
Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 12 October 2021

Site Visit made on 13 October 2021

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P5870/W/20/3264318

Helena House, 348-352 High Street, Sutton SM1 1PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bernard Margulies of Helena House Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Sutton.
 - The application Ref DM2020/00476, dated 19 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing building and the erection of a part-5, part-8 storey building, accommodating 41no. residential dwellings (Class C3) and 317sqm of commercial / community facility floorspace (Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5, D1 and B1(a)) and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing building and the erection of a part 5, part-8 storey building, accommodating 41no. residential dwellings (Class C3) and 317sqm of commercial / community facility floorspace (Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5, D1 and B1(a)) and associated works at Helena House, 348-352 High Street, Sutton SM1 1PU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM2020/00476, dated 19 March 2020, subject to the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Bernard Margulies of Helena House Ltd against London Borough of Sutton. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Spatial Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (London Plan) was adopted after the Council determined the application subject of this appeal. I have therefore had regard to the adopted policies rather than those stated in the decision notice.
4. While I acknowledge the description of development stated in the decision notice, I have used the description from the application form in the interests of certainty.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
- whether the proposed development would accord with the Council's development plan strategy for affordable housing, including the viability and deliverability of the scheme.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The site lies to the north of Sutton town centre on the High Street and opposite a park. The existing building on the site is Helena House which is a vacant block of offices that is six storeys in height. In views from both directions along the High Street, Helena House is viewed with the six storey Sovereign Apartments to the south and No 1 Oakhill Road (No 1) which is four-storeys high rising to five-storeys at the curved corner feature, to the north.
7. Adjacent to the site to the south lies the Prince Regent site. While the site currently has little built development above ground, it benefits from planning permission for the development of a six-storey block of flats, the construction of which had begun at the time of my site visit. As such, I attach significant weight to this scheme. To the south of the Prince Regent site lies Sovereign Apartments, a development which is six storeys at the corner of High Street and an access road, and steps down to three storeys.
8. Further to the south lies the Old Gas Works site, a development that is roughly part 11 and part 6 storeys in height. Although the High Street is otherwise largely occupied by two and three storey buildings, these taller buildings have significantly altered the area to one that is characterised by taller buildings. This effect is also apparent in views from the other streets surrounding the site, including Lewis Road, Burnell Road and Benhilton Gardens.
9. The proposal is for the demolition of Helena House and the erection of a part-five, part-eight storey building. The eight-storey part of the proposal would exceed the height threshold of six storeys set out in Appendix 7 of the Sutton Local Plan 2016-2031 February 2018 (LP). The Old Gas Works site also conflicts with LP Appendix 7, as would the appeal scheme.
10. The increase in height from the six storey Prince Regent scheme to the eight-storey part of the proposal would result in a two storey step up in height. Similarly, there would be a three storey step down in height from the 8-storey element of the scheme to the 5-storey part. These differences in height would not be dissimilar to the relationship between other buildings in the area. Examples of this include the five and three storey elements of Sovereign Apartments as well as the greater differences in height between the various components of the Old Gas Works developments. While I acknowledge the set-back of the latter scheme and the associated public realm improvements, the difference in height is nevertheless prominent when viewed from both directions along the High Street and the variation in building heights forms an integral part of the character of the area. Accordingly, such a relationship in the appeal

scheme would not appear out of keeping given the varied roofline prevalent in the area.

