unlikely to be viable.

**Relevant Excerpts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers**

**What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?**

Uses: Offices units and residential units.

**Capacity (if relevant):** There is capacity for additional housing in Merton. Thomson Reuters have indicated they seek additional office space for their operations which illustrates demand and thus capacity for suitable office space.

**Typical site area and building floor areas, if known:** The site area is approximately 1000 m$^2$. Preliminary areas referred to in the FRA are approximately 460 m$^2$ of office area and up to nine residential units with a total of 540 m$^2$.

**Delivery timeframe(s):** 0 – 5 years; 5 – 10 years; >10 years

**Potential occupiers:** Thomson Reuters, residential use.

**What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?**

Not being able to appropriately mitigate the flood risk on the site.
Deliverability Assessment

General Information

Site 70 – Haslemere Industrial Estate
20 Ravensbury Terrace
Wimbledon Park
SW18 4RL

Area: 0.77 ha

Location Map

Site Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land ownership/occupation (freehold and/or leasehold - length of time) and site description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeholder:</strong> Edler’s Anglo Austrian Patisserie, Columbus Industrial Fund and Oakgreen Estates (represented by Astranta Asset Management), c/- Catherine Seddon, Jones Lang LaSelle, 22 Hanover Square, London W1S 1JA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupier:</strong> Unit 1a recently vacated by MJR Tom and currently occupied by a short term leisure occupier, owned by Oak Green Estates, 2006 – present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units 1b – 3, Edler’s Anglo Austrian Patisserie Ltd, 1975 – present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4, Deans Blinds and Awnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site description:</strong> The site is situated near the northern borough boundary with the London Borough of Wandsworth and is adjacent to the River Wandle and railway lines to the east. The site has a mixture of purpose built industrial units and provides vehicular access to the adjoining Rufus Business Estate to the south. The site is within 5 minutes walk to Earlsfield station which is situated less than 400 m northeast of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediately to the north of the site is 12 Ravensbury Terrace, a three storey building which has recently been renovated and is occupied by creative businesses which include an architecture firm. Further north is a neighbouring site proposal, 12A Ravensbury Terrace (Site 64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of the site are predominantly the garages and yards of two storey residential terraces. To the east of the site is the River Wandle and railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information source:</strong> Jones Lang LaSelle (agent) on behalf of Astranta Asset Management (representing owners) and council officer site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Use:</strong> Business and industrial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use suggested/organisation:</strong> Alternative uses on the site such as residential - Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of Astranta Asset Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation use:</strong> Business / Light Industrial (B1) or a suitable employment led redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultation Responses Summary

**Landowners/occupiers**

Astranta Asset Management (acting on behalf of the owners and incorporating representations made as part of Stage 2a and Stage 3).

The estate has come to the end of its economic life in terms of the large amount of investment required to bring the buildings up to modern standards. The reasons for this are stated as being three-fold. Firstly, there is little to no demand for industrial units in the location. Secondly, the size and location don’t meet market requirements, namely larger units that are not in close proximity to residential use, in areas with good access where larger vehicles do not have to negotiate narrow residential streets (with supporting evidence from a third party consultant). Thirdly, the London Borough of Wandsworth has confirmed they will be implementing a temporary width restriction in Ravensbury Terrace which will restrict access for heavy goods vehicles. This will impact the viability and feasibility of the site as an industrial/warehouse estate for at least 18 months whilst the restriction is in place (N.B. further consultation is required to make it permanent and objection rights exist).

The site benefits from good access to public transport and is immediately bounded by residential use, thus being suited to residential use. Redevelopment for residential use would reduce impacts on neighbouring residential uses.

The continuation of the site for business/industrial use is contrary to policies in the Employment and Economic Land Study September 2010. The representation references paragraph 4.28 which states that small scattered industrial sites in residential areas often provide poor quality accommodation for occupiers and can be very difficult to re-let if they become vacant.

It was also requested that the designation outlined in the draft proposals maps and policy TN5 be removed. It related to land being safeguarded for Crossrail and the district line at Wimbledon.

**Local residents/organisations**

Colebourne S – development must not restrict the railway lines which may be widened.

Conservative Group – supported council’s preferred use to be retained as business/light industrial. Also stated that the river area could be enhanced to create a walkway to join the Wandle Trail.

Rosoman A – support for the suggested use for residential by the owner. They are an adjoining landowner and outlined concerns with the existing industry such as noise, odour, hours of operation, heavy vehicles, and the nature of the asbestos clad buildings affecting him and his property.

