

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 20TH AUGUST 2009

Ref.	Address	Proposal
2009/1773	Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15	Demolition of existing buildings on site and erection of building of between eight and fifteen storeys to provide 89 flats (22 affordable), roof terraces and balconies together with 807sq.m. ground floor commercial floorspace flexible use for A1 (shops)/A2 (financial and professional services)/A3 (cafe/restaurant use)/A4 (drinking establishments) or D1 (non-residential institutions); 1600sq.m. office floorspace (Class B1); basement car park of 73 spaces (2 at surface level for car club). Alterations to the previous application (ref: 2008/5428) to include; reduction in height of rear block by two-storeys, loss of 10 residential units (including loss of 3 affordable units), reduction to the rear building line of the east block.
26 May 2009 HK	East Putney	

SITE: Seven-storey office block and linked nine-storey residential block containing 24 residential units and 2926sq.m. of commercial floorspace set within a 0.275 hectare site on the south side of Upper Richmond Road near the junction with Putney Hill. The residential component of the building is staggered behind the office component by 5.7m. The two attached blocks share a common service core. Ground floor is open and used for parking. Eight-storey office/residential adjoins to the east, four-storey office/residential opposite to the north, five/six-storey residential apartments to the south, three-storey terraces with a combination of commercial and residential to the west. A number of trees exist to the rear and along the frontage of the site. Located within the Putney Town Centre and an Archaeological Priority Area. Rossalyn Tower, (18 St. John's Avenue) a grade II listed building is to the rear, and The Pines (9 and 11 Putney Hill) Grade II* listed buildings are to the west.

HISTORY: 1964: p.p. for the redevelopment of the site by erection of a seven-storey building comprising offices and residential flats together with single-storey block of garages.

1965: p.p. for the erection of an eight-storey block of twelve, 3-bedroom flats and 8 bed-sits forming part of the combined redevelopment of the site for office and residential purposes.

2001: p.p. for ground, first and second floor extension to front to provide offices, retail and restaurant use. Change of use of fifth and sixth floors from commercial to residential and roof extension to provide 12 additional residential units. Balconies on all elevations at fifth-eight floors and re-cladding of the entire building.

2005: p.p. demolition of existing offices and retention of attached residential block. Erection of new building up to ten-storeys comprising 2,403sq.m. of commercial/retail space at ground mezzanine and first floor levels with 40 residential units above. Formation of basement parking accessed from Upper Richmond Road. Retention, refurbishment and alteration to existing service core and attached

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

residential building (comprising 17 existing flats of which 10 would be affordable units). Erection of additional floor over the retained building (to incorporate 1 flat). October 2008: Screening opinion for demolition of the existing building and erection of new mixed use redevelopment comprising 100 residential units, 817sq.m. retail and 1,600sq.m. commercial floorspace in three attached blocks up to fifteen-storeys (47metres). EIA not required.

April 2009: Withdrawn application for demolition of existing buildings on site and erection of building of between eight and fifteen storeys to provide 94 flats (24 affordable), roof terraces and balconies together with 807sq.m. ground floor commercial floorspace flexible use for A1 (shops)/A2 (financial and professional services)/A3 (cafe/restaurant use)/A4 (drinking establishments) or D1 (non-residential institutions); 1600sq.m. office floorspace (Class B1); basement car park of 74 spaces (2 at surface level for car club).

DETAILS: Mixed use redevelopment of the site comprising three linked blocks to Upper Richmond Road of twelve-storeys (38m), fifteen-storeys (47m) and eight-storeys (26m) (running east to west) and a ten-storey linked block to the rear of the site (32m). T-shaped footprint at second floor and above. Maximum 53m (w) x 35.5m (d) x 47m (h). The development is a minimum of 2m from the east boundary, 1.5m from the west boundary and 6.1m from the south boundary. Basement car parking is provided 3m deep, 55m (w) x 48.5m (d).

The commercial units at ground and first floors which cover the majority of the development footprint are 8m high. Ground floor building frontage is in line with the neighbouring terrace at 141-155 Upper Richmond Road. Ground floor A1/A2/A3/A4/D1 uses shown as two units of 533sq.m. and 274sq.m. First floor office accommodation 1,600sq.m, resulting in a total of 2,407sq.m. of commercial floorspace.

89 residential flats (fifteen, 1-bedroom, sixty-nine, 2-bedroom, five, 3-bedroom) A total of 22 units would be affordable (25%). All units would be built to lifetime homes standards with 9 as accessible units (two, 1-bedroom, seven, 2-bedroom).

	Market	Social rented	Shared ownership	Total	%
1-bedroom	3	10	2	15	16
2-bedroom	59	5	5	69	77
3-bedroom	5	0	0	5	6
Total	67	15	7	89	100
%	75	17	8	100	

Materials: glazing and timber screening to north elevation of front blocks, and east and west elevations of rear block. Glazing with timber folding shutters to south elevation of front blocks. Reconstituted Portland Stone and floor-ceiling glazing panels to east and west elevations of front block and south elevation of rear block. Glazed elevations to the Upper Richmond Road ground floor frontage (commercial), aluminium louvres to first floor frontage (office) to Upper Richmond Road and to the first floor of the rear elevation.

Vehicle access is to east side of the site (onto a 5.5m wide access route), with a ramp to the basement car park at the rear of the site, vehicle access gates are set 16.5m from the front boundary. Area maintained for a large vehicle (e.g. refuse lorry) to manoeuvre. A total of 144 cycle parking spaces, (10 to the front for visitors, 10 to the east boundary for staff and 122 cycle parking spaces in the basement for residents). 73 car parking spaces at basement level (including 7 disabled parking spaces) with 2 car club spaces at ground floor level to the southern boundary of the site. Tree pits are provided to the basement level.

First floor landscaped 'office garden' (60sq.m.) to the west boundary, landscaped communal gardens are provided to the east (195sq.m.) and west (277sq.m.) at the rear of the site and a 7th floor communal roof garden (197sq.m.) is provided to the western block fronting Upper Richmond Road. A total of 71 of the 89 units have private balcony areas. Landscaping includes tree planting to the front and rear, and part of the east boundaries. Seven trees are shown as being retained; six along the southern boundary and one in the south-west corner. One of these trees is within the site boundary.

A gas fired combined heat and power (CHP) and biofuel boiler would be provided and the scheme is proposed to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 3.

Wandsworth UDP density calculation: 1793hrph, (Residential only density: 1025hrph) Dwellings per hectare: 31.8, Plot ratio: 4.8 : 1

Amendments from the originally submitted plans for the previously withdrawn scheme include the reduction in the height of the rear block by two-storeys (6m), removal of 10 residential units (reduction from 99 to 89), loss of 3 affordable housing units (reduction from 25 to 22), reduction in depth of the east block by 3m through the introduction of a set back to this elevation, reduction in size of the larger retail unit by 10sq.m. to increase the size of the refuse store, vehicle access gates have been set back 12m from the site frontage, inclusion of tree pits at basement level, removal of one disabled car parking space, increase of 22 cycle parking spaces, inclusion of a gas fired combined heat and power (CHP) and biofuel boiler.

