

All minutes are draft until agreed at the next meeting of the committee/panel. To find out the date of the next meeting please check the calendar of events at your local library or online at www.merton.gov.uk/committee.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

10 FEBRUARY 2022

(7.15 pm - 10.20 pm)

PRESENT Councillors Councillor Dave Ward (in the Chair),
Councillor Stephen Crowe, Councillor Stephen Alambritis,
Councillor David Dean, Councillor Nick Draper,
Councillor Joan Henry, Councillor Simon McGrath,
Councillor Carl Quilliam and Councillor Peter Southgate

ALSO PRESENT

Tim Bryson (Development Control Team Leader North)
David Gardener Planning Officer
Stuart Adams Planning Officer
Bola Roberts (Democratic Services Officer)

ATTENDING REMOTELY

Amy Dumitrescu (Democratic Services Manager)
Lesley Barakchizadeh (Building and Development Control)
Manager Environment and Regeneration)
Sarath Attanayake (Transport Planning Project Officer)

(7:15pm – 22:20pm)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Billy Christie and Councillor Ben Butler attended as substitute. (Agenda Item 1)

2 DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST (Agenda Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest. (Agenda Item 2)

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Agenda Item 3)

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 20th January 2022 are agreed as an accurate record. (Agenda Item 3)

4 TOWN PLANNING APPLICATIONS (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee noted the amendments and modifications to the officer's report. The Chair advised that items would be taken in the following order: Items 8, 9, 7, 5 and 6. For the purposes of the minutes the items are minuted in the published agenda order. (Agenda Item 4)

5 LAND TO THE REAR OF 1-5 ARCHWAY CLOSE, WIMBLEDON PARK, LONDON SW19 (Agenda Item 5)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from one objector who made points including:

- Concerns on the poor structure which was not in keeping with the neighbouring surround
- The Objector felt the family's privacy would be the structure and staff who work there smoking and talking outside
- Trees that would have provided screening are not adequate
- The bright light from the security lights remain on all night
- The Objector listed conditions that they requested be put in place such as opaque glass, controlled lighting, fully positioned screening and corrected positioning on the security flood lighting

- The Agent to the Applicant responded that:
- The site needs regeneration which meets demand for small local companies
- The design was agreed to be within permitted development
- The height was restricted to 5 metres height and side parameters
- The garden is set far back, and the tree screening is adequate
- The Agent to the Applicant felt the benefits of the scheme, outweighed any minor infringement, in that it improved local environment
- The site was an improvement and the quality of the building material was not offensive

The Planning Officer responded to points raised and advised Members that:

- Planning Officers were satisfied with the angle of the Applicants building
- That the modification sheet contained a recommendation on an additional condition

The Team Leader (North) responded to Councillors questions and advised that

- The distance provided is 32 metres from the site to the Objectors property based on the plan
- The Applicant had provided a new toilet facility for the units which is installed nearest to the road arches
- Committee Members noted some of the concerns raised by the Objector had been addressed in the modification sheets
- Members requested for a condition to be imposed that the windows were required to have opaque glass

The Chair moved to the vote and it was

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions in Officers report and an additional condition for obscure glazing for first floor side windows.

6 94 COTTENHAM PARK ROAD WEST WIMBLEDON LONDON SW20 0DP
(Agenda Item 6)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Chair moved to the vote and it was

RESOLVED

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions

7 RUFUS BUSINESS BUILDING CENTRE, RAVENSBUURY TERRACE,
WIMBLEDON PARK, LONDON, SW18 4RL (Agenda Item 7)

The Planning Officer (North Team) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from two objectors who made points including

- The development would increase the population
- The Objector felt the cumulative developments would amount to a thousand-person occupancy.
- The Objector had been in contact with the council over a period of six years over any application to Rufus building site, to ensure that traffic would go down Wellington works
- The Objector spoke of the large volume of construction vehicles that would pass by residents' windows as there were no provisions for vehicle access via Wellington Works through the proposed Rufus business centre site
- The Objector asked the Committee to delay the application until a ruling had been made on the adjacent site

- The Objector asked that the application be refused under urban greening, bulk, height and social housing
- The current Rufus proposal would have an impact on residents whose gardens are 3 metres from the site
- The proposed building is five storeys higher than neighbouring buildings
- Other developments in the area, had height restrictions and this should be maintained and in keeping with the area
- The Objector believed that the development would be harmful to the local landscape and impact the River Wandle trail, which is an urban feature
- The level of urban greening in the application did not meet minimum GLA standards
- Affordable housing is low and only eight out of the 96 units are being considered for affordable housing