11. The change in height from the eight storeys part of the scheme to the five-storey element would be most visible in views from the north. A relatively large area of façade lacking fenestration would be apparent when approaching the town centre. However, the design includes brick detailing which would introduce a level of articulation to the facade.
12. The proposed building would be set forward compared with the existing building. However, it would align with the building line of the adjacent terrace and the corners of the building would be cut away vertically. In addition, the building would present a façade three storeys high above the adjacent terrace, then another three storeys further back, when viewed from the north compared with four storeys as existing. Therefore, while the proposal would result in a greater amount of flank elevation facing north than the existing building, the proposed north elevation would be sufficiently articulated, and its massing broken up, such that the building would contribute to an attractive street scene.
13. The proposed building, given its height and massing, would be a prominent feature in the street scene, particularly in views from the park on the opposite side of the High Street. However, the distance to the nearest buildings opposite would be greater than other parts of the High Street that are developed on both sides. Given the open nature of the park, and that the buildings on the other side are generally two storeys, the height of the proposal would not harm the spacious aspect provided by this green space.
14. The design of the building includes vertical cut outs at the corners with the street and two vertical cut outs along the front elevation. These break up the massing of the scheme resulting in a varied form that would be in keeping with other buildings in the area. The open sided balconies that would occupy these voids would have slim bases that would retain the sense of lightness achieved by the cut outs. Therefore, while I acknowledge the Council's comments regarding integrated balconies with columns such as those on the first three floors of the southern corner, this would increase the massing of the scheme leading to a heavier appearance that would appear unacceptably dominant in the street scene given the increased height of the scheme. Accordingly, I do not consider that the proposed balconies would have an incongruous effect on the character of the area.
15. The area in front of Helena House is occupied by two vehicular accesses and an area of parking. Therefore, while the current set back provides a greater width of public realm than that proposed, it provides a poor-quality pedestrian environment. The proposal would site the building closer to the road inline with the terrace to the north. In addition, the proposal would remove the two accesses and parking area, replacing it with a lay-by and uninterrupted pavement. The building line would flow in a smoother manner from the terrace to the north, sloping back towards the proposed entrances then meeting the chamfered corner of the Prince Regent scheme.
16. While the proposal would reduce the overall width of the public realm at the front of the site, the smoother building line, provision of uninterrupted pavement as well as the proposed landscaping, would result in an improved public realm compared with the existing situation. Although I note the evidence

regarding planters, I see no reason why a condition requiring further details of the public realm could not mitigate any concerns in this respect.

17. The Sutton Town Centre Masterplan June 2016 (STCM) sets out the strategy for the town centre as well as the wider area. It indicates that the strategy for the area surrounding the site is to create an enhanced residential neighbourhood at the north of the town centre, an area known as the Northern Gateway. The proposal would be in part moderately taller than the strategy for buildings in this area. However, the changes in height from the Prince Regent site and between the eight-storey and five-storey elements would be in keeping with the varied heights in the area. In addition, the step down to the five-storey element would reference the corner element at No 1. Therefore, in terms of scale, the proposal would successfully provide a transition from the town centre and the visual cues of the Old Gas Works site, to the more suburban residential areas to the north while referencing the varied heights of the buildings that characterise the area.
18. In summary, while the proposal would not strictly meet the height guidance within the STCM or Appendix 7 of the LP, in this particular instance, since it would provide a building that would be in keeping with the area in terms of massing and scale, and would improve the public realm, the proposal would accord with the aims of the STCM. Moreover, the proposal would greatly improve the appearance of the existing site and would provide a building with an articulated form and high-quality design.
19. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not conflict with the aims of LP Policy 28, which seeks buildings in Areas of Taller Building Potential to be of exemplar design, and make a positive contribution to the quality of the local and wider townscape and skyline. The proposal would also not conflict with the aims of London Plan Policies D3, D8 and D9 which seek development that respond to the existing character, a well-designed public realm and tall buildings that address visual impacts among other things.

Affordable housing

20. LP Policy 8 seeks a minimum of 35% of all dwellings to be affordable on a site having regard to individual site costs and economic viability among other things. London Plan Policy H5 states that the threshold level of affordable housing on gross residential development is initially set at 35%. It goes on to say that where a viability assessment is required to ascertain the maximum level of affordable housing deliverable on a scheme, the assessment should be treated transparently and undertaken in line with the Mayor's Affordable Housing and Viability SPG.
21. The Homes For Londoners Affordable Housing And Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance 2017 (SPG) and the Affordable Housing and Financial Viability Supplementary Planning Document March 2020 (SPD) state that applicants should demonstrate that their proposal is deliverable and that their approach to viability is realistic. In addition, if an appraisal shows a deficit position the applicant should demonstrate how the scheme is deliverable.
22. The proposed development would not provide any affordable housing. However, viability assessments were carried out by both the Appellant and the Council both of which conclude that the scheme could not viably provide affordable

housing based on a profit on Gross Development Value of around 18%. Moreover, since the main parties' figures for the Benchmark Land Value and Base Build Cost were roughly aligned, I see no reason why the Appellant's approach to viability is not realistic.

