

Committee: Sustainable Communities Overview and Scrutiny Panel

Date: 10 January 2018

Wards: Merton Hall is located in Abbey ward

Subject: Harris Academy Wimbledon – Contract award decision for Merton Hall construction works

Lead officers: Yvette Stanley – Director of Children, Schools and Families
Chris Lee – Director of Environment and Regeneration

Lead members: Cllr Caroline Cooper-Marbiah – Cabinet Member for Education
Cllr Mark Allison – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance
Cllr Martin Whelton - Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Environment and Housing

Contact officer: Tom Procter – Head of Contracts and School Organisation

Recommendations:

- A. That the Overview and Scrutiny Commission consider the information provided in response to the call-in request and decide whether to:
- Refer the decision back to Cabinet for reconsideration; or
 - Decide not to refer the matter back to Cabinet, in which case the decision shall take effect immediately

1 PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report provides a response to the points raised in the call-in request relating to Cabinet's decision regarding the contract award decision for Merton Hall construction works taken on 11 December 2017.

2 DETAILS

Summary of the call-in request

- 2.1. The call-in request from Councillors David Dean, Najeeb Latif, and David Williams was submitted on 18 December 2017 and requested the Panel to refer the decision back to the decision making person (i.e. Cabinet) for reconsideration. The key outcome was stated as:
- *“Acknowledge that the unseen draft contract with Elim – which has been magnified by the enormous cost of rebuilding the majority of Merton Hall - is a price too high in both financial terms and loss of a substantial and valuable community asset, which is part of Merton's heritage*
 - *Recommend that the Cabinet agree to renegotiate the purchase of the Elim site in High Path with the church authorities as the current*

arrangement is neither a transparent use of the Council's money nor its assets".

2.2. The detailed information suggested that the council decision lacked five of the seven principles of decision making in Article 13 of the constitution as follows:

- (a) proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
- (b) due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
- (c) respect for human rights and equalities;
- (d) a presumption in favour of openness;
- (f) consideration and evaluation of alternatives

2.3. **General comments on the call-in request**

2.4. It should be noted that Cabinet on 4 July 2016 made the following decisions on the land assembly for the new Harris Academy Wimbledon School that are relevant to this call-in request:

A. To authorise the Director of Environment and Regeneration to complete the freehold purchase of the following land for the provision of a new secondary school and to lease the land to the Harris Federation for the Harris Wimbledon School on a 125 year lease at a peppercorn rent:

(i) The land edged red on plan A from Domex to a maximum price of [REDACTED] excluding stamp duty and fees

(ii) The land edged blue on plan A from Elim and to transfer in exchange the freehold of Merton Hall (the land edged red on Plan B) to Elim and to adapt and re-build the majority of the building for use by Elim to a maximum cost of [REDACTED] excluding stamp duty and fees.

and:

E. To note that in view of the displacement of South Wimbledon Community Centre from Merton Hall, officers are seeking to provide replacement accommodation on similar rental terms with an interim offer made for the currently vacant Pincott Road SW19

2.5. Therefore the substantive subject matter of this call-in (i.e. agreement to the maximum price for the disposal of Merton Hall and the purchase of the Elim site – ‘the land swap’) was actually agreed by Cabinet on 4 July 2016, a decision which was subject to pre-decision scrutiny by Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 29 June 2016, and post decision ‘call-in’ by Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 4 August 2016.

2.6. The decision agreed by Cabinet on 11 December 2017 was to agree to enter into a construction contract for works to Merton Hall agreed in the draft contract with the Elim Church to a contract value, subject to conditions, that was within the budget agreed by Cabinet on 4 July 2016 and agreed by Budget Council in the Council’s capital programme. The delay from July 2016 to December 2017 was due to the time required to obtain planning permission and go out to tender for a suitable contractor, with an extra 4-5

months due to the Planning Applications Committee refusing a first planning application.

