

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

Borough Planner’s report and recommendations on application for 84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

Ref.	Address	Proposal
2008/3321	84-88 Upper Richmond Road SW15	Demolition of the existing office buildings and the erection of mixed-use development comprising 300 residential units (Class C3), 3,439 sq.m of office space (Class B1), 114 sq.m retail (Class A1), 443 sq.m of flexible retail/restaurant space/office (Class A1/A3/B1), 2,862 sq.m of public amenity space, 32 car parking spaces, 213 sq.m of cycle storage in excavated basement level, associated plant and new public art in two buildings, one up to twenty six-storeys to parapet (84m) in height and another up to twenty one-storeys to parapet (67.5m) in height, a single-storey building containing 84sq.m of retail/cafe (Class A1/A3) and landscaped public realm.
27.06.08	East Putney	

SITE: 0.502 ha site on northern side of Upper Richmond Road opposite East Putney Underground Station. The site is elevated above land to the north and east whilst on the level with Upper Richmond Road. The site is occupied by two office buildings, 84 Upper Richmond Road, a 1980’s six/seven-storey brick built building with pedestrian access from Upper Richmond Road and vehicular access off Woodlands Way to the east. 86-88 is a part brick, part concrete 1960’s seven/nine-storey building occupying the west part of the site with vehicular access off Upper Richmond Road. The site boundaries are immediately defined by the elevated section of the District Line to the west beneath which there is a builders’ merchants and yard, the overland railway track between Putney and Wandsworth Town within a cutting to the north and to the east a further elevated section of railway separated from the site by a timber merchants building with service access via Woodlands Way to the east. To the west on the northern side of Upper Richmond Road are three-storey buildings comprising mixed commercial uses at ground floor with office and residential uses to upper floors and single-storey workshops to the rear within the Oxford Road Conservation Area. The eight-storey Capsticks office building is situated to the south-west across Upper Richmond Road. To the south-east across Upper Richmond Road is the nine/ten-storey Swish building comprising a mix of commercial at ground level and residential uses above. Three-storey residential terraces of Disraeli Road immediately back onto

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

the railway cutting to the north with similar residential properties surrounding. Woodlands Way to the east is a cul-de-sac leading to a footbridge across the railway cutting to Disraeli Road. Woodlands Gate is five-storey apartment building to the east on Woodlands Way separated from the east elevated railway by a single-storey car repairs workshop, the three-storey Wandsworth Magistrates' Court, customer access and parking for the timber merchants and a five-storey office building on the corner of Woodlands Way and Upper Richmond Road.

The site is entirely enclosed by a mix of fence and walling and with no access to the public. A TPO'd London Plane tree is situated to the Upper Richmond Road frontage. Within Putney Town Centre and the Oxford Road Conservation Area adjoins to the North-West.

HISTORY: Of relevance: 84 Upper Richmond Road

1977: p.p. erection of four-storey office building and 3 squash courts together with associated parking facilities.

1978: p.p. the erection of six-storey office building and squash courts.

1994: p.p. alterations and extensions to include erection of roof top conservatory (on north side) and glazed link; re-cladding of plant room and alterations to main lobby. External alterations to squash building and provision of staff restaurant.

86-88 Upper Richmond Road:

1963: p.p. erection of part four/part five-storey building and a part three/part seven-storey building for use as wholesale warehouse showrooms and offices on sites.

1972: p.p. use of fourth floor of warehouse part of building for storage and postal despatch of journals and as offices.

1978: p.p. alterations to forecourt to provide tarmac car-parking area.

1981: p.p. re-facing of the existing building.

1988: p.p. change of use of ground, first, third and fourth floors of building at rear of site, from warehousing to business use (Class B.1.).

1990: p.p. additional windows to side and rear elevations.

1991: p.p. change of use of second floor from warehouse to B1 offices.

1995: p.p. alterations to forecourt to provide additional parking spaces with new vehicular access onto Upper Richmond Road.

2003: p.p. demolition of existing seven-storey office building. Erection of new building up to nine-storeys in height to provide offices (Class B1), health club/cafe and 69 residential units (of which 19 are affordable). Formation of basement and surface level parking accessed from Upper Richmond Road.

2006: p.p. granted for use of office building for educational purposes for a limited period of four years.

DETAILS: The demolition of all buildings with removal of 7600sq.m of office space. Replacement with a twenty six-storey building to the west side of the site, a twenty one-storey building to the north-east of the site, a single-storey 8.7m high building to the south-east of the site adjoining Upper Richmond Road, with an overhead lattice work sculpture varying around 16m above ground level supported by 17.5m high

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

angled poles across the entire site. Indicative drawings show the overhead lattice work extend above Upper Richmond Road and above the entrance forecourt to East Putney Underground Station.

The twenty-six-storey tower 84m high would be of a modern and angular construction 5.5m from the north boundary, 7m from the west boundary and 8.75m from the pavement with Upper Richmond Road. It would be 21m wide, 53.5m long at ground level. The width would narrow to 19.5m at a height of 17m, widening to 21.25m at 47.75m and further narrowing thereafter to 14.25m at its highest point. The south elevation would project forward by 7m at its highest point toward Upper Richmond Road and would slope away southwards from the north elevation to the rear by 28m to a height of 80.5m.

The uses would comprise of A1 retail, A3 restaurant or B1 office space, residential lobby, refuse storage and management office to the ground floor, offices to the next 3 floors and the upper 20 floors of residential, the two remaining storeys would comprise of a roof garden and plant to the roof with a parapet. The floor area breakdown of uses would be 3,439 sq.m (gross) of office space (Class B1), 114 sq.m (gross) retail (Class A1); and 443 sq.m (gross) of flexible retail/restaurant space/office (Class A1/A3/B1). There would be 178 residential units (no affordable). Winter gardens would provide amenity space to each apartment varying between either 4 sq.m or 7.6 sq.m in area with a private roof terrace 28 sq.m each serving two penthouse apartments on the top floors.

Materials: A random mix comprising clear mirror, translucent white and opaque glass panels. Acrylic or glass shadow caster facing panels of varying shapes and colours would project on metal tubes approximately 1m in length. A glass reinforced plastic pod to the first floor is proposed to serve as a dining area to the east elevation above a dining terrace of modern design with a red roof continuing around the north-east corner of the building to serve as an office amenity area. A dining patio at ground level serving a retail/restaurant/office area within the building.