23. With regard to deliverability, the Council explained during the Hearing that the primary concern in this respect was the prospect of repeat applications which do not get implemented. The Council's deliverability concerns also include the Appellant's residential value growth forecast using Saville's South East region growth forecast rather than the London region forecast. However, I also accept the difficulty of producing reliable data on which to base forecasts, given the recent Covid pandemic. The Appellant stated during the Hearing that he is prepared to accept a lower profit, since the building as it stands is in need of some maintenance, lies vacant and therefore is not producing an income. In pursuing this appeal and given the condition of the existing building, I see no reason to doubt that the proposal would not be delivered.
24. In any event, while I note the provisions of the SPG and SPD, since deliverability is not expressly mentioned in LP Policy 8 or in London Plan Policy H5, and the Appellant has demonstrated the proposal would not be viable with affordable housing, the scheme would not conflict with these Policies.
25. I have had regard to the comments of the Inspectors for the cases at Copse Hill and Lodge Place. However, further details of those cases are not before me and the Appellant for the case at Lodge Place was a charity. Therefore, I am unable to draw a direct comparison between those appeals and this case. In any event each case must be determined on its individual merits.
26. Consequently, the proposed development would not conflict with the Council's development plan strategy for affordable housing, including the viability and deliverability of the scheme. Therefore, it would not conflict with LP Policy 8 or London Plan Policy H5 which relate to affordable housing.

Other Matters

27. I acknowledge local concerns including those relating to parking and traffic. The scheme is proposed as a car-free development where future occupiers would not be entitled to parking permits. The Appellant has submitted a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking to secure this which I discuss later in this decision. I am therefore persuaded the development would not result in on-street parking, an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe residual cumulative impact on the road network.
28. I also note concerns from nearby occupiers including those of Gateway Court and the properties along Lewis Road. I see no reason, why suitably worded conditions could not adequately address the concerns regarding the effect of the construction process on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, including dust and noise.
29. The occupiers of the surrounding properties have also expressed concerns regarding light, privacy and outlook. However, from the evidence and my observations during the site visit, the proposed building would be sited a sufficient distance and orientation from the surrounding dwellings such that there would not be an undue effect in these respects.

30. While I note concerns regarding the use of the rear access by the commercial units, the scheme proposes the commercial units at ground floor to be serviced from the front. Likewise, refuse collection is proposed to be from the front of the building on High Street. As such, there would not be adverse impacts in this regard.
31. Concern has also been raised regarding the demand for retail units. However, since the proposal for the ground floor units is for a number of use classes, there would not be any harm in this respect. I acknowledge the points raised regarding the proposed communal amenity space. Since the site lies opposite Sutton Green, the proposal would provide a suitable living environment for future occupiers in this respect.
32. I note the evidence regarding the scheme setting a precedent for taller buildings in the area. However, each case must be determined on its individual merits. While I note local concerns regarding legal easements across the rear access, these are not planning matters and have not altered my overall decision.
33. I also note concerns regarding the security of No 37 Lewis Road given its proximity to the rear access. However, given the existing layout and use of the building, the access could be used by a greater number of people to access the site than proposed. Accordingly, there would not be any undue harm in this respect.

Planning Obligations

34. The appellant has completed a Unilateral Undertaking (UU) under Section 106 of the Act (a S106) which includes a number of obligations to come into effect if planning permission is granted. I have considered these in light of the statutory tests contained in Regulation 122 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010. The obligations relate to the following matters.
35. Carbon Off-Set Contribution and Monitoring Fee: The sums in respect of the financial contributions are undisputed and the terms area related directly to the development and are fairly related in scale and kind. As such the contributions would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests for planning obligations set out in the Framework.
36. Travel Plan and Travel Plan Monitoring Fee: The S106 requires the Owner to submit a Travel Plan to the Council and the payment of a Travel Plan Monitoring Fee. From the evidence, I consider the UU, in these respects, is fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed and as such passes the statutory tests.
37. Highway Provisions and Public Realm Improvements: The Highway Works shown on drawing P1-100 Rev PB and a revised Public Realm Improvement Plan are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. As such I consider the UU, in this respect, is fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed and as such passes the statutory tests.
38. Parking Permits: The S106 ensures that the residential units would not be occupied until a notice has been served to the occupants that they shall not be entitled to be granted a Parking Permit. Since the UU is also made pursuant to Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974, I am satisfied that it would secure the development as being car-free. This provision is related directly to the development and fairly related in scale and kind. As

such it would accord with the provisions of Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests for planning obligations set out in the Framework.