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

Affordable Housing Viability Statement: Sets out the financial rationale and justification for the level of affordable housing provision at 25% of the units. The statement concludes that the costs of the development leave a residual value which could provide 22 affordable housing units.

Additional evidence submitted dated 31st July 2009 providing further justification for the financial assumptions used in the toolkit.

Planning Statement: The development makes efficient use of a brownfield site, and results in the demolition of unattractive buildings. It would also provide new retail and commercial floorspace. The extant (2005) permission provided 10 affordable units (25%), made no allowances for children's play space and did not include any sustainability measures. The 2005 consent allowed a reduction of office floorspace

(2,402sq.m.), and the current proposal provides a similar level. The statement refers to the flexible mix of commercial uses through the provision of larger floorplates. The proposed density of the scheme is in line with the London Plan matrix, and the size of the units reflects a demand for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The location of site close to public transport and local amenities justifies the level of parking provision, a car club and cycle parking would be provided. The statement emphasises the design led nature of the proposal. The affordable housing is 25% of the total housing provided, but 32% of the net additional dwellings. It also represents an improvement in the quality of affordable housing with no studio units. The development provides additional space for the public realm and an average of 22sq.m. of amenity space per dwelling. A total of 180.9sq.m. of play space is required and the scheme provides 101sq.m. of 'doorstep playable space', with parks located nearby. A CHP plant and biofuel boiler would be provided and the scheme aims to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 3. A consultation statement dated December 2008 is included, which details that meetings have been held with Wandsworth Council, the GLA, TfL, Putney Society and Putney Partnership. Public drop-in events were held on 28th August 2008 and 10th September 2008. Responses from these events include concerns about height, trees, proximity to neighbouring properties, treatment of the flank elevations, variety to building line along Upper Richmond Road and retail provision.

The applicant has confirmed acceptance that this development could be excluded from the CPZ

Design and Access Statement: Provides the rationale for the design solution proposed, an assessment of the existing site and context and demonstrates the evolution of the project. The design aims to achieve an active frontage, appropriate elevational treatment and materials, and improved building line. The height is justified through its town centre location, its setting in the wider context of Putney Wharf and the approved development at 113 Upper Richmond Road, the improvement of the transition in heights to St John's Avenue, and the varied roofline avoiding a monolithic approach. The statement sets out the fact that the site is located in close proximity to play space at Wandsworth Park (open access playgrounds 2-16 years), King George's Park (open access playgrounds 2-16 years), Leaders Gardens (open access playgrounds 2-16 years) Putney Old Burial Ground, Putney Heath and Barnes Common, and that 101sqm of play space are provided within the site. The statement justifies its layout in terms of access requirements and details the pedestrian and vehicle routes into the site.

Landscape Design Statement: Provides an explanation behind the landscaping. It aims to create an active and engaging street frontage with tree planting to integrate the development with the streetscape. The trees to be retained include a group of 5 limes outside the site boundary to the south, one lime within the site boundary to the south and one ash in the south-west corner, outside the site boundary. Further trees would be planted to the boundaries to provide screening. Planting and hard landscaping features are also provided to all communal amenity areas. Green roofs are proposed to the central blocks.

Arboricultural Implications Assessment: Assesses the quality of the trees on site, and recommends root protection zones. One tree (in the north-east corner of the site) is

recommended for removal due to its dead/dying/dangerous status. Plans have also been submitted showing the root protection zones required. The applicant has submitted a further supporting letter which explains the number of trees to be felled are the same as for the extant 2005 consent, and that the rear building line is further from the roots of the trees on the southern boundary.

Daylight/Sunlight and Overshadowing Report: Presents evidence to show that points at 125 Upper Richmond Road and 178 Upper Richmond Road do not pass the BRE tests in terms of Vertical Sky Component (VSC) levels, but do achieve Average Daylight Factor (ADF) levels. The statement provides a justification all surrounding properties would retain adequate levels of daylight or sunlight with the proposed development in place. The daylight levels achieved with the proposed development in place are better than that achieved with the development at 113 Upper Richmond Road. A further overshadowing report showing sun path diagrams has also been submitted and concludes that there should be no additional permanent overshadowing impact from the development on the nearby amenity areas.

Air Quality: The site is located within an Air Quality Management Area which indicates an area of relatively poor air quality. There are approximately 100 properties within 150m of the site which are likely to be affected by dust if mitigation measures are not put in place during construction. Mitigation measures suggested for the construction, design and built stage. Estimated annual average concentration of nitrogen dioxide were expected to exceed Air Quality Strategy (AQS) objectives with and without the development at some locations. Changes in concentration due to the development are considered very small and the overall impact is considered to be 'slight adverse' in terms of local air quality. Estimated concentrations of PM10 were below relevant criteria at all receptors in all years with and without the development. No industrial processes with significant emissions to air were identified within 2km.

Transport Statement: Site is located within close proximity of a range of social infrastructure, and a range of sustainable modes of transport. The site has a PTAL rating of 6a. A multimodal trip generation analysis has demonstrated that the site would not generate a significant number of trips, with the resultant vehicular trips resulting in a less than 1% increase on the immediate local highway network and the increase in underground trips in particular being negligible. The development promotes a restrained parking provision. Cycle parking is provided in accordance with TfL cycle parking standards. Recommends the use of a travel plan. The report comes to the conclusion that there are no traffic or transportation reasons to preclude the redevelopment of this site.

Framework Travel Plan: Sets the following objectives: to provide residents and visitors with greater travel choice and to encourage healthier and more environmentally friendly travel. To ensure everyone using the site is aware of the TP (Travel Plan) and its purpose. To minimise financial and other incentives for residential and visitors to use private cars and maximise incentives to use sustainable alternatives. The plan sets out management and marketing of the TP and travel information and details the travel survey, monitoring and reviews of the plan.

Archaeological Desk Based Assessment: The site can be shown to have a low potential for all archaeological periods, most of the proposed development lies within the footprint of the existing development, no further archaeological mitigation is recommended in this instance.

Sustainability Statement: The statement proposes green roofs, rainwater storage and surface water attenuation for sustainable drainage. It addresses how place-making, transport, community, ecology, resources, business and building elements of sustainability have been incorporated into the design. It includes an energy statement which details that a gas fired CHP is proposed to meet the base hot water demand, and a biofuel boiler to meet the space heating demand. The predicted annual energy CO2 emissions are 451,032 kg per annum. The proposed CHP and biofuel boiler would equate to a CO2 saving of 115,209 kg per annum which is 26% of this sites total CO2 emissions. The Code for Sustainable Homes Pre-Assessment evaluates the scheme as Code 3.

Addendum Report submitted with further technical details of CO2 reduction and details of the proposed biofuel boiler.