The Agent to the Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- The Objector described the development as a mixed-use office development centre and felt the proposal provides for attractive residential homes
- The development has been identified as needed and is welcomed in the borough
- Each home would be fulfilled in terms of amenities; light, balconies and shared space; eight of which are affordable housing
- The scheme has no parking facilities other than disabled and a car club bay
- The developers have worked closely with Planning Officers and made amendments to the report members have at present
- The GLA did not object to a previous application which was higher in height, however the Applicant considered the current plans would be more in line with the area in Dawlish Avenue
- The developers have taken into consideration the design and amenities for residents such as light, space and fire safety for the scheme
- The scheme would be developed in an otherwise underutilised brown space
- Developers knew about the objections on Wellington Works and they had looked at best practise and ways forward
- Objectors had been in close contact with the GLA, Merton, future Merton and adhered to policy
- The Officers report addressed the issues of sustainability, greening and flood risk
- The vehicle route suggested by residents for the developers, would go against the London Plan

The Planning Officers addressed concerns by Objectors points including:

- The Planning Officer said responses were contained in the modification sheet
- Planning Officers had no powers or policies to serve on the adjacent site relating to access
- Officers provided guidance to the developers earlier on in the process and asked them to do a feasibility report
- The height of the structure is in keeping with similar structures alongside Wandle River area.
- A viability study had been carried out and the Planning Officer confirmed that there would be eight affordable housing units within the scheme

The Planning Officer responded to councillors questions:

- The Planning Officer confirmed that the affordable houses would be in a block on its' own
- Planning Officers had been in touch with the councils environmental Officers who are aware of contamination on the developers' site and adjacent site
- Flood risks, design and proximity between other properties, were issues that could pose restrictions on three bedroomed homes built
- The council no longer agreed density. Consideration is given to how close the development is to public amenities and other properties

Members made comments on the application. Members commented on access in terms of fire risk and location of the scheme to the road and direct access for the emergency services. Members raised concerns on balance on number of bedrooms and more affordable homes. Issues on contamination and safety. Members asked to defer the application pending further information.

The Team Leader (North) responded to members comments:

- Having separated blocks for affordable and private house makes the scheme more attractive for Housing Associates to manage
- Planning Officers could not place conditions on schemes having separate affordable and private housing

The Chair moved to vote and it was

RESOLVED:

That the Application be deferred to a future Committee Meeting, to allow members seek further information on financial viability, contamination and whether affordable housing could be amalgamated to the other building in the proposal.

.

8 ST GEORGE HOUSE EAST WIMBLEDON SW19 4DR (Agenda Item 8)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from two objectors who made points including:

- Concerns were raised on the proposed building height
- The development would restrict sunlight and reduce amenities for residents
- Concerns were raised that the station square would be in shadow most of the day
- The application is for glass reinforced concrete and does not go with the surrounding heritage
- The Objector felt that the office space proposed in the development is in excess of workforce levels, with more staff working from home
- The proposal was not made known to residents until Friday
- There are questions of its' sustainability
- DRP stated that the building would restrict daylight most of the day all year round
- The development creates a dull, dark and cold look to the open spaces
- Wimbledon already had adequate office space without the need for this application, considering current hybrid ways of working.

The Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- The building as it currently stands does not support grade A office space and cannot be adapted
- The building would provide fabric first and eco-friendly, energy efficiency by the year 2030
- The development would provide landscape features for wildlife to forage nest and roost
- A new pedestrian link would be provided through to St Georges Road
- The development would enable well over one thousand jobs, with the current construction providing ongoing jobs
- Following the feedback from DRP, the Applicant had amended the design including lowering the height and providing sustainability in line with SDP
- The development will boost the local economy
- The scheme allows for safety to travel to work, with 340 cycle spaces that would be provided
- The Applicant informed members that the design team had described that the building was 'well designed and impressive'
- The Planning department and GLA supported the scheme in line with SDP
- 70 letters from local residents and businesses had been received by the Applicant in support for the scheme, including Love Wimbledon
- The application had satisfied daylight testing
- There is an increase in demand for office space
- The scheme would grow the office sector of Wimbledon

Ward Councillor, Councillor Daniel Holden, gave a statement opposing the application on behalf of the residents, residents' associations and civic societies. Councillor Holden raised concerns on height restrictions and stated that the proposal was out of character to the Wimbledon rhythm. The building would be larger than any other building in Wimbledon. There were public amenities problems. The building would cast a shadow in the square giving an overbearing feel. Councillor Holden stated that the window design was out of keeping with the character of Wimbledon. Councillor Holden asked the Committee to consider rejecting the proposal under DMD1 and the issue of height, excessive bulk and rhythm.