The twenty-one-storey building would also be of a modern design and be rotund, sited 7.5m from the north boundary, 2.5 from the east boundary and 48m from the Woodlands Way entrance and 26m in diameter. The building would be sited on a network of 7m high columns above a central core with the entrance lobby, refuse recycling and sub-station at ground level within a triangulated shaped steel frame clad with stainless steel metal panels and glazed openings. The upper building would be constructed of alternate black and white vertical standing seam aluminium strips interspersed with glazing. A communal roof terrace 440 sq.m in area comprising of decking, green roof, and landscaping, plant room and storage would serve all apartments. The roof would feature an anodised aluminium or vitreous enamel metal panels circling the building, which would be lit at night to form 'halo' appearance. The building would be entirely residential to comprise of 122 units. 108 of the units would be affordable, including 7 supported living units, which would represent the total number of affordable units at the site totalling 36% with a 50/50 social

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

rented/shared equity mix. The total private residential amenity space for the two buildings would be 1430 sq.m.

Vehicular access would be off Upper Richmond Road via a ramp to the west to an underground car-park formed in an excavated basement along the north and west boundaries, 11.5m from the south boundary and 57m from the east boundary entrance with Woodlands Way. The basement would extend to serve both tower buildings and would contain 32 parking spaces, 5 of which would be dedicated to the disabled, 213 sq.m cycle storage and access for service vehicles. 20 further cycle spaces at ground level would be provided with a total of 370 cycle spaces on-site and offers from the applicant to support the further provision of storage facilities capable of accommodating 90 bicycles outside East Putney Underground Station secured via s106. A public pick up and drop off access bay would be formed to the Upper Richmond Road frontage. Car club parking spaces would be provided within the basement. Servicing and refuse collection would take place at the northern perimeter of the site with access from Woodlands Way with a plant room within the basement.

The third building would be sited in the south-east corner of the site, 4.5m from Upper Richmond Road. 8.7m high pitched roof x 5.9m wide x 15.76m long wide proposed as a café/retail unit. Materials: core-ten brown metal cladding with irregular punched windows with colour reveals and full height glazed entrances.

The proposal would open up pedestrian access from Upper Richmond Road through to Woodlands Way to the north-east and all areas would be landscaped to form a pedestrianised hardstanding. Occasional tree planting, seating, tactile paving, automatic bollards to prevent vehicle access and lighting would be provided in addition to areas of outdoor seating associated with the café/restaurant uses. The overhead lattice work would be circular tubes or varying colours and be internally lit at night.

The applicant advises they are presently in negotiations with TfL to form a shared surface across Upper Richmond Road and need to incorporate a 3m wide footway along the southern boundary of the site. Furthermore they aspire to provide improvement works to the entrance area of East Putney Underground Station.

Interactive timber decked children's active play area comprising of an interactive water, sculptured land form including a 'water wall' and fountain jets are proposed to add visual and direct active areas of interest within the open space. The total public amenity space would be 2862 sq.m. Screening to the north, east and west of the site boundary formed by a combination of solid concrete walls, trellis structures for climbing plants and tree planting is proposed. The TPO'd tree to Upper Richmond Road would be retained.

Density: 1574 hrph. Plot Ratio: 5.93:1

The application is accompanied by each of the following supporting documents:

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

Planning Statement: Refers to the regenerative effects the proposal would have by replacing aged buildings through cross-subsidising the development of better flexible office accommodation to meet modern demands in the town centre through the redevelopment with a tall building with an appropriate mix of uses, increasing vitality of Putney and meeting housing targets in an area with a good level of public transport at the site (PTAL level of 5) and good infrastructure promoting sustainable transport choices. The report continues the site is a suitable location for an iconic, attractive, landmark building which would act as a catalyst for regeneration to enhance the Borough's character complementing large scale development projects at Clapham Junction, Battersea Power Station and the Ram Brewery, providing high quality civic space including public art which creates link between Upper Richmond Road and Woodlands Way. Refers to the outstanding approval for the erection of a nine-storey mixed use development of 69 residential units (19 affordable) and 3402sq.m of Class B1 office accommodation out of a total 9700sq.m.

The statement includes a Wandsworth Office Market Report to support the reduction in existing office space by describing the standard of the existing buildings as being ageing, in need of extensive refurbishment, being of insufficient height between floor plates and bespoke layout not suited to the market which restricts their marketability leading to their current vacancy. The combination of these factors together with the demand for modern standards and extent of local infrastructure in comparison with other more well established office areas such as the City, Canary Wharf, Hammersmith and Chiswick which render the area less attractive, mean it is unlikely the buildings are capable of meeting statutory requirements without incurring significant and economically unviable expenditure with 86-88 most notably considered to be obsolete. The report states the development would provide modern flexible suites to meet current demands and provide a more efficient fit-out and denser level of occupation than currently experienced at these older offices as numbers of employees would not decrease on a pro-rata basis and meet local demand.

Design and Access Statement : The statement examines the planning and design issues of the scheme. It covers analysis on the regional and local context, summarises opportunities and constraints, and assesses the impact of the scheme. It describes the urban design approach to justify the development of landmark buildings with the objectives to include a high-quality public realm, public art, to create a sustainable development and to act as a catalyst for the renaissance of Upper Richmond Road with reference to the site, uses, sustainability, character of the area, townscape, distant views and accessibility issues.

High Buildings Strategy: Seeks to provide an overview of the planning and development of high buildings regionally and within the Borough with reference to policy and a sieve map exercise identifying constraints, restrictions and opportunity areas where tall buildings could be assimilated with sensitive or inappropriate areas such as large protected open spaces, Metropolitan Open Land, Historic Parks and Gardens, green chains and links between Open Spaces, SSSI's and Local Nature Reserves, Wandsworth LDF, PTAL levels, local density levels, type of centre, heritage features, conservation areas, listed buildings, panoramic views and vistas, topography and landform and flooding blocked out. The report concludes the site falls within an area appropriate for taller buildings; the application building would be located within a cluster of buildings and act as a landmark for the surrounding area.

Statement of Community Engagement: Identifies the programme of pre-application community consultation on the emerging proposals which involved local people and stakeholders via newsletter and public exhibition with comments invited. Subsequently greater office accommodation was provided, building form changed, public realm contents were revised, market housing included, raised lattice artwork reduced, a raised external terrace for a restaurant introduced.

Sustainability Statement: Provides information and calculations on building sustainability and renewable energy at the development with details of cooling and heating systems, use of fuels and emission levels, concludes that

Transport Assessment: Sets out an appraisal of the transportation issues only for this site and does not take into account cumulative impact with any other schemes. The Transport Assessment (TA) assesses existing local transport facilities for the London Underground, including existing peak time passenger loadings, National Rail, London Buses, pedestrian facilities, cycle facilities, the highway network traffic volumes, estimates trip generation, takes into account the existing lawful use, effect of construction and effects of the development on movements. The report findings project vehicular traffic would account for just over 5% of all trips generated by the proposed development with the greatest effect on the Putney Hill to Upper Richmond Road movement and the reverse of this in both the morning and evening peaks.