Noise and Vibration Assessment: The site is in PPG24 Noise Exposure Category ‘C’ for daytime and night time periods. The following noise attenuation measures have been recommended: For the front of the development overlooking Upper Richmond Road, windows with a view or partial view of the road require acoustic double glazing. These rooms should be fitted with acoustic through-wall air bricks for background ventilation or alternatively have air ducted in from the rear of the property. The acoustic performance of any ventilation openings should be such as not to degrade the overall acoustic performance of the façade. The façade construction should be considered for its sound insulating properties in order to reduce the amount of noise breakthrough from road traffic noise through this element. The results of a vibration assessment found the site not exposed to level of vibration considered to be of material concern and are at a level where adverse comment is not expected.

CONSULTATION: 3000 copies of Planning Newsletter, site and press notice 263 neighbours: 223 objections:- Height, tower block, appearance, scale, overpowering, overdevelopment out of context/character, bulk, visual impact, design, impact on skyline, large footprint, canyon-like, mass, width, dull, uninspired, proximity to boundary, density, unsympathetic design, impact on historic buildings, will not improve Upper Richmond Road, proportion, out of context and character, dwarf neighbouring Victorian terrace, mismatched clutter of different height blocks, infilling gap in streetscene, loss of gap between buildings, treatment of side and rear elevations, time spent on application, accuracy of drawings, submission during summer break, increase in population, pressure on services, noise from balconies, light, overshadowing, noise from drinking establishment, loss of amenity, overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of public realm, noise from deliveries, landscaping will take years to mature, loss of trees, loss of open space, psychological impact of proximity to 125 Upper Richmond Road, cumulative impact, insecure, encourage crime, housing will be for professional renters, loss of sense of place, wind tunnel effect, create cold areas, wildlife, parking, pressure on public transport, traffic, noise from traffic, should consider cumulative highways impact with other developments, would provide a back alley to East Putney station, size of proposed units, noise to

proposed units, quality of north facing balconies, lack of affordable housing, lack of family sized units, north facing units, lack of outdoor space, precedent, no planning policies for Putney town centre, request for policy setting a maximum height for development, value of properties, building will date – need for a longer term view, would reduce trade to existing commercial units, vacant commercial units should be filled/refurbished first, should require more employment floorspace, should not be residential use, concern about viability of retail space, loss of employment space, noise and dust during construction, changes are minor and do not address the issues, accuracy of views of listed building.

2 support: Anything which changes current eyesore is a good thing. Redevelopment is long overdue

Responses to the previously withdrawn application on this site (ref 2008/5428)-
267 objections: height, width, mass, scale, site coverage, overdevelopment, density, canyon effect to Upper Richmond Road, obtrusive, reduction of gap to eastern side of the development, visual appearance, design, materials, proximity of building line to Upper Richmond Road, impact on skyline, impact of the height on the neighbouring terrace, existing building is poor, parking, traffic, impact on public transport, disruption to Upper Richmond Road from cars turning into the building, servicing and delivery requirements, increase in number of pedestrians, loss of amenity, loss of light, loss of winter heat, overshadowing, loss of privacy, overbearing, would create wind tunnel, block satellite signal, noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution, loss of view, disturbance from drinking establishments/commercial units, noise from car club, damage sense of community, overcrowding, crime, change in character, impact on infrastructure – transport, schools, health, dentists, nurseries, post office, police, drainage, electrical, refuse, loss of office space, detrimental to local economy, empty shops/offices should be filled before building new ones, more independent shops should be encouraged, ratio of residential units to office space is excessive, Putney should be a business/commercial area rather than a residential one, enough restaurants, bars and shops, impact on off street parking would encourage people to shop elsewhere, overspill of chairs, advertisement boards onto pavement, noise to proposed dwellings, lack of affordable housing, high rise blocks are not the best design for affordable housing, lack of 3 bed properties/family housing, 31 north facing units, oversupply of residential flats in Putney, not enough outdoor space/recreational space, proposed flats are too small, loss of trees, impact on roots of existing trees, impact on birdlife and wildlife, maintenance of trees, harm to grade 2 listed Rosslyn Tower and its rear wall, precedent, enough apartment blocks in Putney already, property prices, driven by financial gain, noise and disruption during construction, appearance of construction site, waste during construction, traffic during construction, damage to neighbouring properties during construction, Councillors time spent on examining applications, taxes spent on determining application, size of area notified is too small, residents' time taken opposing plans, trees shown on rear elevation are unrealistic heights, 18 St. John's Avenue not considered in daylight reports, blight on residential area from so many high rise residential developments, should consider cumulative impact with other new developments, plan for Putney should be provided, Tileman House is a relatively new building and changes in building fashion should not result in demolition.

1 support: improvement on 2005 planning application, replacement of outdated, redundant, ugly building, much needed office, retail and residential space, improve streetscape, good public access to shops at ground floor, in scale, materials.

GLA: Mayor raised serious concern over the height of the 15-storey element of the proposal. The provision of a residential-led mixed-use development is supported. As such the principle of the development complies with the London Plan. The proposed residential density is within the guidance range set out in the London Plan. The findings of the independent financial assessment have not been submitted. As such it is not possible to determine whether the proposal provides the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. The proposal provides 101sqm of designated play space. Given the site's town centre location and small number of family units, the degree of shortfall and the number of well established parts surrounding the site, residents of the development are unlikely to suffer from a deficit of play space. The proposal is consistent with strategic design policies. The proposal has been designed to be accessible for everyone. The applicant has broadly applied the energy hierarchy in the London Plan, although, insufficient information has been provided to ensure compliance with the remaining energy policies. The report does not assess the individual and cumulative impact of the proposed biomass boiler. The proposed complies with climate change adaptation policies. On balance, whilst the application confirms generally to the London Plan, it fails to secure compliance in several regards.

TfL - Car parking provision is excessive and should be reduced. TfL welcomes the provision of 2 car club spaces, which are accessible by the public. TfL expects the applicant to provide charging points for electric vehicles. All cycle parking provided should be safe, covered and secure and the provision of shower and changing facilities for use by the office staff would be welcomed. The applicant has agreed to carry out any necessary works required by the relocation of the proposed vehicle access including dropped kerbs, footway crossover, tactile paving and road markings. The applicant has committed to providing a financial contribution of £20,000 to TfL towards highway improvements to the Upper Richmond Road and Putney Hill/Putney High Street junction. Construction logistics plan and delivery and servicing plan should be submitted. Final version of travel plan should be submitted. TfL supports this application in principle provided the issues raised above are satisfactorily addressed.

CABE: We are mostly supportive of the proposed scheme which could set a good precedent for future developments in this area and as such we feel that its contribution to Putney should be carefully examined. The composition of the overall massing is elegant and the organisation of uses is logical. Main concerns relate to the limited amount of open space provision on-site, the design of the public realm and the quality of the internal environment. The local authority should ensure that the proposed on-site provision of amenity space, affordable housing and car parking sends the right message to future developments in terms of the desired quality of life for residents, sustainable communities and green travel plans.

Justine Greening MP: Height, overlooking. Need for better office space that would bring businesses and jobs to Putney. Consideration regarding the type of

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

accommodation, provision of accommodation for families needs to be better. The piecemeal development of Upper Richmond Road does not offer a cohesive strategy for the regeneration of the area. Developers should meet with residents and councillors regarding a plan of local regeneration for Upper Richmond Road. Any general planning strategy should be more locally based.