Wimbledon Society (incorporating Stage 2 and 3 comments):

- The site provides a significant amount of industrial land in close proximity to Earlsfield centre and station
- The retention of employment and growth of commercial should be encouraged
- Residential is inappropriate given the location in the functional flood plain
- Possibility of establishing a riverside walk
- The river at this point has a very special sylvan and natural character with green banks. Setting back future buildings and access roads would allow enhancement of the river bank, noting that the rear elevation would be in public view of the railway lines
- The suggested PTAL rating seems too low
- Offices and creative industries would be appropriate as large vehicles are not required
- Wimbledon West Primary School is situated to the west of the site therefore school use could also be added to the preferred use.
Statutory agencies

Environment Agency:
Stage 2a – the site is not suitable for residential development and no mitigation is possible because it is in the functional flood plan of the Wandle River (Flood Zone 3b).
Stage 3 – following a meeting and further liaison with the Environment Agency, their Stage 3 representation reiterated many of the concerns but they do acknowledge that suitable mitigation measures may be possible if the site is redeveloped. This can be appropriately determined within a site specific flood risk assessment and compliance with council policies.

GLA:
Stage 2a – support council’s suggested use to be retained as business/light industrial.
Stage 3 – no reference to the site or the change to the preferred use.

Metropolitan Police – the site allocation has no reference to Secured by Design (SBD) principles.

London Borough of Wandsworth – would seek caveats to be placed on the titles to ensure that the preferred use (including possible residential) would include sufficient mitigation measures to avoid conflicts or prejudice the use/viability of the adjoining industrial land within the Wandsworth Locally Significant Industrial Area. A potential mixed use development could give rise to other problems, in particular traffic. This correspondence was received from the London Borough of Wandsworth Planning and Environmental Services Department.

London Borough of Wandsworth – since the representation above was received during the Stage 2a consultation, the London Borough of Wandsworth advised that they are implementing an experimental width restriction in Ravensbury Terrace which will prevent access for HGV’s to the site. A width restriction is proposed in order to prevent HGV’s accessing Edler’s Anglo Austrian Patisserie due to safety and amenity concerns. A width restriction can be imposed at any time for a period of up to 18 months as it is an experimental restriction. Following months of further deliberations, LBW resolved not to proceed with the experimental width restriction at a committee meeting on 23 April 2013, but are undertaking further investigation into the restriction of large vehicles in Ravensbury Terrace.

Others

Natural England – the site is adjacent the River Wandle and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. They would also like the opportunity to comment on the potential for use of green infrastructure.

Responding to Issues Raised in the Consultation

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the above concerns?

The proposed site allocation and alternative uses
The issues raised in the consultation are generally summarised as follows:

- The site should be retained for business/light industrial
- The site should not be used for residential use
- The site should be redeveloped for solely residential use

The London Borough of Merton’s preferred use is for a continuation of existing uses or a suitable employment led redevelopment.

The allocation retains the ability for the site to continue the existing business/light industrial uses. However, as a result of consultation with various parties and the measures proposed by the London Borough of Wandsworth to impose a width restriction in Ravensbury Terrace, the London Borough of Merton recognises that it may not be
viable or feasible for the site to be retained for business/light industrial use even in its current capacity, let alone allocating it solely for a continuation or expansion of these uses. The agent acting on behalf of the owners has provided evidence regarding the state of the existing buildings and their suitability for ongoing light industrial uses and how they may be compromised. The evidence stated that the buildings are at the end of their economic lives for various reasons and that they do not suit the needs of the modern market. Refurbishment would result in substantial costs that would not be recovered in the current environment, especially when taking into account the impending width restriction. These issues have been recognised and the allocated use is for retention of the existing uses, or an appropriate employment led redevelopment of the site. This recognises the issues the site faces for ongoing use of the site for light industry type uses, but also takes into account that the site is not suitable for a residential led development and council’s desire to retain jobs on the site. It is considered that the preferred use bridges the gap between these two types of developments and provides a suitable alternative for the site to be redeveloped. Both the owner and council support the allocation in its current format.

Based on the evidence provided regarding the state of the building, the marketing of part of the site and the potential width restriction measures being considered by the London Borough of Wandsworth, the London Borough of Merton considers that an employment led mixed use development is appropriate for the site. London Borough of Merton’s preferred use for the site changed as a result from Stage 2a to Stage 3 to acknowledge this. Both the owners and the London Borough of Merton now agree that an appropriate employment led redevelopment of the site is suitable. The final mix of uses is unknown and will be based upon further research but could comprise a mix of employment, business, office, community and residential uses. The issues are therefore deemed to have been taken account of in regard to the issues raised by the owners.