Underground passengers are projected to account for over one third of trips made to and from the proposed development. At peak times this would represent between a maximum 1-2% increase in existing passenger numbers, the greatest projected increase would be by 46 occurring between 1800 and 1900 for passengers arriving from the north. Overall capacity of the station combining arrivals and departures at peak times is calculated to be minimal and the increase in overall patronage represents less than 1% of the estimated capacity of the line. The TA advises that at peak times the trains experience an occupancy that is approximately two thirds of the overall capacity provided on the line. The report concludes the overall effect can be considered to be of neutral significance and no mitigation measures are proposed for the underground station as a result of the proposed development. Similarly, the TA concludes there is sufficient existing capacity within the bus and national rail service

to withstand the estimated increases in patronage and no mitigation measures are proposed. The impact of the proposed development on cycle use is considered to be acceptable and of neutral impact on pedestrian movements and usage of the surrounding footway network. The TA advises the proposed development would lead to a minor increase in movements with significant reductions in vehicles movements due to the reduced parking capacity of the site.

Framework Travel Plan: Outlines the key aims and objectives of the Travel Plan, how it will be administered and managed and provides a list of suggested measures to encourage more sustainable patterns of travel.

Environmental Statement: The Environmental Statement (ES) seeks to identify the potential environmental effects of the proposed development and then assesses the extent and significance of those potential environmental effects based on consideration of the character, duration and importance of effects, environmental sensitivity of the development area and government regulations, policy and guidelines. The ES considers alternatives for development of the site being to retain the existing site to be inappropriate due to age, appearance and site constraints for future use; refurbishment being commercially uneconomic and physically unviable; implementation of the previously permitted scheme a missed opportunity to take advantage of highly sustainable location to deliver affordable housing, reduced car dependent development, high standard and flexible office accommodation, enhanced public realm and provision of landmark building of high architectural quality.

The ES further assess the proposed development as follows:

Summarises the national, regional and local regeneration; land-use; sustainability; accessibility; town centre; mixed-use; retail; economic and business; biodiversity; climate change; transportation; public open space; servicing, waste storage and collection; flood risk; and housing policies concluding compliance with planning policy.

The development would have a neutral effect on the transportation network in the surrounding area due to sites proximity to public transport, pedestrian and cycle facilities against the number of projected people and generated trip movements which would be satisfactorily accommodated without available capacities being exceeded.

Sufficiently distanced from ecological sites of value and on-site habitats of negligible value, mitigation measures during construction, tree protection measures and new landscaping and nesting measures lead to a minor positive impact on the surrounding area from an ecology and arboriculture perspective.

An assessment of the landscape, townscape and visual impact considered the regional, local and site context concluding a minor negative effect on the setting and characteristics of south-west London due to the migration of high-rise development into the western suburbs but identifies the introduction of an iconic development

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

coupled with location, relationship with South Circular and public transport nodes, the site being mostly obscured by intervening built masses and partial or oblique views from private properties forming a low impact. Coupled with positive aspects of expansion of streetscape, new public realm, site improvement, children's play area, new pedestrian link between Woodlands Way and Upper Richmond Road and formation of modern development the positive and negative effects will be balanced leading to a neutral impact.

Daylight and sunlight impact will benefit during construction phase by removal of existing buildings, though a number of neighbouring properties will have a degree of their light affected on completion, given flexible approach given by BRE Guidelines for the urban environment there would be a neutral impact.

A wind assessment identified the entrance to the retail unit at the front of the development, two seated areas on ground level and roof terrace to the twenty six-storey building would require strategic screening and planting for the development to have a neutral effect on site microclimate.

The air quality assessment demonstrates emissions during construction and from additional traffic flows and new modern heating plant attributed to the completed development would have a neutral effect.

The development would not cause any significant noise or vibration effects to adjoining properties other than during construction which would be mitigated against and occur during daytime. New residential units would need to be appropriately insulated against traffic noise and from any activities associated with proposed on-site A3 uses. Vibration from adjoining railway line negligible. Neutral effect.

Adverse effects to television services for up to 138 dwellings and a further 128 dwellings could lose a small amount of their signal. The applicants would obligate to upgrade aerials for all affected dwellings and provide non-subscription satellite services that carry main TV services to acutely affected properties where necessary. Neutral impact to electronic interference.

Limited potential ground contamination, identifies construction requirements and need for construction management plan.

No cumulative impacts on water resources and drainage are likely with integrated drainage, construction techniques, brown roof area and on-site water storage up to and including 1 in 100 year flood event.

The proposed development is forecast to lead to the need for 13 primary and 7 secondary school places which are available within existing capacity.

Beneficial effects of mix of uses to town centre, provide quantity, quality and mix of housing, including affordable housing, economic benefit through employment

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

generation, support economic growth, existing health service capacity, reduce opportunities for crime and limited demands on community facilities and services due to age range of occupiers would all lead to immediate positive socio-economic effects of the proposed development.

Some construction and land waste during development may be recycled or disposed of to landfill, likely to be small. Standard recycling and landfill disposal rates for household waste. Neutral impact.

No significant submitted or granted development schemes within the vicinity therefore no expected cumulative effects.

In conclusion the ES acknowledges adverse effects associated with the construction which are temporary ending on completion of the development with mitigation measures to reduce the impacts. It advises in most other aspects there would be a positive or neutral impact. In particular the proposed development will make a significant contribution to the local economy and public realm, transforming an area of poor environmental quality with ecological benefits.

Proposed Head of Legal Agreement: The applicant offers the operation of an on-site car club, provision of 90 bicycle storage facilities outside East Putney Underground Station, contribution to off-site child play area and securing on-site affordable housing by means of a s106 agreement.