Stuart King (Labour Prospective Parliamentary Candidate): Objections to previous application still stand. Requests stronger plan for Putney. Overdevelopment, height, footprint, precedence, housing should be secondary to the commercial use, amount of housing, lack of affordable housing, loss of office space. Tactics of withdrawal and resubmission are cynical, time consuming and undemocratic. Reduction in bulk to the rear has a negligible positive improvement on light and overlooking, reduction in affordable housing is intolerable.

Natural England: No objection. It is our opinion that this proposal does not affect any priority interest areas for Natural England in respect of conservation of biodiversity, geology or landscape issues within central London.

Putney Society: Object. Excessive height. excessive footprint, loss of trees, doubt whether tree pits are adequate for large trees, bulky design, it comes too far forward, it would relate poorly to the Victorian Terrace to the west, it would loom over the street to a height of fifteen-storeys creating a threatening landscape feature seen from across the road, solid wall of building from one side of the site to the other leaving no space for light and sun to come through, canyon-like frontage, damage setting of Grade II listed Rossalyn Tower, car parking provision is excessive, basement excavation prevents proper landscaping being provided. Flats to Upper Richmond Road would get no sunshine, but would get the noise and disturbance from the road below, overlooking to neighbouring dwellings particularly to St. John's Avenue. Further the Society submitted their own 'Design Brief'. This states: Regret that the Council has no clear and detailed planning policies for Putney town centre. Any redevelopment of Tileman House should seek to achieve the following objectives:

1. The uses of the building should reflect its location in the centre of Putney. Commercial use on ground floor, offices over and residential above (with affordable housing) in an amount which provides a neighbourly and respectful building.
2. The height of the building should fit with the adjoining buildings. Each part of the scheme submitted in 2008 ought to be reduced in height. The building should complement its neighbours.
3. The footprint of the building should allow for the retention of the existing established trees on the eastern and southern boundaries. New tree planting on the site frontage would enhance the public realm.
4. Parking provision should be modest and limited; reflecting the central location and good public transport availability.
5. The building's bulk should respect its neighbours and allow for light and sunshine to penetrate through to the Upper Richmond Road. The frontage needs to align with the adjoining buildings and to allow for a ground floor public realm of real quality. Any rear extension to the main building should respect the residential buildings to the south in St John's Avenue.

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

6. The new flats should enjoy adequate sunshine penetration into the rooms. 'Single aspect' housing, facing due north, would not be satisfactory.
7. No part of the building should cause overlooking or loss of light to other buildings.
8. The landscaping should be of the highest quality.

If Tileman House is redeveloped it can be expected that it will provide a model to be followed by other anticipated redevelopments along the Upper Richmond Road.

Putney Town Centre Partnership: Concern about ground level landscaping, existing trees have amenity value, basement plan fails to indicate how these trees would send their roots down into adequate areas of soil, doubt whether ground level townscape/tree planting of a high order would be achieved.

DOLAS (Trees): Felling all trees onsite, except for 1 mature lime tree is unacceptable. Many trees on this site are worthy of retention, appears that no consideration has been given to the trees in the design process of this building. The proposals in their current form suggest that G20, a line of mature lime trees at the rear of the site, but on neighbouring property, would have restricted root development on the site's side of the boundary wall, due to the boundary walls foundation. Root would have grown under the wall and would be present in the area on the site side of the wall. Damage to the root could have detrimental effects to the health and stability of these neighbouring trees. The application, which suggests felling all trees onsite including some fairly substantial specimens along the Upper Richmond Road. Do not see this as a feasible option. We encourage trees in the Borough, especially where they offer very good public amenity value, such as these.

DOLAS (Refuse): 89 residential units require 19 x 1100 litre bins (for both refuse and recycling). Space to present bulky items awaiting collection is required. Storage of 0.005 cu.m. of waste per week per sq.m. should be provided for B1 and A2 use, 0.075cu.m. waste per week per sq.m. for A1 use, and 0.1 cu.m. waste per week per cover for A3. Alternatively if there is a commitment to having more frequent collections than weekly in covenants attached to the commercial leases the space for waste storage could be decreased. Collection vehicles should be able to wait within 10m of the collection, all bins must be accessible for serving without moving other bins first.

English Heritage: Existing building is of little architectural or historic interest and the site is suitable for redevelopment. However, the existing building is set back from Upper Richmond Road, and to a degree has an active west-facing elevation facing the West Putney Conservation Area. The proposed new building is brought forward to the line of the pavement which will considerably exacerbate its visual presence. If the principle of a tall building is acceptable at this location, we urge that further consideration be given to the West-facing elevation. At present this elevation lacks interest and does not address the nearby conservation area.

Thames Water: No objection regarding sewerage infrastructure or water infrastructure. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the application should

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water is required.

Director of Housing: Satisfied with the proposed tenure split within the affordable housing element of this scheme. Does not support the proposed unit mix for affordable housing, as it does not reflect the needs and aspirations of the local area. Satisfied with the layout and amenity space provided for the affordable rented units but would require further information on the shared equity units. Satisfied with the number of wheelchair units and that these are ‘pepper-potted’ within the development. Do not see any reasonable constraints to providing a higher proportion of affordable housing on this site. The last submission increased the supply of affordable housing by 3 units and this new application increases the number of affordable housing by a further 5 units, however we cannot see any reasonable constraints to a further increase in the number of units for affordable housing. The toolkit needs to be re-run to reflect affordable 106 and the Director of Housing’s observations, paying particular attention to the number of persons and the level of grant assumed. In addition we would like to see an increase in 3bed units in line with the Borough’s target to provide 35% of all units to be 3-bedroom units or larger. All new build affordable housing units must comply with Homes and Communities Agency’s Essential Design & Quality standards and Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. Furthermore, in order for the affordable housing units to qualify for Homes and Communities Grant funding, the development must positively address at least 12 out of the 20 Building for Life Criteria. The Director of Housing with the Council’s Home Ownership Department, require that an affordability assessment is carried out, confirming that the intermediate units will be sold at an affordable level and aimed at local people.

Economic Development Office: The redevelopment of this site offers an opportunity to significantly improve the south side of Upper Richmond Road. The Upper Richmond Road represents a key employment area for both Putney and the Borough and the provision of new homes and employment space for businesses ideally equivalent to any existing area is important to support Putney town centre via the spending power of those living and working in Putney. The original 2008/5428 application, which this current application modifies, reduced current employment space of about 17%. The latest (2009/1773) reduces the commercial floorspace by a further 10sqm. However, given that there is already a previously approved planning permission with this amount of employment space included, one might decide that this new application meets the new LDF policy that new schemes should provide replacement office floorspace. Moreover, increasing the proposed employment floorspace could probably only be achieved by building further residential units as part of an even more intensive, and therefore, taller scheme which would not be popular. The benefit of this latest scheme is that it would significantly improve part of the ageing office stock in the Upper Richmond Road by creating modern employment floorspace suitable for a range of modern business uses. Redevelopment

would hopefully provide encouragement to other owners along the Upper Richmond Road to redevelop.