39. While the agreement does not provide for off-site contributions towards affordable homes, it does include a viability review mechanism which requires that a viability assessment is carried out two years after the grant of planning permission and again after the sale or occupation of the 31st residential unit. An affordable housing contribution would be required in the event that the viability assessments determine a surplus. Given the findings of the Viability Report submitted as part of the application, I consider this approach to be acceptable. Accordingly, I consider the agreement in this respect is fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed and as such passes the statutory tests.

Conditions

40. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. I have made some minor changes to these having regard to the tests set out in the Framework and the guidance contained in the Planning Practice Guidance. I have amended some of the wording of the conditions in the interests of precision and clarity.
41. The conditions regarding time limits and specifying drawings is necessary in the interests of certainty. The conditions regarding a construction management plan and contamination are necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. These conditions need to be pre-commencement as they would affect the early stages of construction.
42. The condition relating to external materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. A condition regarding air quality is necessary in the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the future occupiers of the development. In order to safeguard against flooding, a condition regarding surface water drainage is necessary and a condition relating to piling is necessary given the proximity to main sewers.
43. The conditions regarding green roofs and landscaping are necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the condition regarding a Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan is necessary to safeguard biodiversity. In the interests of sustainability, a condition relating to water efficiency is necessary. The conditions regarding cycle storage and a travel plan are necessary to promote sustainable transport choices.
44. In addition, conditions regarding acoustic fences, external lighting, waste management and delivery servicing plan are necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Since the condition relating to waste management would be unlikely to affect the early stages of construction, it does not need to be pre-commencement. The condition relating to crime prevention measures are necessary to safeguard the living environment of future occupiers.

Conclusion

45. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: E0-000 Rev. PA, P0-100 Rev. PB, P1-100 Rev. PB, P1-101 Rev. PC, P1-102 Rev. PC, P1-103 Rev. PC, P1-104 Rev. PC, P1-105 Rev. PC, P1-106 Rev. PC, P1-107 Rev. PC, P1-108 Rev. PB, P2-100 Rev. PB, P3-100 Rev. PC, P3-101 Rev. PC, CCL 10386/TCP Rev 1 and Tree Schedule 10386.
- 3) No development shall begin, including demolition and site clearance works, until a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and Construction Management Plan (CMP), to include details of: (a) loading and unloading of plant and materials; (b) storage of plant and materials; (c) programme of works (including measures for traffic management); (d) provision of boundary hoarding, behind any visibility zones of construction traffic routing; (e) hours of operation; (f) and means to prevent deposition of mud on the highway g) means to control air quality have been submitted, to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved statement.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of the development, an options appraisal and remediation strategy with appropriate measures required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the approved remediation strategy in are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any changes to these components require the express consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, a remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved, verified and reported to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.
- 6) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report demonstrating the completion of the works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. It shall also include any plan (a "long-term monitoring and maintenance plan") for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency

action, as identified in the verification plan, if appropriate, and for the reporting of this to the Local Planning Authority. Any long-term monitoring and maintenance plan shall be implemented as approved.

- 7) Piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall not be permitted other than with the express written consent of the Local Planning Authority, which may be given for those parts of the site where it has been demonstrated that there is no resultant unacceptable risk to groundwater. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of development above ground (excluding demolition) the type and treatment of the materials, including samples, to be used on the exterior of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved materials shall be used in the construction of the development hereby approved, completed prior to its occupation/use and retained thereafter.
- 9) Prior to the commencement of development above ground, details of mitigation measures to provide mechanical ventilation to the residential units to reduce the NO₂ air concentrations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority. The approved mitigation measures shall be implemented on site and be retained for the duration of the development.
- 10) Prior to the commencement of the above ground works, a scheme for the management of surface water run-off must be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing which identifies appropriate site drainage and flood risk management measures, including SuDS, in order to manage surface water run-off as close to its source as possible in accordance with the Mayor's drainage hierarchy in London Plan Policy SI I3. The submitted scheme should:
 - (i) provide details of the design storm period and intensity, proposed SuDS measures to delay and control the rate of surface water discharged from the site and proposed measures to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters;
 - (ii) include calculations carried out by an appropriately qualified professional to show that the peak run-off rate for the 1 in 100 year 6-hour rainfall event (plus 30% for climate change) will be as close as reasonably practicable to the greenfield run-off rate for the same event;
 - (iii) where greenfield run-off rates cannot be achieved, and methods of drainage include those lower down the Mayor's drainage hierarchy, evidence should be provided to justify the proposed measures and to demonstrate that the peak run-off rate for the 1 in 100 year 6-hour rainfall event (plus 30% for climate change) will be no more than 3 times the calculated greenfield run-off rate for the same event;
 - (iv) demonstrate that the 1 in 30 year rainfall event (plus 30% for climate change) can be contained without flooding; any flooding occurring between the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 year event (plus 30% for climate change) will be safely contained on site; and that rainfall in excess of the 1 in 100 year event is managed to minimise risks.