- 2.7. In relation to the scope of Cabinet's decision that the scrutiny panel is being asked to consider, the advice of the Monitoring officer is provided in the legal Implications (Section 7) of this report. Nevertheless, to ensure transparency this report addresses all the points made in the call-in request. The report addresses the five areas as provided in the call-in request as follows:

1. Proportionality - Summary of call-in statement

- 2.8. *Questioning whether the decision to enter into a construction contract for Merton Hall is proportional to the council's prime objective, namely to deliver a new secondary school on the High Path site, particularly in consideration of (i) Value for Money (ii) impact of the loss of Merton Hall on the local community. (iii) there are alternatives (iv) the circumstance that an application has been made for the building to be listed in the National Heritage List for England and the list of Assets of Community Value (ACV) and the planning decision is subject to Judicial Review (v) fails to take into account the request made by Cllr Najeeb Latif on 9 November 2017 for the council to serve a temporary Building Preservation Notice on Merton Hall*

- 2.9. Answers to eight specific questions were requested.

2.10. Proportionality – officers response

- 2.11. The 8 specific questions and officers' response is as follows:

i) What was the chronology of the negotiations and discussions between Merton Council and Elim Church on the proposed land swap and redevelopment of the Merton Hall site?

- 2.12. The chronology is outlined below and can be traced from the papers provided in appendix 5:

- Summer/Autumn 2015: Agreement that there were only two options for the new secondary school: South Thames College or the High Path site. CPO advice received and initial discussions with Domex and Elim
- January 2016: Established that Elim were agreeable to working with the council but only on condition that a local replacement building could be found
- March 2016: The above remained the case and the High Path site became the only option for the council
- April 2016: Merton Hall suggested by officers as the only real option to enable Elim vacation – Elim visited the premises and agreed for the council to undertake a feasibility study
- May to June 2016: Feasibility study undertaken. Clarification that Elim would not accept an option that kept the existing main hall of Merton Hall but would accept a scheme in the feasibility study to re-build the main hall. Officers received valuation advice along with construction costs estimates, and received agreement in principle on the funding package from the EFSA (Education and Skills Funding Agency – the government agency of the Department for Education).

- June 2016: Cabinet report finalised for 4 July 2016 decision
- ii) Did Elim Church specifically identify and ask the council for Merton Hall?*
- 2.13. No – Elim specified a replacement building in the Wimbledon area for their congregation to continue.
- iii) Did the proposal to do a land swap between the High Path site and Merton Hall initially come from the council?*
- 2.14. As stated above, Elim specified a replacement building in the Wimbledon area for their congregation to continue. The council determined a land swap would represent best value. The council also decided it would prefer to manage a construction project to the appropriate value rather than provide Merton Hall and a capital sum as it was felt there was expertise within the council to manage the project to achieve the objective of a clear site at High Path as quickly as possible.
- iv) How much did the council offer Elim Church to purchase the High Path site outright?*
- 2.15. No offer was ever made as the Elim Church made it clear that a pre-requisite to moving was to provide a replacement building so that they could continue their church activities.
- v) Why did the council feel they had to agree to the loss of Merton Hall given its value to the local community and the fact there were other options available?*
- 2.16. The council needed to find a site that was suitable for a church. There are few options and those that have housing potential would be very expensive for the council tax payer and thus not represent best value for money. Merton Hall was agreed as a suitable site since all the existing regular users could be accommodated elsewhere, it is an appropriate size for Elim and it will be retaining its community use. Also, the restrictive planning potential of the site is such that the council is able to justify the value for money of an effective land swap with Elim's existing site and the payment of construction costs to provide an equivalent building.
- vi) Who put this draft deal on Merton Hall together? What Member involvement was there in it?*
- 2.17. The draft deal on Merton Hall was led by senior officers in Environment and Regeneration and Children, Schools, and Families. Members were briefed and consulted but the proposal on Merton Hall was initially proposed by officers as the best solution to achieve the objective of a clear site to deliver the new Harris Wimbledon School.
- vii) What is the commercial value on the Elim Church site on High Path*
- 2.18. This is provided in paragraphs 2.11 and 2.15 of the 4 July 2016 Cabinet and the valuation report is Appendix 9 to this report
- viii) What is the commercial value on the Merton Hall site*
- 2.19. As above, this is provided in paragraphs 2.11 and 2.15 of the 4 July 2016 Cabinet and the valuation report is Appendix 9 to this report. In summary, the Elim Church land (and Domex adjacent, hence the £6.1 million required

to purchase this land) has the potential to become residential development with its associated land values yet there is no reasonable prospect of Merton Hall being brought out of community use and into commercial or residential use. Therefore the 'land swap' plus construction project paid for by the council represents best value to purchase the land.