Engineering Services: The development provides a low level of parking provision. An equitable allocation of parking spaces should be made to the affordable units. 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. Car club spaces must also be made available for residents from outside the development. Incentives to encourage use of means of transport other than the private car would be sought. The developer would need to provide and operate a travel plan. The additional traffic would have a minimal effect on traffic flows and vehicles turning into and out of the access are unlikely to have a significant effect on the traffic signal controlled junction of Upper Richmond Road with Putney High Street and Putney Hill. The site is located very close to Putney Town Centre and Putney Station and has very good accessibility to public transport. However, the additional passenger loadings would add to capacity problems on trains closer to Central London and there are also current concerns about capacity of trains at East Putney Underground Station. The applicant should be required to make contributions (in the region of £350,000) towards improvements to Underground and Mainline Train facilities including improvements to East Putney and Putney Mainline Station. The development would provide off street servicing facilities for refuse collection and other deliveries would take place from existing loading bays in Upper Richmond Road. A construction management plan would be required to ensure that disturbance to local residents and disruption from construction traffic are minimised. The frontage on Upper Richmond Road should be set back and a wider public footway provided particularly at the western end of the site where the frontages are already set back. The western boundary wall should also be set back to accord with this. The developer would need to meet the cost of relaying the footways along the frontage of the development. The travel plan framework is generally acceptable, but to ensure it moved onto a full travel plan in a timely manner it would be appropriate to make this a requirement of any approval.

Environment Agency: A low environmental risk.

H.E.S. (Noise): Happy with the content of the acoustic survey, which places the development into NEC C as defined in PPG24. Mitigation measures are recommended within the acoustic report. If the ground floor is to be used for A3 or A4 uses the applicant must demonstrate that there would be adequate provision for a kitchen extract system within the development and where any additional plant and equipment is to be sited. Seek confirmation if there is intended to be any external areas to be used as part of these uses. The opening of doors to external areas from these uses should be restricted by condition to between 0800 and 2100hrs to prevent disturbance to neighbouring properties.

H.E.S. (Air Quality): The proposed site is located within Wandsworth's Air Quality Management Area and, as stated in the report, the proposed development is located within an area of relatively poor air quality which will be sensitive to any changes in vehicle emissions or dust generated as part of the construction or end use at the site. The mitigation methods for site planning, construction traffic and demolition works must all be applied at the site including further measures outlined in the Control of

Pollution & Noise from Demolition & Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008. Consideration should also be given to the possible effects of noise and vibration nuisance where appropriate. It is not considered that monitoring for nuisance dust would be necessary at this site given that all control measures are applied and adhered to. A combination of a gas fired CHP and a supplemental biofuel boiler (for space heating) is being proposed for this development. The use of biofuel as opposed to biomass is preferable however it will still have a detrimental impact on air quality as opposed to using gas CHP to provide all the energy requirements at the site. If the developer wishes to proceed with the biofuel boiler conditions are recommended. Setting up or participating in City Car Clubs for residents and the installation of electric vehicle charging points in car parks are both considered good practice and will provide measures to help offset the increases in air pollution which will be generated during and after the construction phase.

NHS Wandsworth: In view of the potential impact of this development on the ability of the PCT to effectively meet the needs of all residents of the Borough, Wandsworth PCT has expressed the requirement for Section 106 contributions to health of £300,333 in order to ensure the sustainability of the development. This is based on the potential impact that the new developments will have on existing healthcare infrastructure.

DOLAS (Parks Service): The Play Strategy in 2007 identified this area as deficient in play space. The nearby open spaces under Parks Service management are Putney Old Burial Ground, Wandsworth Park and Leader's Gardens. Putney Old Burial Ground has three Grade II listed tombs and one Grade II* listed tomb. It is a small quiet open space and there is no suitable space to install play equipment in the ground here. Both Wandsworth Park and Leader's Gardens are some distance away, beyond walking distance for small children. Both places already have well furnished playgrounds that have recently been improved by play services.

DOLAS (Play Services): New developments should provide a minimum of 10sqm per child arising from an increase in the child population of the area. The area around East Putney is play deficient in 0-4 provision. The obvious site for a contribution would be Wandsworth Park. This playground would benefit from some more challenging equipment.

POLICY: GEN1, 2, 3 and 4 (General); 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); RDP6 (Creating accessible environments); RDP7 and 8 (Planning obligations); TBE1-4 (Layout and form of development); TBE5 (Design and external appearance); TBE6 and 8 (High buildings); TBE10 (Development affecting conservation areas); TBE13 (Historic buildings); TBE14 (Archaeology); H3 (Residential amenity); H9, 10 and H11 (New housing); BIN1 (Business development); 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).

Core Strategy Submission Version: 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).

London Plan Policies: 3A.1 (Sustainability Criteria), 2A.2 (The spatial strategy for development), 3A.1 (Increasing London's supply of housing), 3A.3 (Maximising the potential of sites), 3A.6 (Quality of new housing provision), 3A.9 (Affordable housing targets), 3A.10 (Negotiating affordable housing in individual private and residential and mixed use schemes), 3A.11 (Affordable housing thresholds), 3B.1 (Developing London's economy), 3B.2 (Office demand and supply), 3C.1 (Integrating transport and development), 3C.2 (Matching development to transport capacity), 3C.23 (Parking strategy), 3D.1 (Supporting town centres), 3D.13 (Children and young people's play and informal recreation strategies), 3D.15 (Trees and woodland), 4A.1 (Tackling climate change), 4A.3 (Sustainable design and construction), 4A.4 (Energy assessment), 4A.6 (Decentralised energy, heating, cooling and power), 4A.7 (Renewable energy), 4A.11 (Living roofs and walls), 4A.16 (Water supplies and resources), 4A.19 (Improving air quality), 4B.1 (Design principles for a compact city), 4B.2 (Promoting world-class architecture and design), 4B.3 (Enhancing quality of the public realm), 4B.5 (Creating an inclusive environment), 4B.9 (Tall buildings – location), 4B.10 (Large scale buildings – design and impact), 5E.1 (The strategic priorities for South West London).

COMMENT: The material considerations for the proposal are the principle of development; the impacts of the scheme including specific reference to the proposed height; quality of architecture/design and contribution to the streetscene; residential amenity; transport; affordable housing; quality of accommodation proposed; loss of office space; commercial uses; public realm and landscaping including impact on trees; energy efficiency and waste.

Principle of development: The existing property does not make a positive contribution to the streetscene in terms of its appearance and surroundings. The replacement of the outdated office accommodation to provide a new development to encourage businesses to Putney is supported. The provision of an active frontage at ground floor level and improved appearance to the public realm are positive aspects of this proposal. Residential development on this site accords with Council policy and the provision of affordable housing would be supported. Demolition and new build has already been established for mixed use development granted in 2005. The Core Strategy seeks such mixed use redevelopment to contribute to the refurbishment of the existing office blocks in this area.