The site is not considered appropriate for solely residential use based on the site being largely located within the function flood plain (zone 3b) and the desire for council to retain employment led uses and jobs on this site (in conjunction with the adjoining Rufus Business Estate). The preferred use is deemed to be an appropriate compromise and will result in much of the noise, odour, hours of operation, heavy goods vehicles’ and traffic issues being reduced and/or mitigated. The London Borough of Merton is not precluding the ability for some element of residential use to be incorporated on upper floors, subject to meeting relevant policy regarding flood risk and other policies.

Regarding the protection of the nearby industrial land within the London Borough of Wandsworth, the council can place caveats on the title at their own expense as the need may arise. Cross boundary traffic impacts will be assessed at the time a planning application is made within an appropriate transport assessment and consultation with the London Borough of Wandsworth. This will take into account potential adverse effects and any appropriate mitigation. The information from the Planning and Environmental Services team conflicts with the intention to impose a width restriction in Ravensbury Terrace.

**Adjoining land is required for railway expansion**

The land adjoining (and partially overlaying) is an historic designation whereby it was safeguarded for Crossrail or some alternative expansion of the adjoining railway. It was made public in February 2013 that Crossrail2 is likely to follow an alternative route therefore the land is not likely to be required for railway expansion. The identification on the draft Policies Map will be retained however because the final safeguarding plans for Crossrail2 are not due to be released until 2014. It is therefore necessary to retain the existing designation in the draft Policies Map as it is subject to the existing safeguarding route, however it is recognised that the land is not likely to be required for this designation and it is likely to be removed in 2014. It therefore needs to be retained at this point in time.

**Possibility to establish and expand a walkway along the Wandle River**

It is considered that redevelopment of the site is not likely to result in adverse effects on the river, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions regarding redevelopment of the site and protection of runoff etc. The
site is considered too small to contribute to green infrastructure and the site does not have good connectivity with adjoining sites. There appears to be restrictions on the provision of any walking trail along the river due to the narrow width of the river and built development up to the river bank both north and south of the site. There does not appear to be adequate land available and physical constraints for a walkway both upstream and downstream on both banks of the river.

Flood risk
It is acknowledged that the site is identified within the functional flood plan (flood zone 3b) according to Environment Agency modelling. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the site has not flooded since it has been occupied by one of the current owners (1975 – Anglo Austrian Patisserie) and likewise for the adjacent site to the north (Site 64 12a Ravensbury Terrace). The Environment Agency acknowledged that some sites within the functional flood plain can be developed, provided they meet the required criteria regarding sequential tests, mitigation and modelling to be determined as part of a site specific flood risk assessment (Stage 3 representation). The agency stated that they would largely rely on existing and proposed council policies to adhere to these criteria. This information would therefore need to be prepared and submitted as part of a planning application to redevelop the site. It is considered that the site can be appropriately developed, subject to meeting these criteria, and that at-risk uses would need to be situated above the flood level (plus freeboard) and also have appropriate emergency access.

Secured by Design principles
Secured by Design is referred to in Merton’s Core Planning Strategy as well as the Mayor’s London Plan. This is considered sufficient to address the matters through any planning application to redevelop the site.

What is the likelihood that these measures would be implemented (or are there barriers to the implementation of the above measures)?

The main issue raised is with regard to the future use of the site. There are representations which state that industrial uses are appropriate on the site and also that they are not appropriate on the site. The same applies for residential uses. It is considered that an appropriate compromise is achieved with council’s preferred use for the site. An “employment led redevelopment” of the site enables a suitable provision for employment uses to be retained and enhanced on the site as evidenced by the success of current and historic businesses on the site. It also recognises the constraints to site development such as access, the imminent width restriction and its good PTAL level to acknowledge that uses similar to the existing operation may no longer be feasible or viable. The council also does not preclude residential use on the site, subject to appropriate mitigation measures regarding reverse sensitivity with existing uses, the nearby railway lines and flood risk. The council does not support solely residential use on the site.