2.20. In addition to the specific questions above the proportionality call-in queried four further points which are outlined below with officers' response:

(i) Value for Money

2.21. Paragraphs 6.4 to 6.8 of the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report reviewed the value for money aspect and it is copied below for ease of reference:

2.22. The construction cost of a 1,050 place secondary school is at least £25-30 million and, with land costs in London, it is not untypical for the total cost of a new secondary school to be above £40 million. The construction cost of the Harris Wimbledon School is entirely the responsibility of the ESFA but on the basis of it being £25-30 million the total cost to the public sector of this scheme is £40-45 million.

2.23. Providing places through existing schools is generally less expensive and depends on the existing infrastructure in the school. The ESFA expectation is that secondary school expansion can be delivered for £20,920 per place, so £21.97 million for a 1,050 place school, but many councils struggle to deliver to this rate and have to supplement such expansions from their local resources. In Merton's case the non-faith schools in Wimbledon are PFI schools and have already expanded significantly with the associated strain on infrastructure. The cost of these additional 1,050 places could therefore have been around £24 million.

2.24. When Free Schools provide Basic Need places the ESFA expects a financial contribution from the Local Authority and would expect the Local Authority to donate its land. However, the council negotiated a contribution of £5.85 million from the ESFA, therefore enabling the net liability to be a maximum £8.75 million

2.25. Therefore, if the council had not negotiated for the new school to be part of the Free School programme it would have cost the council approximately £35 million more. If the council had delivered the extra places at existing schools it would have cost the council approximately £15 million more.

2.26. The Elim Church site is the remaining portion to be finalised in the much larger site for the new school, and all costs to the council are within the figures outlined above. The 'land swap' of Merton Hall and Elim Church land and the construction project meets best consideration of value for money for the Council as the High Path site has the potential to become residential development with its associated land values, while there is no reasonable prospect of Merton Hall being brought out of community use and into commercial or residential use. With the assistance of external valuation advice, the Director of Environment and Regeneration therefore concluded in July 2016, and is still of the opinion, that this agreement represents best value for the Council

(ii) impact of the loss of Merton Hall on the local community.

2.27. While it is acknowledged that the sale of Merton Hall has promoted a strong response, the evidence shows that it was underused as there were only five regular bookings throughout the week for the main hall and a further seven regular bookings using the smaller spaces. In terms of casual bookings, over the period January 2015 – September 2016 there was, on average, one casual booking per week at the hall (97 bookings over a period of 91 weeks). The full schedule of regular users from 2016 (prior to the council's proposal to transfer the hall to Elim was announced) is provided in Appendix 10. All of the regular users have been successfully relocated.

(iii) there are alternatives

2.28. Paragraph 3.4 of the 11 December Cabinet report again reviewed the alternative sites for Elim Church and concluded that Merton Hall remained the most practical solution to enable Elim to move from their present site. Any alternative solutions would take too much time to deliver, if they could be delivered at all, and would cost the Council considerably more money. Merton Hall was chosen as the most appropriate facility since:

- It is a relatively underused asset for LB Merton to maintain; all 12 of the regular hirers (only 5 of which used the main hall) could be accommodated elsewhere, and the facility is now closed.
- With the capital investment by the Council it is an appropriate size for Elim to enable them to vacate their present site. The restrictive planning permission potential of the Merton Hall site is such that the Council is able to demonstrate the value for money of an effective land swap with Elim's existing site and the payment of construction costs to provide a suitable replacement building.
- A further alternative option that has previously been considered is that the Council exercise its CPO (Compulsory Purchase Order) powers to acquire the site compulsorily. The council would be required to pay the market price for the site plus statutory compensation. However, the use of CPO powers is to be used only very sparingly and is intended as a last resort after all other options have failed. The process is long and can result in a public enquiry, which would delay the process possibly taking up to 24 months to see the CPO through. Consideration needs to be given on when and whether the council would want to go down this route as it is likely to be seen as a hostile act by Elim and the hope of negotiating an early settlement may be lost.