The proposal would be broadly in keeping with the mixed use character of Upper Richmond Road. The 'active frontage' created by the inclusion of commercial units at ground floor is encouraged, creating visual activity and interest at the ground floor level, whilst the residential flats above support the 24 hour usage of the site. This is in keeping with the possible uses set out in Core Strategy policy PL14.

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

The scheme is at a higher density than the sites in the surrounding area. However, policy PL14 of the Core Strategy notes that buildings may need to be at a higher density in order to provide the visual and economic benefits sought for this location.

Loss of office: There is currently 2926sq.m of commercial (office) floorspace at Tileman House. The extant 2005 consent, granted permission for a reduction in this amount to 2403sq.m acknowledging the improvement to the streetscene scheme offered. The current scheme maintains the 2005 level of provision with a split of 1,600sq.m. for office floorspace with the remaining 807sq.m. for A1/A2/A3/A4/D1 uses. The applicant has stated that the current floorspace is dated and ‘unlettable,’ however, no supporting information has been submitted to verify this claim. The proposed floorspace would be to modern office standards and would be flexible and capable of being subdivided to meet the needs of small and medium sized businesses. Therefore, in this instance, there would be no less commercial floorspace from the approved situation, and the floorspace that would be provided would meet a recognised need within the Borough. The proposed scheme is appropriate in this regard as it is considered the development offers other benefits particularly improvements at street level.

Historic environment: The site is in close proximity to two listed buildings, Rossalyn Tower, 18 St. John’s Avenue (Grade II), and The Pines, 9 and 11 Putney Hill (Grade II*). There are currently glimpsed views towards Rossalyn Tower from Upper Richmond Road which would be lost, however, these views are already screened by trees and are not readily visible. Rossalyn Tower has a very distinctive and prominent tower feature that rises at the rear of the house. The best views of the house are from the south, looking down Rayner’s Road, where Rossalyn Tower terminates the vista. The proposed development is set to one side and should not appear in the backdrop to this vista and should not, therefore, mar the views available. There are also views of the listed building within St John’s Avenue from the south side of the street looking across to the house towards the north-west. At present the existing Tileman House office building appears as a backdrop to this view. The proposed new building has a 10-storey addition at the rear that would bring the Tileman House development closer to the listed building in St John’s Avenue. In addition, the new building on the Upper Richmond Road frontage would be higher than the existing building. This would be an inevitable increase in the dominance of the new development on the setting of the listed building and would almost certainly diminish, to some degree, the quality of the views that are available from St John’s Avenue. The site is not within a conservation area but it is close to both the Oxford Road Conservation Area (beyond the railway lines to the north) and the West Putney Conservation Area (beyond Putney Hill to the west). Whilst there may be a change to the view from the conservation areas, due to the distance, there would not be a detrimental impact on their character and setting.

Design and height: Much of this section of the south side of Upper Richmond Road is fronted by a series of nondescript buildings that might be considered to be of disappointing architectural quality. It is not an attractive streetscene and the current building is possibly the most unattractive between Putney Hill and East Putney Station, an important factor in previous decisions to permit further development here. All the buildings are wide and high and with little variation in skyline, together they present a monotonous, north facing wall of development that can feel overbearing.

The Core Strategy objective seeks development that will address these issues and bring much needed improvement to the quality of the streetscape. The proposed development adopts a radical approach to the massing of the building in order to bring variety to the skyline and interest to the streetscape in two significant ways. Firstly, the mass of the building is broken into three narrow fronted elements that respond more sympathetically to the narrow frontages of the traditional Victorian context. Secondly, each element is a different height which introduces variety in the skyline. Each of the three elements is given a constant, strong architectural treatment by being framed in a high quality material. Within the strong framing, the opportunity is taken to create a varied architectural treatment to add richness and visual interest to the facades. The potentially blank, exposed flank ends of each element have been given narrow slot openings that would break up the surface of the elevation and add visual interest. Therefore the architectural approach and composition proposed for this building could result in a positive impact on the appearance of the site and in this respect, be supported.

At fifteen-storeys the proposed central part of the development would be higher than others built or approved along Upper Richmond Road. The highest existing buildings along this part of the road are nine-storeys, with the ten-storey 'SWI5H' development at number 75 (beyond East Putney Underground Station). The Committee has resolved to grant permission subject to a section 106 legal agreement at 113-123 Upper Richmond Road for a mixed use development up to eleven-storeys.

The scheme does propose a high building in so far as it exceeds the height of the surrounding buildings and therefore Policy IS3 (d) of the Core Strategy applies. This states - "Tall buildings...may be appropriate in locations well served by public transport, such as town centres...or at other defined focal points of activity, providing they can justify themselves in terms of the benefits they bring for regeneration, townscape and public realm." This location is within the town centre, is well served by public transport and due to its location close to the crossroads between Putney High Street and East Putney Underground Station, it is considered to be a focal point of activity. The scheme is considered to have a positive impact on the public realm (discussed below). The proposal would also bring new office and commercial floorspace to Putney and contributes to the aim of repairing the poor quality buildings along the north side of the Upper Richmond Road. The height of the proposal understandably, is a major reason for respondents to consultation.

Whilst a 'taller building' may be appropriate at this location, the proposed height and relationship to the surrounding properties is considered inappropriate. The eight-storey element is positioned next to the east elevation where the building adjoins the Victorian terrace on the corner of Upper Richmond Road/Putney Hill and positions the building line closer to the north boundary. This is a jarring relationship and the scale does not relate well to these adjoining properties albeit some might argue that the overall composition would be better than what exists now. The twelve-storey element to the east is at a higher level than exists along Upper Richmond Road. The main element has a height of fifteen-storeys and is higher than any other development in the locality and is uncharacteristic of the surrounding area. There are concerns about the height of this element, as it would be raised above the height of the development along Upper Richmond Road. The developer has submitted information

about building heights along the River Thames, however it is considered that these do not form the immediate context of the site. To the rear, the proposed height is ten-storeys. This represents an increase in bulk and massing to this rear elevation, when considered in the context of the existing building. The overall height and scale of the buildings is considered to be inappropriate to its setting in this part of Putney Town Centre, and would be inappropriate and out of character with the surrounding area and prevailing building heights and this is not offset by the elegant composition and design approach.

Residential amenity (existing): Concerns have been raised over loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. There are already residential windows to the front and rear of tall buildings along Upper Richmond Road and the views created would not be significantly different to those that already exist. To the east and west, new views would be created, however, the building is at least 20m from the boundaries with further separation to residential windows at this orientation minimising opportunities for overlooking. To the south, the rear elevation would be closer to the rear boundary than existing. However, the windows in this elevation could be conditioned to be obscure glazed.

The ground and first floor occupy the majority of the site area. This would result in a development of two-storeys (6m h), 6m from the rear boundary. The impact of the ground and first floors would be felt most strongly on the properties on St. John's Avenue to the rear. However, due to the topography of the site, the residential properties are at a higher level than the application site level. Furthermore, the closest residential flats at Marlin House are approximately 35m from the rear boundary. Therefore the distance from the rear boundary and distance from habitable rooms would mitigate the impact of this two-storey element. The property to the east is in commercial use at the lower floors and therefore the ground floor and first floor site coverage would have little impact to this elevation. To the west are commercial units at Crescent Stables and fronting Upper Richmond Road (with residential above), therefore the impact at ground and first floors would be to less sensitive uses.