The Planning Officer responded to Councillors points:

- The building will be on the northern side of St Georges Road, which is the largest site of office development
- Although the height goes beyond what is considered in the Future Wimbledon SPD, the overall design and height can be supported.
- The development is set back and this will mitigate the overbearing aspect on the road and forecourt
- The public will benefit by the widening of the pavement

In response to Member questions, The Planning Officer advised:

- The SDP had been drafted for a while; consideration was not given for the return to office space by work force.
- The winds microclimate studies showed there would be more slight winds on the southwest side of the building. The frontage would provide comfortable levels of cover for pedestrians and people sitting outside on the pavements
- The Planning Officer advised that the development has a ground floor that will protect public realm
- Cross rail had not raised objections to the application
- The Development was within the London urban green specification
- The building has an indicative height of 54 metres including plants in the parapet
- The Planning Officer said that that the urban greening had been passed by the GLA during stage one and biodegradable. Trees will be planted via the biodiversity on St Georges Road. Two will be removed on Wimbledon Road.
- The application will go back to the GLA for approval
- The Applicant had submitted a sunlight daylight report
- The number of glass windows has been reduced in line with DRP guidelines

Members commented on the application.

Concerns were raised on the bulk and size and the fact that the Design Review Panel had rated the application amber twice. The SDP needs to be respected. Additional concerns were raised on height.

The Chair moved to vote and it was

RESOLVED

That the Committee grant planning permission subject to any direction from the Mayor of London, completion of a S106 Agreement and Conditions

9 201A SOUTH PARK ROAD, WIMBLEDON, SW19 8RY (Agenda Item 9)

The Development Control Leader (North) presented the report.

The Committee received a verbal representation from two objectors who made points including

- The application breached policies DMD2 and 3
- The application plans contained discrepancies and inaccuracies
- The plans were not clear The proposed works would have an impact on privacy
-
- The Objector said the scheme would affect the foot path and would contribute to a loss of amenities. A fence would be required to depict boundaries
- The scheme will affect loss of sunlight
- There is poor visual design
- The application would have a detrimental impact on the Objectors property
- The scheme is similar to a previously rejected application submitted in the past
- The height and depth of the scheme had not been altered, which would cause a detrimental impact on the Objectors home
- It was queried how a previously refused scheme could be brought back with a higher boundary wall
- This was the fifth application and should therefore be refused.

The Agent to the Applicant spoke in response and made points including:

- The applicants wanted to create a family home and were not developing to make a profit.
- The scheme was to accommodate the Applicants growing family
- The Agent to the Applicant drew members' attention to two relevant previous planning application decisions; Noting that the 2012 appeal for the planning application had been dismissed.
- The second application had been granted in September 2021, as the height was only 6.2m on the boundary line. A reduction of 0.3m was acceptable.

Members were asked to note that the windows that would have affected the neighbouring property were bricked up

- The current scheme would be 3.7m deeper and would not have any detrimental impact on the neighbouring property
- Sunlight daylight assessments had been carried out and neighbouring properties would not be affected
- Similar schemes had been granted on the same side of the Street.

The Chair announced that representations would only be received by Ward Councillors. Therefore, the statement from Councillor Benbow, would not be read out at the meeting but the written statement would be made available.

Councillor Ormrod made representations to the Committee on behalf of residents of South Park Road, and raised points including:

- Similar applications submitted were refused, including an appeal.
- A further application had then been approved, with no cap on flat roof ridge, or conditions put on the application and similar to the refused previous application.
- The scheme would have an impact on neighbours' homes and on surrounding homes on the corner of Wycliffe Road. Councillor Ormrod raised concerns on consideration for neighbours, which this scheme did not and which the DMD2 states should be the case under design.
- The application had failed to meet DMD2 in other areas proposed in the scheme.
- The designs were not in keeping with the surrounding area and the scheme would impact on neighbours lighting and privacy amenities.
- The proposed scheme was large and overbearing and would be similar to a commercial building.
- Councillor Ormrod requested conditions be placed on the application, should it be granted and would provide some suggested conditions

The Team Leader (North) responded to some of the points clarifying the refusal of previous application/The daylight study took into account both houses on either side of the Applicant with neighbours. The roof was flat in design and similar to other flat roof extension in the area

The Planning Officer responded to councillors' questions

The Chair moved to the vote on the officer's recommendation, and it was

RESOLVED:

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission subject to conditions.