The approved scheme shall be implemented on site and be retained for the duration of the development.

- 11) Prior to the commencement of the above ground works detailed specification of the proposed green roof should be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing, together with an implementation programme including future maintenance. Documentary evidence must be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing to demonstrate that the green roof has been installed in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of the development.
- 12) Prior to the first occupation of the development, full details of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All hard and soft landscaping and tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and to a reasonable standard in accordance with the relevant recommendations of appropriate British Standards (in particular, BS 3882: Specifications for Topsoil, Recommendations (2015) and BS 8545: Trees from Nursery to Independence in the Landscape, Recommendations (2014) or other recognised codes of good practice). The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part or relevant phase of the development or in accordance with the timetable agreed with the Local Planning Authority. Any tree(s) or plants that (within a period of five years after planting) are removed, die, or (in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority) are damaged or defective shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of a similar size/species/number as originally approved.
- 13) Prior to the first occupation of the development, a Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (BEMP) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The BEMP will include full details of how any existing site wildlife will be protected, full details on an extensive biodiverse roof (including substrate information, such as particle size, chemical composition etc., cross sectional views, a full planting regime and management) and other green infrastructure, soft landscaping, including any trees, shrubs and herbaceous beds, as well as nesting opportunities for swifts and invertebrates. Full details of planting, provenance, numbers, species, aftercare, management and monitoring of all biodiversity enhancements, as well as reporting to back to the Local Planning Authority, will be included in the plan. Work shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved scheme and maintained in perpetuity.
- 14) Prior to first occupation of the development, a completed Water Efficiency Calculator for New Dwellings must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing to show that internal potable water consumption for each of the dwellings will be limited to 105 litres per person per day. The Water Efficiency Calculator shall be accompanied by details of the location and type of all appliances or fittings that use water, the capacity or flow rate of any equipment and any rainwater or greywater collection systems incorporated as part of the development.
- 15) Prior to first occupation of the development, details of an acoustic fence on the northern, eastern and southern boundaries to the rear of the building shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. The approved details shall be installed prior to the first occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

- 16) Prior to first occupation of the development, full details of external lighting should be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and properly maintained.
- 17) Prior to first occupation of the development, a detailed waste management scheme for refuse and recycling facilities storage and collection to/from the site shall have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The approved waste management scheme shall thereafter be implemented and retained.
- 18) Prior to first occupation of the development, a full Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, and the approved details shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter.
- 19) Prior to the installation of the secure cycle storage facilities, full details of the same shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority which shall show their positioning within the site, the size and materials of the enclosure and the means of access. The approved details shall be implemented on site prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved and thereafter permanently retained in accordance with the approved details.
- 20) Prior to first occupation of the development, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall then be implemented, developed, monitored and enforced in accordance with the approved details.
- 21) Prior to first occupation of the development, full details of the necessary crime prevention measures to achieve 'Secured by design' accreditation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details shall include natural surveillance, car and cycle parking, lighting, fencing, gates, doors, windows etc. The details once approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

END OF SCHEDULE

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Oliver Eves
Neil Rowley
James Brown

Juan Jose Sarralde

Savills Planning – Senior Planner
Savills Planning – Director
James R Brown & Company
Limited – Registered Valuer
Peter Stewart Consultancy -
Director

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Robert Young

Stuart Cooke

Andy Webber

Temp Principal Planner - Sutton
Council
Urba Ltd Director Registered
Valuer
Head of Development
Management and Strategic
Planning Environment, Housing
and Regeneration

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor Stephen Penneck Sutton Council (Ward: Sutton North)

DOCUMENTS

Unilateral Undertaking Dated 18 October 2021