It is noted that the outlook from the residential windows of many nearby properties may change and may be less open. Generally this change in outlook would not be so detrimental as to justify refusal. The most affected windows would be the side windows to no. 125. The main length of the building is 2m away from the east boundary, however, a set back to the rear of the eastern block has been introduced which means that directly outside this window there is a 10m separation to the twelve-storey elevation. This is a similar situation to that at 113 Upper Richmond Road, where windows from no. 125 face onto the site, where a 7m separation along the full length of the west boundary was accepted.

The applicant has submitted supporting information, calculating the loss of light to the existing properties using the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and Average Daylight Factor (ADF). These values are used to assess whether existing rooms would receive an adequate level of sunlight after development. Three points are identified where the windows fail these calculations (i.e. where the rooms would not receive adequate levels of daylight/sunlight). Both sets of windows to the front of 178 Upper Richmond Road (assumed to serve a bedroom and a kitchen) and the windows to the west

elevation of 125 Upper Richmond Road. The side windows to the fourth to eighth floors of 125 Upper Richmond Road are the only windows to the bedrooms of these one-bedroom units. The results show that whilst the rooms generally satisfy ADF values, they do not pass VSC values. Both values should be satisfied to demonstrate that the room receives an adequate level of light.

At no 125 the side windows all pass ADF levels. However, whilst the results show a significant improvement to the light received to these windows from the original submission in December 2008, all the windows continue to fail the VSC test. The applicant makes comparisons with the development at 113-131 Upper Richmond Road where a similar relationship was accepted. However, this achieved better lighting results than the current proposal, and due to the form, orientation and footprint of the development, it would not be directly comparable to the proposed situation. At no 178 the margin of failure for VSC levels is reduced, however none of these windows pass this test. The windows do meet ADF values for bedrooms, and whilst there are assumed to be kitchens to this elevation, the applicant states that these are below 13sqm and therefore are not relevant to be tested. It should be noted that if they were tested they would not satisfy either lighting test. The applicant makes reference to the change in British Standard which affects the way in which ADF results are calculated. However this application will be assessed against the material considerations at the time of the application, which includes the updated British Standard.

No assessment of the visibility of the sky line from these properties, has been submitted by the applicant. A comparison of the plans approved in 2005 shows that as approved the building was just seven-storeys high at the closest point to 125 with a substantial set back to each storey above this, which would give better light levels to the neighbouring windows than that proposed. It was also a lower height overall (10 storeys) which would have a lesser impact on the properties to the north. It could be argued that the 125 Upper Richmond Road has, by including habitable rooms windows facing directly onto the adjoining site 1m from the boundary, either prejudiced all development of this site or abandoned the protection that could be afforded to the windows.

The submitted scheme represents an improvement in terms of the impact on neighbouring amenity from the previously withdrawn scheme. All windows pass ADF standards, however all windows to 178 and 125 Upper Richmond Road continue to fail VSC standards, albeit by a smaller margin than the previous submission. Therefore there would be a detrimental impact on the levels of light received to these rooms.

Transport: The proposal would provide 0.8 car parking spaces per residential unit. TFL have requested no parking provision (other than disabled parking) whilst Engineering Services are of the opinion that this is a low level of provision. It is concluded that the parking levels represent an appropriate compromise between the avoidance of overspill parking and the aim to reduce the use of the private car. The developer has confirmed that residents would be excluded from the CPZ further reducing concerns of overspill parking. Two car club spaces would be provided at ground level, to be accessible to people outside the development. 142 cycle parking

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

spaces are proposed and a draft green travel plan has been submitted. These measures all seek to reduce dependence on the private car.

The scheme would generate an additional 15 traffic movements in the morning peak hour and 10 in the evening peak hour which is less than 1% of the traffic flows in Upper Richmond Road. The additional traffic would have a minimal effect on traffic flows and vehicles turning into and out of the access are unlikely to have a significant effect on the traffic signal controlled junction of Upper Richmond Road with Putney High Street and Putney Hill. TfL have requested a contribution of £20,000 towards highways improvements, which the applicant has agreed is acceptable.

The development would generate an additional 11 passenger movements by train in the morning peak hour and 13 movements in the evening peak hour. It would generate 17 passenger movements on the Underground during the morning and evening peak hours. The site has very good accessibility to public transport. However, the additional passenger loadings would add to capacity problems on trains closer to Central London and there are also current concerns about capacity of trains at East Putney Underground Station. A contribution of £350,000 has been suggested for improvements to public transport (to provide step free access and further improvements at Putney Railway Station) to mitigate these impacts. However, this has not been agreed by the applicant.

The development would provide off-street servicing facilities for refuse collection and biomass deliveries. Other deliveries would take place from existing loading bays in Upper Richmond Road. A delivery and servicing plan should be submitted to aim to minimise the impact of servicing delivery on the local road network.

Adequate provision is made for pedestrians with the improvement of the public realm, and access to the ground floor level frontage of the development which would create a wider footway (although this would fall within the boundary of the site).

Whilst there would be an impact on the number of people using public transport, the overall transport strategy, access and car parking provision are considered to be appropriate at this site.

Affordable housing: 25% of the flats would be affordable housing. This would comprise 68% social rented units and 32% intermediate housing (equity share). The London Plan target is for 50% where appropriate and a mix of 70% social rented units and 30% intermediate units.

The justification for the level of affordable housing submitted does not include a detailed cost plan that provides enough detail to withstand the independent testing undertaken. Also there is a lack of information to verify the claimed site acquisition cost. Therefore the submitted financial appraisal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that the scheme as proposed is offering the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that it could support and the evidence submitted is insufficient to provide a justification for the level and split of affordable housing which is below the policy requirement.

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

The applicant makes comparisons with the approved 2005 situation and the existing housing on the site. However, this application must be considered on its own merits and an appropriate level of affordable housing should be provided relative to the new units proposed and current policy.

Quality of accommodation: 71 of the proposed units (80 %) have access to private amenity space. These are mostly in the form of balconies or roof terraces. Four communal roof terraces are also provided, with 60sq.m. for the offices and two roof terraces at 2nd and one at 8th floor (a total of 729sqm of terraces). It is considered that an adequate amount of amenity space is provided.

There are concerns about the lack of children's play space. The open space strategy and play strategy produced by the Council identifies this area of East Putney as being deficient in access to public parks and deficient in free play space for 0-4 year olds. Whilst the applicant identifies nearby parks, these were considered in the Council's assessment of play space and do not detract from the conclusions drawn. The applicant has entered into discussions about the potential to fund improvements to nearby parks. Therefore on balance the proposals should not be refused on this basis.

The units meet the floorspace guidance in the Wandsworth SPG. An appropriate mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units are provided. There is a bias in favour of one bedroom units; this mix is nevertheless considered to be appropriate for this location. A number of dual aspect units have been incorporated into the scheme which provides better quality living spaces for the proposed occupiers, and the scheme provides clear and separate entrances for the commercial and residential uses.