CONSULTATION: Planning Newsletter (2300), site and press notices. 3 Support, 487 Objections including one 5 signatory letter and one 7 signatory letter: Contrary to UDP and London Plan Policy; design and materials; proportion, height and size inappropriate, out of scale with character of area; impact on Oxford Road Conservation Area; inappropriate location; impact/loss on historic landscape; repeating mistakes of 60's; socially inappropriate; need for family homes; Environmental Statement flawed, incorrect assumptions, lacks detail, inadequate daylight/sunlight and shadow study; residential amenity, dominant and oppressive, loss of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing; overlooking and loss of privacy; glare, solar dazzle; density; need – empty restaurant at Swish development; increase population and movements; traffic and congestion; inadequate parking; impact on public transport; congestion at tube station and on tube trains; development should discourage vehicle use; pedestrian crossing/safety; Woodlands Way access, footbridge affected; loss/lack of offices, loss of employment land; layout; no public transport improvement contribution; no social infrastructure contributions; no benefit to quality of townscape or public realm; no need to regenerate site/area; disruption during construction, noise, nuisance and pollution; cumulative impact with other local high rise developments; no need for landmark building; limited street frontage, unsuitable layout/constrained plot for redevelopment; lack of servicing facilities; loss of television reception; impact on environment; water provision; introduction of large number of commuters harmful to community; unoccupied accommodation locally; long-term maintenance of public open space; safety and suitability of children's play

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

area; lack of local infrastructure, schools, health provision, policing; light pollution; precedent.

Councillor Maddan: Whilst totally in favour of the redevelopment of this site, believe that this is a gross overdevelopment, and that the mass and structure of the proposed tower blocks will have a substantial impact on the community to the north of the site, particularly the residents of Disraeli Road, Fawe Park Road, Disraeli Gardens, Wadham Road and Bective Road. The fact that the sun rises in the east and crosses to the south of the site, means that the above residents will suffer from substantial shadowing and loss of sunlight as well as the buildings being wholly intrusive. Developers of sites such as this are encouraged to develop the site in such a way that residents and businesses use public transport, and it is disingenuous to claim that the site development will have no impact on a public transport system which is already at saturation point. Totally support the concerns of local residents who have been vociferous and have previously submitted objection.

Councillor Larsson: Whilst some improvements to upgrade the site would be welcome I share the concerns raised by many residents that the development would be overwhelming and wholly inappropriate. The buildings would appear unseemly, out of scale with the surroundings and should be opposed. The heights would cause overshadowing to residents of Woodlands Gate which would be unacceptable.

Stuart King (Labour Parliamentary Candidate): Grotesque overdevelopment, poor design, height, out of scale with surrounding environment without parallel within the area. Require large contribution to alleviate impact on public transport, car journeys, schools, hospitals, doctors and dentists. District line capacity is at a peak with the tube station unlikely to take the strain. Car parking provision inadequate leading to parking overspill on surrounding roads. Overdevelopment and too great population density levels, Putney will become swamped and strained leading to incapacity of infrastructure. Loss of office space and workers will affect local economy. Lack of affordable housing. Precedent, lead to overdevelopment in surrounding area with cumulative adverse impact.

Stuart King (Labour Parliamentary Candidate): survey: 7 Support, 223 Objections.

Justine Greening M.P.: Many residents are thoroughly concerned about these proposals. Most would support a high quality and imaginative development which will help to regenerate the area, bringing improved economic prospects and quality of life to the heart of Putney. However, the current plans are completely inappropriate and will have a negative effect on the areas that surround it. The height of both buildings is the most immediate concern for residents. They could be significantly higher than other residential and office buildings in the area, I believe the design is, frankly, an eyesore and totally out of keeping with the surrounding architecture and inappropriate for this particular site.

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

Finally, there is a local concern that the infrastructure of the area – notably the public transport system and the road network – will not be able to sustain a huge development. I do not want to see regeneration held up by the woeful lack of previous investment on our District Line, but this is clearly an important point. I understand that the Council cannot stop developers from submitting entirely inappropriate plans as this. I am also well aware these were developed under the terms of the previous Mayor of London who had a policy that actively encouraged developers to submit proposals for densely populated tall towers. Nevertheless, I would request that my constituents' views are fully taken into account during the planning process.

The Putney Society: Involved in meetings with applicant prior and during application. Public meeting expressed strong objection to proposal. Proposed development premature given the need for a town centre plan for Putney to include a high buildings policy for the town centre. Architects justification for the site as most suitable for a prominent landmark insensitive and separate. The proposed towers are too high, too-dominant, cause over-shadowing, overbearing, unsuitable design, intrusive, loss of privacy and un-neighbourly. Gross over-development against UDP residential density and plot ratio standards. Would not preserve or enhance the character of the Oxford Road Conservation Area. Reference the SWISH development on corner of Keswick and Upper Richmond Roads as a model generally acceptable. Further objections on the grounds of insufficient parking, no transport improvement plan, impact on public infrastructure, safety implications on Woodlands Way, pressure on public transport, public realm beneath and around buildings will attract criminal activity, abusive and drunken behaviour at night, precedent. Reject.

Wandsworth Teaching and Primary Care Trust NHS: The proposal will present significant additional demand for primary, secondary, mental and intermediate healthcare services commissioned by the PCT with a resulting combined annual financial impact in excess of £1.3m. Request contribution by means of S106 to reflect this financial requirement.

Greater London Authority: The Mayor commented that whilst the location and high level of public transport accessibility of the site were suitable for a high-density mixed-use development; the height, scale and massing of the proposed tower buildings were unduly obtrusive and wholly inappropriate to their surroundings. The applicant should reconsider the design of these tall buildings as part of any further referral of the scheme. The application does not comply with the London Plan in respect of the affordable housing provision, children's playspace, energy, ambient noise, access provisions and transport. The following changes might, however, remedy the above-mentioned deficiencies, and could possibly lead to the application becoming compliant with the London Plan: Submission of a housing toolkit appraisal to assess the financial viability of the scheme and to justify the low provision of affordable housing. Confirmation as to whether a registered social landlord has been secured, how the proposed sheltered housing would be managed and whether a housing grant has been sought. Confirmation of firm proposals to meet the shortfall in children's playspace required as part of this development, energy efficiency

improvements, submission of a noise assessment, further access provisions for disabled people details, response to issues raised by Transport for London, and provide contributions to establishing social facilities, training and employment strategy to offset loss of employment space.

CABE: The absence of a Borough-wide tall buildings strategy makes it hard for a proper assessment of towers to take place in this context. Remain to be convinced that buildings of this height will be appropriate in this suburban location. Welcome the principle of opening up this site to the public and increasing links to the neighbourhood to the north, but are concerned about the scale of development, the quality of living accommodation and public realm. The experience of this space will be compromised by the tall buildings framing it. The height and form of these buildings will have a negative environmental impact on their surroundings, and will fail to provide a high quality living environment for residents. There is also little evidence to suggest that the principles of sustainability have been integral to the design of the buildings. The buildings are not in accordance with the joint CABE and English Heritage guidance on tall buildings which states that a tall building must be of excellent design quality, and enhance the qualities of its immediate location and wider setting. The current proposals constitute over-development of the site. Planning permission should be refused for the proposal in its current form.