2.29. *The circumstance that an application has been made for the building to be listed in the National Heritage List for England and the list of Assets of Community Value (ACV) and the planning decision is subject to Judicial Review*

2.30. The 11 December 2017 Cabinet report carefully considers the issue that the council has received challenges in the above three areas – they are clearly listed in the Executive Summary and the main body of the report. The report also outlines the urgent need for the new school and the consequences of not implementing the decision in a timely manner. The recommendations in the report, agreed by Cabinet, is proportional and reasonable in not seeking

to circumvent the listed building application, and taking into consideration that the implication of delaying the decision by many months until the outcome of the ACV is known would have major consequences for the timescale in delivering the school. Paragraphs 2.17 to 2.25 clearly sets out these issues for Cabinet to reach a conclusion. The council decision on accepting (or not) an ACV application was undertaken by separate officers to those involved in implementing the Harris Wimbledon School project.

2.31. *(v) fails to take into account the request made by Cllr Najeeb Latif on 9 November 2017 for the council to serve a temporary Building Preservation Notice on Merton Hall.*

2.32. As shown by the legal advice given in appendix 8, the council cannot a serve a notice on itself but the Cabinet report and agreement clearly says that entering into the construction contract is dependent on “The Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) determines to decline the application made to add Merton Hall to the list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest maintained by the DCMS (The National Heritage List for England), whether or not any subsequent request is made for the DCMS to review that decision.” Cabinet has therefore agreed to abide by the spirit of this request.

2.33. **3. Due Consultation - Summary of call-in statement:**

The call-in acknowledges that there is a need for commercial confidentiality but questions whether there has not been any kind of meaningful consultation with the local community on the principle of the council’s land swap with Elim Church

2.34. **Due Consultation – officers response**

There was a need to seek Cabinet’s approval to the land assembly at High Path but to keep it confidential until we had reached the point that the parties to the agreement were willing to go public. This was in November 2016 and a public meeting was held at Merton Hall on 21 November 2016. This was well publicised by the ward Members and was well attended. A council press release followed on 22 November 2016 which clearly set out the council’s intentions with regard to Merton Hall and Elim Church. At this time the council all set up a specific web page where this was outlined <https://www2.merton.gov.uk/learning/schools/moreschoolplaces/harriswimbledon.htm>

2.35. The planning application process also had a consultation process with regard to the specific plans for Merton Hall. Both Merton Hall applications (in early 2017 and summer 2017) involved transparent consultation as required for all planning applications. The comments and representations made on these applications are available to view on the council’s Planning Explorer website.

2.36. **4. Respect for human rights and equalities - Summary of call-in statement:**

2.37. *The call-in suggests that the council is breaching its own equalities protocol by using taxpayers’ money to promote and enhance a church whose attitudes and beliefs are understandably seen as homophobic by some in the local community. This was identified as a serious issue by the Children*

and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel at their meeting of 8 November 2017. As a result of their discussions, Members made a formal recommendation requesting that “Cabinet seek formal written assurances from the Elim Church that under its management Merton Hall lettings will enable the venue to remain for the use of all the community and that these lettings will be fully compliant with equality legislation.”

2.38. *The replacement facility for SWCA of 3 Pincott Road is significantly inferior and there is no recognition of the fact that the Pincott Road site is part of the planned High Path regeneration, and there is no analysis of the advantages and disadvantages for residents on lower incomes of moving the food bank hosted at the Elim church and what temporary arrangements might be put in place to ensure that this important facility continues to serve the community.*

2.39. **Respect for human rights and equalities - officers response**

2.40. While it is acknowledged that 3 Pincott Road is a smaller facility, the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report outlines that this is part of a range of building options to ensure no displacement of community users. This is within the context of there being only 12 regular user groups, only 5 of which let the larger hall facility. The stated measures are as follows:

- 3 Pincott Road SW19 has been converted from being a vacant office space to provide two community rooms operated by SWCA,
- All Saints Primary school hall is now being operated by SWCA out of school hours,
- The Council has worked with SWCA on any group that may need a community facility;
- Ensure that when built, the new Harris Wimbledon School will open extensive community facilities out of school hours

2.41. With regard to the open use of Elim Church, on 11 December 2017 Cabinet accepted the reference from CYP Scrutiny to seek formal written assurances from the Elim Church that Merton Hall lettings will be fully compliant with equality legislation. Due to the Christmas vacation period this has not been completed at the time of writing the report. However, as with any organisation, it is a legal obligation that Elim Church comply with equalities legislation in their ownership and use of Merton Hall.