10 PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS (Agenda Item 10)

The Committee noted the report

11 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT - SUMMARY OF CURRENT CASES (Agenda Item 11)

Planning Enforcement – Summary of Current Cases (Agenda Item 11)

The Committee noted the report

At the close of the meeting and at the invitation of the Chair, the Committee agreed for the Chair to write an email on behalf of the Committee to the Planning Team Leader Jonathan Lewis, thanking him for his service to the council and best wishes on his retirement.

Planning Applications Committee

10th February 2022

Supplementary Agenda

Modifications Sheet.

Item 5. Land to the Rear of 1-5 Archway Close, Wimbledon Park, London SW19

Page 11 Consultation – additional to paragraph 6.1

Two representations objecting to the application, in addition to the one reported in the Committee Report, have been received which includes a joint representation from ward Councillors Edward Gretton, Janice Howard and Oonagh Moulton.

Reasons for objection

1. The units overlook the windows and garden of 1 Railway Cottages due to the height of the gangway that serves the units.
2. The locations of trees on the submitted plans are incorrect – the trees and hedges that are supposed to screen the development do not exist as indicated and are not evergreen. The deciduous fruit trees along the boundary fence do not provide screen in the winter months.
3. There is light pollution from the security lighting that is intrusive and it is not time controlled as stated within the application.
4. There is inadequate and unrealistic parking provision.
5. The building is 5m from out boundary and sits higher than surrounding buildings.
6. Poor quality building, the design of which is not set within the parameters which the owners of 1 Railway Cottages were required to confirm to when they submitted a pre-application advice for a development and the building is detrimental to the character and appearance of the local area.
7. Glare caused to motorists on Durnsford Road bridge from the glazing within the units at certain times of the day.
8. The two storey building with gangway is in contravention of a condition of 1 Railway Cottages approved planning application 20/3780 which prohibited the use of a flat roof of an extension as a terrace.

Case Officer response:

The view from the office units to 1 Railway Cottages is from an oblique angle and this together with the separation distance between the two buildings is sufficient to mitigate any direct overlooking that results in material loss of privacy to the habitable room windows and garden area of 1 Railway Cottages.

Despite the deciduous fruit trees along the boundary fence not providing screening in the winter months as mentioned above, the view from the office units to 1 Railway

Cottages is from an oblique angle and this together with the separation distance mitigates direct overlooking and consequently significant loss of privacy.

The application has stated that the security lighting is time controlled and Officers will apply a condition securing details of the security lighting.

The plans show car parking allocated for the units which is compliant with London Plan parking standards.

The building is 5 metres from the rear boundary of 1 Railway Cottages but the overall distance from the rear of the property is sufficient to mitigate significant overlooking and loss of privacy to habitable room windows and the most intensively used part to the garden area which is immediately near the building in question.

Every planning application is assessed upon its own individual merits. It is not considered that the office units have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the locality which in this instance is industrial in nature. The office units consist of materials commonly found on industrial buildings such as metal and the overall form of the building is simple like many industrial buildings and are not particularly attractive aesthetically, although it is considered that the office units are well designed and well-designed example of their type.

The Transport Planner has raised no objection to the proposal based on impact to motorists due to glare from the buildings.

Every application is determined on its own merits. A condition preventing use of a flat roof above extension as a terrace is used to prevent overlooking and noise disturbance to immediate residential neighbours either side of the property in question. In relation to the gangway of the office units and 1 Railway Cottages, officers consider this to be different as the buildings are not situated immediately next to each other.

Reasons for objection from the joint representation from ward Councillors Ed Gretton, Janice Howard and Oonagh Moulton

1. The developers built the development with without consent
2. The design and materials are out of keeping with the local heritage bridge and historic brickwork and heritage railway cottages.
3. The cottages and gardens at the rear are overlooked.
4. The strong lights are a nuisance and remain on at night.
5. No form of landscaping or tree cover has been provided on site and would provide the railway cottages from overlooking.

Case Officer response:

Whilst the building was built without consent, enforcement action has led to this planning application to be made. Durnsford Road bridge and the railway cottages are not listed and as such the office units do not adversely affect them and their setting. The office units comprise materials commonly seen in the wider industrial area and its form is of a design that closely relates to industrial architecture. Reasons for objection 3 and 4 above have already been addressed above. Officers do not consider that tree planting would be appropriate to provide screening.

Page 16 – Conditions:

Additional conditions recommended:

8. No external lighting shall be installed without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity and in accordance with Policy DM D2 of the sites and Policies Plan 2014.