Environment Agency: No objections to the proposal as submitted but would like to offer the following advice. There is potential for shallow groundwater in the Head Deposits. The applicant should note that this could have an effect on aspects of the building design, including site drainage, foundation and basement design. The construction of a basement could also influence groundwater flow. Recommend that a maximum water use target of 105 litres per person per day for residential development is applied in line with the London Plan.

TfL: The Transport Assessment is calculated using a lower quantum of office provision than is proposed. Clarification and new data is required and further analysis on that basis. Disabled parking spaces should be made available to on-site staff as well as residents. Given the high PTAL and location of the development restraint-based approach to car parking is supported by TfL in line with London Plan. Vehicular access from Upper Richmond Road and for delivery and servicing vehicles from Woodlands Way is supported as all vehicles would enter and leave the highway in forward gear reducing traffic disruption and improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists. TfL accepts that the expected increase in station users from this development would not overwhelm the station facilities. However, TfL remains concerned that the increase in passengers, particularly those headed northbound in the morning peak, will prevent passengers further up the line from being able to board trains. To help mitigate this impact and therefore comply with London Plan policy, TfL requests that the residential and workplace travel plans focus on and strongly encourage travel by walking, cycling, and bus. Support cycle storage provision. In order to support cycling as a realistic mode of transport in line with London Plan policy, showers and changing

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

facilities should be provided within the office/retail elements of the proposal. No adverse implications to bus use. TfL welcomes the proposal's intention to improve pedestrian connections, particularly between East Putney Station and Disraeli Road. However, TfL is concerned that the proposals would generate a significant increase in pedestrians wanting to cross Upper Richmond Road directly across from East Putney Station where there is presently no crossing. A new (third) pedestrian crossing in this location would be unacceptable given presence of two crossings and strategic nature of Upper Richmond Road. A study required that can determine appropriate crossing and tube station/public realm improvement works which should be funded by the developer as would the subsequent improvement works. Further travel plans, delivery and servicing plan, car club and construction logistics plan to accord with TfL standards required. There are a number of potential constraints on the redevelopment of a site situated close to railway infrastructure. Therefore we require any planning permission granted for this site to include the following conditions: Before any work commences on site the agent is to contact London Underground with full details of the proposed works and foundation agreements. London Underground engineers will need to agree to the proposals before work can commence. If the developer or their agent is already working with London Underground or its agents on this project they should continue to do so, so as to ensure the safety of the railway and the development.

English Heritage (Archaeology): Potential for prehistoric finds. Request condition for implementation programme of archaeological work in accordance with written scheme for investigation, assessment to clarify archaeological potential at the site and impact that the existing use may have had upon this resource. Suitable specification for all methodologies for investigative works.

Civil Aviation Authority: Aviation safeguarding responsibilities including physical safeguarding, integrity of communications and navigation systems is the responsibility of the aerodrome operators/licensees. Consult with Heathrow Airport/BAA and London Heliport in Battersea. In isolation, the CAA would not make any case for aviation lighting related to the subject development. Advise of crane usage regulations.

BAA: The proposed development has been examined from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective and does not conflict with safeguarding criteria. We, therefore, have no objection to this proposal.

Thames Water: No objections, request condition to ensure appropriate increase in water supply.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority: The Brigade is satisfied with the proposals subject to suitable vehicle access for Brigade appliances and provision of suitable water supplies in accordance with Building Regulations.

Putney Partnership: Some positive comments and others expressing concerns. Welcome the prospect of redevelopment of the site, the opening-up of the site for pedestrian access, mixed use of the site, support the balance of use in the current proposal, which compensates for decreased office space by adding more residential occupancy thereby maintaining overall retail income into the town. However, we reserve the right to object in future if any reduction in the overall volume of the scheme results in any further reduction in office space. Office employment space is considered a very important component of the overall scheme. Concerns there is an incongruous relationship between the two proposed blocks both in style and mass. More cohesive massing and elevational detailing would be highly beneficial. The segregation of affordable housing into a separate block with very different elevational treatment is felt to be socially divisive. The current choice of window decals and brightly coloured 'lattice' overhead sculpture suggest the overall appearance is likely to deteriorate quite rapidly, making it likely to look very tired due to fading and dirtying of materials in relatively few years. The longevity/durability of the building, particularly in terms of appearance, should be a higher priority. The scheme should be capable of ageing and weathering well, in such a way that it still looks good in the medium and long term (20 years +) without significant maintenance. This will probably necessitate revisiting the choice and use of materials. Existing mature trees on the site must be retained. The Council should make any planning consent conditional upon a section 106 Agreement seeking a significant financial contribution from the developers to improve all public transport in Putney, particularly access to Putney Station.

Director of Housing: 33% affordable split 50/50 social rent/intermediate housing, proposed in line with the draft LDF in January. Pleased to see supported housing included. However, as the current approved core strategy now requires 50% affordable housing split 70/30 in favour of social rent, this should be reflected in the application, unless a lower level can be justified by a three dragons toolkit viability assessment. In its absence, no justification in accepting a level of affordable housing not in conformity with the Council's approved policy.

Engineering Services: The development would provide 32 car parking spaces including 5 for the disabled which is a very low level of parking provision. An equitable allocation of parking spaces should be made to the affordable units but no allocation is proposed. 350 cycle parking spaces would be provided. The site is located very close to East Putney Underground Station and has good accessibility to public transport. However, the additional passenger loadings will cause capacity problems on the underground closer to Central London and there are also current concerns about capacity of trains at Putney Station. The development should be self sufficient in parking and in accordance with Council policy would be excluded from the CPZ which operates in this area. The developer's agreement to this should be sought before the development is submitted to the Planning Applications Committee. The provision of a car club with 5 spaces, within the development, which must also be made available from residents from outside the development, would be required. Also incentives to encourage use of means of transport other than the private car will be

sought. The developer will need to provide and operate a Travel Plan approved by this Council. Consideration will need to be given to pedestrian and cycle desire lines and provision of measures to improve safety and convenience of them. This will involve reviewing the existing pedestrian crossing facilities and the provision of measures to assist pedestrians from the development crossing Upper Richmond Road to reach East Putney Station. In view of the heavy dependency of the development on public transport the applicant would be required to make contributions towards improvements to this including improvements to East Putney and Putney Mainline Station. The Council is particularly keen to achieve access to Putney Station from Oxford Road to improve the accessibility of that station to this part of Putney. Network Rail are seeking an initial sum of £35,000 to undertake a feasibility study into this additional entrance arrangement and this should be sought from the developer at the earliest opportunity to progress this work. A construction management plan will be required to ensure that disturbance to local residents and disruption from construction traffic are minimised. The developer will need to meet the cost of relaying the footways along the frontage of the development.