The applicant has submitted a report to detail the noise and vibration levels to the proposed properties. This report suggests that the development is in noise category C of PPG24 where planning permission should not normally be granted. However, the report suggests mitigating measures to demonstrate how an appropriate internal noise level could be achieved. Provided these measures were implemented this would result in appropriate living conditions for future occupiers.

Commercial element: The provision of active frontages along the Upper Richmond Road is supported in order to create an interesting and human scale to the development. However, it is important to ensure that the proposed uses do not conflict with the primary and secondary shopping frontages in Putney Town Centre. It would be appropriate to attach restrictions to control the amount of floorspace that could be used as A1, or the sizes of the units to ensure that these would not compromise the retail function of the town centre. The applicant has confirmed that there would be no external areas associated with the proposed commercial units which reduces the concerns about noise and disturbance to residential flats above. If the unit were to be used for A3 or A4 use it would be necessary to demonstrate that appropriate kitchen ventilation could be provided and this should be secured by condition of any approval.

Public realm/landscaping (inc trees): This site presents an opportunity for uses that would make a significant contribution to the vitality of the town centre. The existing building makes very little or no contribution at ground floor level to either the quality of the public realm or the vitality of the town centre. The proposal to bring the

building forward to the traditional building line is welcomed. This would bring the ground floor activity more in contact with the street and has greater potential to engage positively with the passer-by. In addition, there would be three new entrances at the front of the building to the office accommodation proposed above ground floor level and two residential entrances. These entrances generate activity and interest at street level and provide a high level of passive surveillance of the street throughout the day and night that helps to ensure public safety and security. It should be noted also that the proposed ground floor has a very generous floor to ceiling height. This would maximise the contribution that the activity contained within the building can give to the vitality and attractiveness of the street at this location. There is still a generous forecourt that could be attractively landscaped, including new tree planting.

The proposal includes the loss of most of the trees on the site. Seven trees are shown as being retained, six of which are outside the boundary of the site. These provide the potential for significant boundary screening and offer good public amenity value. It is acknowledged that new trees would be provided as part of the landscaping scheme, however the trees proposed to be removed are good quality. It should be noted that the number of trees to be removed is the same as approved in 2005. Tree pits have been provided at ground floor level to ensure there is root-space for the ground floor trees within the excavated basement parking below. Root protection zones are shown for the trees to be retained but further detail would be required about how the existing trees in and adjoining the site would be protected during the building works, this could be controlled by condition.

The upper floor gardens provide a mixture of hard and soft landscaping. This would help to provide interest to the communal amenity spaces. Planting to the seventh floor of the west block also serves to soften the roofline and in general the proposals for these areas appear to be appropriate.

Energy efficiency/sustainability (inc air quality)/climate change: The commitment for the residential units to meet Code for Sustainable Homes level three and the commercial units to meet BREEAM very good standards is supported. Final certification would need to be obtained before any of the units are occupied, which could be secured by condition.

The proposed site wide CHP system suggests good CO₂ emission reductions and increases the development's overall energy efficiency significantly. Further detail of the CHP plant could be secured by condition. Whilst the inclusion of the biofuel boiler would be unlikely to meet the 20% requirement set out in policy IS2 a justification for this shortfall in light of the inclusion of CHP has been submitted. This technology raises concerns over air quality, particularly as the Borough is an 'air quality management area'. Whilst the applicant's air quality report concludes that the impacts of the proposal on air quality would be acceptable, it does not assess the individual or cumulative impact of the biomass boiler. However, subject to conditions requiring that the boiler is an exempt appliance in accordance with the Clear Air Act 1993, detail of the stack height of the biofuel boilers, confirmation that the fuel would comply with a recognised fuel quality standard and the boiler will be regularly maintained, the proposed biofuel boiler could be accepted.

2009/1773

Tileman House, 131-133 Upper Richmond Road, SW15

The revised plans show an area of brown roof to the central block and an area of green roof to the rear block. No evidence is submitted as to why a green roof has not been provided to the east block. The inclusion of these elements is supported. It is regrettable that the developer has not gone further to include this treatment to all blocks.

The proposal seeks to implement sustainable use of water resources through the use of rainwater holding facilities to be used to provide storage of run-off from hard surfaces and roofs, plus devices to limit water use within the residential units. The requirements for any cooling to the units will be met through opening windows and heat recovery mechanical ventilation systems, however further detail of the cooling to the office units would be required.

Other: An adequate number of bins are provided for the residential units, and whilst the final occupier of the commercial units is not known a large space has been allocated for this use. To ensure that a space for the storage of bulky items awaiting collection is identified a condition could be recommended.

Concerns have been raised about the precedent that this application could set. Whilst the Core Strategy: submitted version document recognises that Upper Richmond Road has the potential for future development, all future applications would be considered on their own merits.

Comments have been raised that a 'Plan for Putney' is required. The Core Strategy document policy IS3 refers to tall buildings generally and policy PL14 to East Putney, combined with the UDP policies form an adequate planning policy basis on which to consider this application. The contents of the Putney Society design brief have been considered, however a decision must be made against adopted planning policy. Issues such as impacts during construction, value of property, loss of view are not material planning considerations and cannot influence this decision.

Conclusion: The withdrawn scheme and this proposal have been contentious applications. The principle of development at this site is supported. Many of the objections have been related to the overall height of this proposal. Whilst the design and the way the building has been broken down into three narrow fronted elements, together with the improvements to the streetscene and increased ground floor interest and activity are positive elements of this proposal, the height proposed and relationship with the surrounding buildings are excessive. Additionally, there remain concerns about other aspects of the scheme proposed. The proposal does not provide sufficient justification for the level of affordable housing proposed; therefore it is not possible to conclude if 25% is the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing. This point could be the subject of further discussion and resolution. There remain other areas such as sustainability measures where the provision of further information could provide some comfort on the scale and nature of these impacts. The scheme also proposes development very close to the east boundary, where the only windows to the bedroom in one-bedroom flats are located. The proposed building would mean that these windows would not achieve an adequate level of light and therefore the scheme would have a negative impact on these existing dwellings. However the windows are only seen from the boundary.

RECOMMENDATION: That, subject to any Direction from the Mayor of London, p.p. be refused on the grounds that:-

1. The proposal by reason of its height and scale would form an overbearing and unduly dominant feature uncharacteristic of the surrounding area and prevailing buildings heights, would have a detrimental impact on the streetscape, and would have an inappropriate relationship with adjoining properties contrary to UDP Policies GEN7, TBE1 and TBE5, Core Strategy Proposed Submission Policies PL4, PL14 and IS3 and London Plan policy 4B.10.
2. The local planning authority has received inadequate housing viability information in order to assess if the proposed level of affordable housing in terms of the overall numbers, the mix of types and sizes and the split between social rented and intermediate has been maximised on this site in order to secure the Council's affordable housing target. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy: submission version policy IS 5 and London Plan Policies 3A.9 and 3A.10.