To summarise, it is impossible to satisfy all of the concerns raised because they relate to a scenario which is not possible (i.e. development that is at opposite ends of the spectrum – industrial and residential use). It is however considered that council has made appropriate consideration of these suggestions and acknowledging that the site is appropriate for ongoing employment use, but acknowledging that there could be a mixed use component to it. It is considered that this is the most appropriate compromise that could be achieved taking into account the issues on the site and all the representations made.

Site Suitability - ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site suitability – have any issues been identified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The London Borough of Wandsworth is investigating potential heavy goods vehicle calming measures in Ravensbury Terrace therefore potentially restricting the types of employment/industrial uses that could occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The site is identified as being located within the functional flood plain which is a potential risk to residential and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other uses.

Information source: Site visit by council officers, information provided by landowner’s agents.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

The site is considered suitable for employment led redevelopment subject to future uses being able to derive an appropriate form of access utilising small vehicles only.

The potential for residential and other at risk uses will need to be assessed as part of any planning application to satisfy both council policy and Environment Agency requirements. Council is enabling such investigations to be made at the time of redevelopment. Anecdotal evidence claims that the subject site and the adjoining site to the north has never been flooded.


### Site Availability - ISSUES

**Site availability – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

Council has received representations from the body acting on behalf of the owners who all support the allocation. Council has been informed that the site is in freehold ownership and is available for redevelopment.

Information source: Landowner’s agent and meeting with the representatives.

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issue?**

There are no issues identified regarding site availability.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Site Achievability (Viability) - ISSUES

**Site achievability (viability) – have any issues been identified in the assessments?**

The owners have made a representation which supports council’s preferred use for redevelopment. It is considered that based on the information received and the level of interest that the site is considered viable to the owners which is sufficient. The viability of the site for redevelopment is therefore considered implicit with this information. Viability of future industrial uses on the site is severely restricted based on the nature of the existing buildings and the pending access restrictions to the site.

Information source: Council determination based information available (representation and liaison with owners and their agents).

**Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?**

There are no issues identified regarding the viability of the site for redevelopment.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

### Other Issues

**Strategic planning factors**

The site is part of contiguous employment use to the north and south.

The site has good access to public transport services (PTAL 4) and is within 5 minutes walk of Earlsfield railway station.

The eastern boundary of the site is designated as a site of importance for nature conservation and green corridor and is also identified as safeguarded for Crossrail 2 (Wimbledon Hackney Line).
The site is within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) and is susceptible surface water flooding to south and east of the site.

Have any other issues been identified?

Continuing space for employment in this area.

Investigating the potential impact of any proposed development on archaeological heritage.

Development proposals will need to incorporate suitable mitigation measures to address the issues associated with the functional floodplain to minimise flood risk for future occupiers and the potential for water pollution from the site.

Mitigating potential parking, traffic and safety impacts on neighbouring streets and local amenity.

Impact of any development proposal on protected species, biodiversity and the adjacent green corridor.

Transport proposal 24TN identifies a potential pedestrian/cycle bridge crossing the River Wandle in the vicinity of the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Are there improvements/measures that could overcome the identified issues?

The allocation will require an appropriate employment led redevelopment of the site. The remaining matters will be considered as part of any planning application on the site.

Information source: Council determination based on information available.

Alternative options/uses

Do nothing (i.e. the site is not allocated in the plan) – the site would continue to operate with its current employment use. Any redevelopment proposal would be ad hoc and considered on its merits at the time a planning application is submitted.

Alternative uses on the site – the site is situated at the within an area contiguous area of employment led uses. The site is currently used for manufacturing and industry uses but is considered suitable for a range of B uses suitable in a residential area. The council has deliberately left the site allocation broad ranging to provide flexibility for the owners to develop a new, high quality mixed use design which will achieve the necessary employment led uses on the site, but has the ability to accommodate alternative uses also. The council considers a range of uses potentially suitable on the site, however they will be subject to policy, evidence and consultation.

Relevant Extracts from the Notes of Meetings or Correspondence with Landowners/Proposers

What type(s) of development is foreseen at this site?

Uses: Appropriate employment uses possibly incorporating community and residential.

Capacity (if relevant): Dependent on demand at the time of development. There is capacity for housing in Merton if it is to be included.

Typical site area and building floor areas, if known: Unknown.

Delivery timeframe(s): [0 – 5 years] 5 – 10 years; >10 years

Delivery timeframe(s) specified by: Agent/owner; council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential occupiers: Unknown.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the potential barriers to delivery of the identified proposal?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appropriate employment led scheme being developed which is deliverable taking into account the sites’ constraints.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>