Economic Development Officer: This site is part of an unusually high concentration of office employment space in Putney and the Borough. The two current buildings provide a significant amount of employment creating space. Although the proposed redevelopment scheme does contain employment space, this is about half what would be expected on this site given the LDF policy for replace space. There should be about 8.000sq.m of employment creating space to replace what is there at the moment.

Head of Environmental Services: A PPG 24 assessment has been carried out which places the site in NEC C and B. Mitigation in the form of glazing recommendations for the facades of the proposed buildings are also contained within the Environmental Statement. If consent is granted a condition must be included requiring that a scheme of mitigation against external noise be submitted, approved and installed to our satisfaction prior to the commencement of the residential use; this scheme to cover glazing and ventilation. The applicant must confirm this scheme and not merely refer to the acoustic assessments recommendations. We will require details of how the proposed A3 units kitchens are to be ventilated and the type and location of all plant and equipment. The applicants approach to land contamination contained within the Environmental Statement is acceptable.

DOLAS (Trees): The report highlights about 5 trees. Concerns about the large mature Plane tree along the frontage. This is a very important tree within its streetscape, and offers extremely high amenity value as well as being protected by a Tree Preservation Order. No mention of protective measures regarding the tree such as fencing or any method statement proposing how the works are to be carried out in close proximity to the tree, however as long as the tree is fenced off to a distance of 10 metres from the trunk to the fence, see no reason why this development cannot proceed. Nothing must breach the fencing during construction. Nothing must be stored under the tree or within the fencing. If the building is to be sited within the 10 metres of the tree, then a

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

method statement will be required. This is to highlight how construction would take place within the 10 metre root protection area. i.e. Hand dig only, no root severance, no ground levels to be changed, specialised foundations such as pile and beam to be used etc.

DOLAS (Waste): The proposed space and access for residential waste storage appears. No indicated space provision for residents to present bulky items of waste awaiting collection. The space provision for commercial uses is more flexible. There is no requirement to provide suitable space for the likely volumes of waste arising each week providing that a commitment to having more frequent collections than weekly in perpetuity is enshrined in covenants attached to the commercial leases. Weekly refuse collection would be required by covenant to protect this. Within the commercial waste store, additional space for the separate storage of at least 1 stream of recyclable waste must be provided.

POLICY: GEN6 and 7 (Townscape and the built environment); GEN12 and 13 (Housing); GEN15 (Business); GEN16 and 18 (Town centres and shopping); GEN22 (Open spaces); GEN23 (Natural environment); GEN25 (Transport); RDP1 (General development considerations); RDP4 (Mixed uses); RDP7 (Planning obligations); RDP10 (Flood risk); TBE1-4 (Layout and form of development); TBE5 (Design and external appearance); TBE6 (High buildings); TBE10 (Development affecting conservation areas); TBE14 (Archaeology); H3 (Residential amenity); H9 and H11 (New housing); TCS1 (Town centres); BIN3 (Offices in town centres); TCS1 (Development in town centres); TCS9 (Retail development); TCS13 (A3 food and drink uses); ON9 (Trees); T1-2 (Transport); T5 (Pedestrians); T6 (Cycles); T7 (Servicing access); T9 (Parking); T10 (Car free development)

Core Strategy Proposal Submission: PL4 (Open space and the natural environment); PL5 (Provision of new homes); PL6 (Local economy); PL8 (Town and local centres); PL14 (East Putney and Upper Richmond Road); IS1 (Sustainable development); IS2 (Sustainable design, low carbon development and renewable energy); IS3 (Design and townscape); IS5 (Affordable housing); IS7 (Planning obligations)

COMMENT: The material considerations for the proposal are the impacts of the scheme; residential amenity; public realm; quality of architecture and whether this creates an icon landmark building; loss of office space; commercial uses; affordable housing; transport; energy efficiency; trees; and waste.

The scheme broadly follows the principles of redevelopment set out in policy PL14, in that it seeks to deliver modern office floorspace, new housing, new retail and restaurant space and an improved public realm. The site is tired and some upgrading even through development would be welcome, and the applicant's ambitions seek to address this. The delivery of policy PL14 will also depend on attention to detail such as access and public realm improvements and active frontages. The policy acknowledges that in order to achieve this, developments are likely to be at a higher density than existing buildings and that there may be scope to increase building

heights, particularly on sites located near the station. However, the policy also warns that proposals for tall buildings will need to demonstrate that they would cause no harm to the amenities of adjoining properties and show how they would bring significant benefits to the quality of the townscape and the public realm.

Impacts of the scheme: The clear intention of the scheme is to transform the character of this site and of Putney Town Centre itself. The building is described as having an “inspirational design”. It is also felt that it would be “a catalyst to regeneration, an inspirational cultural icon and the focal point of community identity”. The scheme is radical and extreme in its ambitions for change to the existing character of Putney. Hence while the scheme does propose some degree of positive change, the undesirable impacts seem disproportionate. Public access to the site is good although there are some concerns toward Woodlands Way and the conflict with the timber yard.

Because of their scale and height, the proposed buildings would impact on both the character of the town centre and the amenities of the adjoining residential streets. The twenty six-storey building would have a sizeable footplate in relation to the size of the site. The proposal is deliberately designed as a landmark and an icon for what the applicant see as the future direction of change of the centre. Consequently it would have a widespread visual impact on surrounding residential streets as inevitably buildings of the height proposed will be seen. This ambition is not shared to the same extent as the public consultation shows with the majority of respondents considering the impact of these buildings would be unwelcome. The buildings would have a negative connotation of imposing, encroaching urbanisation looming large over the more domestic scale of the surrounding area.