5. Presumption in favour of openness - Summary of call-in statement;

2.42. *There has been more secrecy around this issue than is necessary to protect commercial confidentiality e.g. the precise arrangements reached with Elim Church, the finances of the scheme and the detail of the negotiations, and considerable scope for conflicts of interest to arise in this case through the fact that it is Merton Council which is one of the two parties engaging in the land swap and which has secured planning permission and yet it is also the council which is tasked with evaluating and deciding on both the application for listing Merton Hall as an Asset of Community Value and for the application of a temporary Building Preservation Notice.*

2.43. **Presumption in favour of openness — officers response.**

- 2.44. The council recently published the previously confidential report from 4 July 2016 and the website page referred to earlier shows the transparency, although fine details of a commercial transaction not completed must remain confidential.
- 2.45. As detailed earlier, the council decision making on accepting (or not) an ACV application was undertaken by separate officers to those involved in implementing the Harris Wimbledon School project and Cabinet has no power to place a Building Preservation Notice upon itself yet acted in the spirit of it in agreeing not to implement the contract immediately.
- 2.46. **6. Consideration and evaluation of alternatives - Summary of call-in statement**
- 2.47. *i) the list of alternatives is by no means comprehensive and ii) the necessary information has not been provided to enable residents and Members to evaluate whether the Cabinet was correct to dismiss the alternatives listed, such as using the council's CPO powers. For example, we understand that Merton Council originally made an offer to buy the Elim Church site on High Path but this offer was rejected by Elim's headquarters Furthermore, no details have been provided of which other industrial premises owned by Merton Council in the borough were considered by Merton Council for the re-siting of Elim Church. As such, there is not the evidence available to Members to reassure them that one of these premises would not have proved a more cost effective option.*
- 2.48. **Consideration and evaluation of alternatives - officers response**
- 2.49. The paragraphs and papers in this report, including the Appendix 9 valuation report shows the context of CPO and why the approach taken was in the best interests of the council, and that the only reasonable means to secure the Elim Church site was to provide the 'equivalent reinstatement' of an alternative building
- 2.50. The council has answered all questions from members of the public on specific ideas for alternative premises. For example:
- St George's Hall on St George's Road* – This is fully owned by the London Borough of Merton and would just be of sufficient size, especially as the expectation is that multi storey building can be provided on this site. However, this is a premium town centre site. While for commercial reasons the council cannot disclose the detail of our land values for proposed uses, suffice to say that if Elim were offered the St. George's Road site and a newly built facility, the council would be paying significantly more than it needs to which could not be justified as good value for money to council tax payers. It would also not be consistent with the council's ambitions for Wimbledon town centre as an employment centre.
- Lombard industrial Estate SW19* – This site is not within the control of the council. If the council were to successfully negotiate an area of sufficient size it would not be available to develop until at least December 2018 which would be a year later than our current plan. However, even if the council were able to do this, there are planning policy and issues of equivalent reinstatement that make this site unviable. The Lombard Industrial Estate is designated as a strategic industrial estate in the Mayor's London Plan, and

there is high demand for space in this site. It would therefore not be possible for the council to change planning policy to allow church use on the site. In any case, the church wishes to be in an area accessible to the local community. Being in a fully industrial site would not be and so the council would not be able to meet the principle of equivalent reinstatement.

3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

- 3.1. The Council's constitution requires the Commission to select one of the options listed in recommendation A.

4 CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN OR PROPOSED

- 4.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

5 TIMETABLE

- 5.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

6 FINANCIAL, RESOURCE AND PROPERTY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

7 LEGAL AND STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1. In relation to the scope of Cabinet's decision that the scrutiny panel is being asked to consider, the advice of the Monitoring Officer is as follows:
- 7.2. The panel is asked to consider the decision of Cabinet on the 11th December 2017. As described in para 2.4 and 2.5 above, the Cabinet have previously made decisions in July 2016 which were subject to call-in in relation to the "land swap". These decisions are not subject to the call-in as they have already been made and acted on. Committee is asked to consider the decision made by Cabinet on the 11th December 2017 in relation to letting the construction contract and the resolutions made.
- 7.3. The panel may decide to refer those decisions back to Cabinet for reconsideration. Matters relevant to these decisions set out as grounds for the call-in request are:
- The extent of the construction works and the cost of the award of the contract.
 - The application to list Merton Hall as an Asset of Community Value and the timing of the construction works.
 - The application to add Merton Hall to the National Heritage list for England and the impact this application has on the timing of the construction works and contract.
 - The application to judicially review the Planning Authorities decision to grant planning permission for works to Merton Hall and the impact this application may have on the timing of the construction contract and works.
 - Any effect of a request by Cllr Najeeb Latif on 9th November 2017 for the Council to serve a temporary Building Preservation Notice on Merton Hall.

- The conditions attached to the conditional contract to dispose of Merton Hall to Elim Church.
- The Council's arrangements to consider an application for Merton Hall to be listed as an Asset of Community Value and the consideration of the need for a Temporary Preservation Notice.
- The Equalities Analysis appended to the Cabinet report of the 11th December 2017

Matters which are not relevant to the decision to award the construction contract

7.4. A number of grounds and issues are set out in the call in request which refer to an earlier decision of Cabinet on the 4th July 2016 (i.e. agreement to the maximum price for the disposal of Merton Hall and the purchase of the Elim site – 'the land swap'). That decision was subject to pre-decision scrutiny by Children and Young People Overview and Scrutiny Panel on 29 June 2016, and post decision 'call-in' by Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 4 August 2016. These aspects of the project are not the subject of the decision which has been called in.

7.5. Matters raised which are not directly relevant to the decision of 11th December 2017 and which are out of scope of the call-in further to para 16 (c) (iii) of the call-in rules (the decision for which call-in consideration is requested must not have been subject to a prior call-in request) are:

- The land transaction and its cost - "the land swap" - having been previously subject to decision and call-in.
- The decision to dispose of Merton Hall to Elim Church or alternative options such as CPO – having been previously subject to decision and call in.
- The move of Elim Church to Merton Hall – having been previously subject to decision and call in.

8 HUMAN RIGHTS, EQUALITIES AND COMMUNITY COHESION IMPLICATIONS

8.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

9 CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

10 RISK MANAGEMENT AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

10.1. This is provided in the 11 December 2017 Cabinet report

11 APPENDICES – THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE PUBLISHED WITH THIS REPORT AND FORM PART OF THE REPORT

- Appendix 1 Call-in request form
- Appendix 2 Cabinet report 11 December 2017
- Appendix 3 - 4 July 2016 Cabinet report approving Harris Wimbledon site assembly (with redactions)

- Appendix 4 – Schedule of documents requested in this call-in with references
- Appendix 5 - Documents prior to decision making process on Merton Hall/Elim Church property transaction (These were provided as exempt documents for Overview and Scrutiny Commission on 4 August 2016 - the report is still showing this although it can now be disclosed with the blacked out information that is still commercially sensitive)
- Appendix 6 – Meeting notes and correspondence between the council and Elim Church including on the land swap and lettings policy (Damian)
- Appendix 7 – The meeting notes of the new school group
- Appendix 8 - Copies of correspondence the request for a Temporary Building Preservation Notice for Merton Hall
- Appendix 9 – Valuation report
- Appendix 10 – Usage of Merton Hall before its closure

12 BACKGROUND PAPERS

- 12.1. 21 September 2017 Merton Hall Planning Application Committee Report
27 September 2017 Planning Decision Notice

The Council's website provides further background including the scheme design for Merton Hall

<https://www2.merton.gov.uk/learning/schools/moreschoolplaces/harriswimbledon.htm>