Residential amenity: Such is the scale and height of the proposed buildings they would have a domineering and overbearing impact on the amenity on the surrounding residential area, most notably to the north. The daylight and sunlight study provides only analysis of overshadowing and loss of light to a number of dwellings on Disraeli Road, those being nearest to the application site at a distance of 51m directly to the north, and to Woodlands Gate to the east at the Summer and Spring Equinoxes only. Details of impact to properties further along Disraeli Road and to adjoining areas of influence should have been provided for further assessment of impact and in this respect the submission is considered inadequate. The study as presented demonstrates the impact during March on those residences to be unacceptable with a shadow formed by the two buildings from the morning through afternoon from Oxford Road and beyond and along the rear of properties shown in the study along Disraeli Road. The study shows the example of overshadowing during the summer month of June when Woodlands Gate would be overshadowed in the evening. The study provides sufficient evidence that the proposal would have an adverse impact for a number of months of the year on those properties shown and would likely have further impact on the surrounding streets with properties not shown. The loss of light is demonstrative of the impact the proposal would have on the amenity of those residences. This would be combined with the height, mass, bulk and design which would have an alien

relationship to the domestic form of those properties. Considerable objections have been received from occupiers of those properties and surrounding who advise the buildings would form a discordant relationship with an adverse impact on their enjoyment of their properties beyond that currently formed by the buildings on site.

Public realm: The public realm improvements offered as part of the scheme are small in scale compared to the volume and visual impact of proposed new buildings. The size, quality, vitality and utility of the proposed public open areas are heavily compromised, firstly by the applicant's lack of control over key parts of the site's surrounding context (i.e. the railway arches), and secondly by the lack of active uses proposed in the base of the circular tower, which presents inactive frontages on the majority of its ground floor frontage. There is potential for conflict by the Woodlands Way access with the timber yard use. Effectively the scheme offers only new routes through the site, which, while welcome, do not represent a major new public space, in proportion to the scale of the proposed buildings, and suffer from the lack of active frontages to animate and make them safe. The routes provided do not reflect the ambition to create a destination. The ambitious public art features, again welcome in principle, would not overcome the lack of useable space and destinations within the scheme, as well as being themselves somewhat aspirational rather than guaranteed since they rely on agreements with TfL. The public art may serve only to attract pigeons and the application fails to address control over this possible problem. Consequently the public realm improvements that can be delivered do not outweigh the harmful impact to the character of the centre caused by the sheer intrusive size of the scheme.

Quality of architecture: The architectural style of the proposed buildings is deliberately not contextual. The Design and Access Statement states: "While the architectural style of the development is not in keeping with the local area, this is consistent with the objective to provide a landmark for East Putney and symbol of regeneration". There is no doubt that the scheme demonstrates an ambition for the highest quality of modern architecture, which is a response to CABE guidance on tall buildings. The approach is bold and uncompromising. The overall the effect is of assertiveness at the expense of sensitivity to context. The result is a scheme that challenges the existing character of Putney and the architectural approach exacerbates the problems of incompatibility of scale, which for many, are the fundamental grounds for objection to the scheme. There are issues with not just the mass but the detail. The proposed shadowcasters could appear as arbitrary bolt-ons, which may have long term maintenance problems and could appear, as some suggest, dated in little time.

The scheme is supported by a Tall Buildings Analysis that seeks to support the ambition for the formation of landmark building by identifying the site as a natural location to support tall building around a cluster of tall buildings. This ambition is based upon possible permissions and over-emphasising the importance of the transport links as being of strategic importance due to the confluence of the A205 South Circular and a tube station. Taller buildings may be justified in terms of the

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

Core Strategy but the case for the creation of an ‘iconic’ building of this height remains to be made.

Loss of office space: The application proposes the reduction of existing office provision from 7600sq.m to 3300sq.m on the basis the present buildings are outdated, in need of replacement and regeneration and are not in demand. The replacement office would be to modern standards and would be of benefit to the type of office provision within the Borough. The applicants report by CBRE on the Wandsworth Office market concludes that the proposed building would retain flexibility to be offered on a floor by floor basis, meeting smaller requirements of 2400 sq.m-3000 sq.m and the floors should be capable of being split to allow occupiers of 1200sq.m upwards. This approach concerning floorspace type is supported in Core Strategy PL6 and PL14 and should possibly be secured by s.106 agreement to ensure future use of the office space can be used flexibly. However, policy PL14 requires the provision of replacement office floorspace within Upper Richmond Road which the application does not adequately propose whilst BIN3 seeks to protect existing office provision. The Wandsworth Office market assessment appears to be inadequate to make a sound judgement on commercial viability and provides no financial justification which would be required to further demonstrate the office need, or lack of need in the area.

Commercial uses: The amount of retail provision appears appropriate within this part of the town centre and is considered to relate acceptably to the site as proposed and its surrounds. However, drawing trade from the High Street for retail development is a concern and there should be a limit to the A1 element. Flexible A3-A5 uses would be appropriate away from residential areas and would benefit the area by introducing activity into the evening.

Affordable housing: The application proposes an acceptable mix of house units, albeit all located in the twenty one-storey building and none in the twenty six-storey building. The proposal for a 36% affordable element fails to meet London Plan policy which should be up to 50% of the total unless otherwise justified. It should be expected the proportion should be at least one third affordable but no justification is provided for the shortfall. It also fails to meet requirements for the appropriate mix of shared ownership to social rented provision which should be split 30/70. No financial justification has been put forward by the applicants for the lower level of affordable housing or nature of affordable split. The proposal would, therefore, not be in conformity with the Council's approved policy. The flats would be built to lifetime homes standards and a significant proportion built for wheelchair accessibility requirements, limited private amenity space is provided for all residential units.

2008/3321

84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

Transport: Trip generation figures used in the Transport Assessment (TA) rely upon some questionable assumptions. The TA appears to have underestimated the number of residential trips by car and public transport modes and this will affect other parts of the assessment. The assertion that additional public transport trips generated by the development would not have adverse impact on existing public transport services does not equate with the experience of users of said services.

To check current conditions observations on the District Line at both East Putney and West Brompton stations showed over crowded and nearly full London-bound trains with virtually no room to accommodate further passengers. 75% of trains observed at West Brompton heading for Earls Court were full up or nearly so with a full service running well. If there had been any disruption, conditions would undoubtedly have been more severe. Overland services from Putney Station towards Waterloo in the morning peak are also very full and passengers are known to be left behind at Wandsworth Town station at present the development would add pressure to loadings on these trains. It should be noted that Network Rail/South West Trains are proposing to lengthen trains and platforms to provide extra capacity in the next few years (Dec 2010 onwards) and would welcome the opportunity to open up a new Putney Station entrance from Oxford Road, which would alleviate some congestion at the station. The applicants have been approached regarding a contribution towards investigative and implementation costs with no response.

An over-arching travel plan is required setting out a management process for integrating residential and non-residential aspects of the plan. Assumed mode split targets should be set based on evidence contained within the TA now with a post-occupation survey then informing how the initial target should be revised, and helping steer future travel plan actions. There is a potential problem with the assumption of 14.7% car use for market housing as this implies a minimum of 29 cars being used by residents. With a further three car park spaces set aside for car club parking, this would bring total car parking to 32 spaces, but five are required to be designated for disabled parking. Therefore, it is doubtful whether the 32 spaces proposed could accommodate the mode splits set out in the TA and a lower target for car use would be required. Incentives to encourage use of means of transport other than the private car should be sought and the development would also need to be excluded from the Putney CPZ to ensure there is no overspill parking on surrounding streets. The provision of car club parking referred to in the residential travel plan is welcomed and would need to be secured by legal agreement. Given the low level of car parking proposed for the site a minimum of 3, up to possibly 5 is required.

Whereas there would be benefit from opening access through the site onto Woodlands Way to improve permeability and there are no highway safety concerns the layout and appearance of that entrance is far from ideal as it narrow, shared with the timber yard service and delivery vehicle access and dominated by the timber yard building rendering it unappealing. Careful landscaping would be required to improve the appearance but the applicant benefits from only limited control of the entrance set back 13.5m from Woodlands Way.

Energy efficiency: Overall the sustainability statement is poorly set out and is lacking in information. The report implies in a number of places that the contribution from renewables is 23% CO2 reduction, however, this figure is actually the overall predicted savings on site. The proposed contribution from the biofuel boiler is less than 10%. There is very little information about the proposed Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM targets for the development. It is not clear what the buildings on site are aiming for and there are no pre-assessment reports to demonstrate how this will be achieved. There is not enough evidence supplied for the dismissal of a Combined Cooling Heat and Power (CCHP) system there is clearly a large cooling load, and small-scale CCHP systems are in existence. The fuel source is not convincingly reliable and the details of the system operation have not been properly detailed. There are other concerns as to the suitability of biofuels and biomass in dense urban environments. The biofuel boiler provides only 10% CO2 savings through renewables, which is well short of the 20% target and not fully explained. A more efficiently-sized system may justify a renewables percentage less than the 20% target.

Others: The TPO'd London Plane may be retained with suitable protective measures to ensure the preservation of this valuable feature. Trees to the north boundary and landscaping within the site would need to be controlled by condition. The Environmental Statement specifies that the risk of overland flow will be managed by installation of a specific drainage system to control surface water generated onsite. This is welcomed and should be made clear within the application. Wandsworth NHS PCT request for a S106 contribution is not considered appropriate as based on projected occupancy figures many would likely be from within the Borough and not all occupiers would move in at once thus the burden on the NHS would not be as immediate but partially from existing users and spread over a period of time which would not be significant before the the 3 yearly NHS budgetary review. The applicants may wish to negotiate with the Trust for the use of a unit within the development to meet their requirements.

Conclusion: The Council's aspirations and objectives for this part of the Borough as set out in the LDF Core Strategy would not preclude redevelopment of the site for the uses proposed, nor higher buildings than those existing. However, this scheme deliberately challenges current perceptions of this part of Putney town centre and in doing so would present buildings intended to stand out and be seen. It is not an in-fill scheme and certainly not recessive. While the stated rationale is that this is a response to the Council's published policy for regeneration in the LDF, it clearly proposes a disproportionate scale of change that would adversely affect neighbours' amenities without commensurate public benefits. Consequently the harmful visual, environmental and residential amenity impact is not justified by the public realm improvements and other town centre facilities the scheme offers which offer varying degrees of success. Whilst bold architectural style can enliven and lift an area, in this instance, it appears that it would serve only to accentuate the alien nature of the buildings which would be substantially taller than their surroundings and would have

an impact on the skyline. There are several detailed concerns within the site regarding the proposed form and how they would appear, relate to and work with other elements of the scheme such as non-active frontages, access onto Woodlands Way and the overhead lattice artwork which would not be formed over the highway or the underground station forecourt. The Environmental Statement does not demonstrate the full extent of overshadowing, loss of sunlight and daylight to all residential properties likely to be affected at appropriate times of the year to assess the widespread implications. Even so, those dwellings included are shown to suffer unacceptable impact. The proposal would place increased burden on public transport and in particular the underground and over ground rail networks which would exacerbate present overcrowding problems without adequately offering to contribute to improvements to those networks. The proposed reduction in office accommodation is not sufficiently justified nor is it considered to be satisfactorily counter-balanced by the benefits and affordable housing levels below London Policy requirements are not supported by any justification statement.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse p.p. for the following reasons:-

1. The proposal would create an overbearing and incongruous form of development of inappropriate form, size, height, design, materials and appearance out of character with the built form of the surrounding area and of an inappropriate layout and design which would be to the detriment of visual amenity, to the detriment of the amenity of users of the development and would form an over-development of the site with inappropriate environmental conditions to the detriment of the area and surrounding infrastructure with insufficient benefits to the quality of the townscape, the quality of the public realm and funding contributions toward off-site improvements contrary to UDP Policies GEN7, TBE1, TBE2, TBE4, TBE5 and T1 and Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policies PL4, PL14 and IS3.
2. The proposal by reason of its height, layout and proximity to residential properties would form an overbearing and dominant feature having adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers contrary to UDP Policies GEN12 and H3 and Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policy PL6.
3. The loss of office space which would lead to the loss of employment accommodation within the town centre and which is not considered adequately justified has been put forward to take a contrary approach to UDP Policy BIN3 and Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policies PL6, PL8 and PL14.
4. The proposal comprises below standard proportion of affordable housing and an inappropriate split between shared ownership/social rented accommodation with no justification contrary to the requirements of GEN13, Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policy IS5 and London Plan Policy 3A.9.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 6TH NOVEMBER 2008

2008/3321 84-88 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

5. The proposal fails to provide satisfactory information to demonstrate acceptable levels of energy efficiency, measures to minimise environmental impact and to ensure an optimum sustainable form of development in accordance with the requirements of UDP Policy GEN1 and Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policy IS2.

The Town Hall
Wandsworth
SW18 2PU

A G McDonald
Borough Planner

29th October 2008

Background Papers

The following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

1. Unitary Development Plan 2003 – available at <http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/Home/EnvironmentandTransport/PlanningService/UnitaryDevelopmentPlan/udp.htm>
2. London Plan 2004 – available from GLA
3. Government guidance – available from ODPM
4. Representations from third parties and supporting material submitted by applicants – available at <http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/gis/search/Search.aspx>

All reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committees, regulatory and other committees, the Executive and the full Council can be viewed on the Council's website (www.wandsworth.gov.uk/moderngov) unless the report was published before May 2001, in which case the committee secretary can supply it if required.