9. Within 2 months of the planning permission hereby permitted, details of the security lighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The security lighting shall include times for on/off so that it has minimal impact during un-social hours, and details of their position and angle on the site.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenity and in accordance with Policy DM D2 of the sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Item 6. 94 Cottenham Park Road West Wimbledon London SW20 0DP

Item 7. Rufus Business Building Centre, Ravensbury Terrace, Wimbledon Park, London, SW18 4RL

Page 60 – Consultation

Additional representation

Late letter of objection received further to the previously submitted petition. The letter raises the following concerns:

- Rufus Business Centre and Wellington Works sites should be considered together (co-coordinated)
- All access to Wellington Works must be provided through the Rufus Business Centre (Dawlish Avenue is not a safe access to Wellington Works).
- Rufus should be refused as it does not provide vehicle access to the Wellington Works site.
- We support both Rufus and Wellington Works but only in a way that is safe and sympathetic to the local community.

Officer response – Officers acknowledge the merits of the points raised regarding access (as Wellington Works could be land locked for future residential purposes), however officers have limited power and no planning policy justification which specifically states that the redevelopment of Rufus Business Centre must provide a

vehicular access to a neighbouring site (Wellington Works). Officers encouraged the applicant to look at providing a vehicular access to Wellington Works, however the applicant states that due to flooding constraints on the site (flood zones 2 and 3 – medium and high probability of flooding respectively) a new road would affect flood displacement.

The applicant has confirmed that during discussions with the Councils Flood officer and Environment Agency:

The proposals for development at Rufus Business Centre include a retaining wall along part of the southern boundary. This wall has been specifically set to a level of 8.95m AODN to restrict the amount of floodwater reaching Durnsford Rec (and surrounding properties) as a result of flooding from the River Wandle. The proposed pedestrian access from Rufus onto the access road has been set to a level of 8.83m AODN for the same reason. Reducing the length of the retaining wall or lowering land levels in these areas would create an increased risk of flooding to nearby properties, by allowing too much water from the River Wandle to flow onto the Recreation Ground and into the surrounding area. Equally, raising these levels would have the opposite effect by reducing the amount of floodwater that can reach the Recreation Ground, and would consequently increase the risk of flooding to the properties on Haselmere Avenue and Ravensbury Terrace. As such, it is advised against changing the land levels along the access road to facilitate a new vehicular access through the development site.

Other matters relating to a new road include increased costs, under optimisation of the site (potential loss of affordable housing) and part of the land sits outside the applicants ownership.

As set out in the committee report, officers has safeguarded potential pedestrian/cycling routes as required by planning policy.

It should be noted that Wellington Works Site is currently a commercial unit (long standing use) and attempts to provide residential on the site have been refused planning permission by the Council on inappropriate access/highway safety grounds. These decisions have been defended at a public inquiry (LBM Ref 17/P1400 - use of both Wellington Works and Dawlish Avenue access) and the recent planning refusals (LBM ref 20/P1675 & 20/P1665) is now subject of a pending appeal.

Clarification

Page 91 - Paragraph 7.5.24 updated (typo) to confirm development has been designed based on compliance with Part B of the Building Regulations 2019 not 2010 as originally sited.

Paragraph 7.5.24 updated as follows:

7.5.24 The application is accompanied by an independent Fire Strategy Statement by Mr Salisbury, a Chartered Fire Engineer at Salisburyfire. Mr Sailsbury graduated with BEng (Hons) in Fire Engineering from the University of Leeds (1999) and is a member of the Institution of Fire Engineers and member of the Society of Fire Protection Engineers. The Statement provides a summary of the key fire safety features of the building. This is based on compliance with Part B of the Building Regulations 2019. In order to ensure that the development is carried out

in accordance with regulations, a planning condition requiring full details of Fire Strategy measures, including evidence of agreement from an approved Building Control body (approved inspector) can be secured via planning condition.

Item 8. St George House East Wimbledon SW19 4DR

Page 172 - Consultation

Following publication of the Planning Applications Committee Agenda, a further 177 letters of objection and 1 letter of support have been received. The letters of objection were on the following grounds:

- Excessive size/height and out of keeping with surrounding area/overbearing
- Poor design/materials
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing
- Disruption during construction
- Precedent
- Demolition of existing building is unsustainable/against climate change policies
- Lack of consultation
- Lack of office demand
- Site should be used for housing not office
- Building may only be temporary due to crossrail
- Increase in congestion once building is built
- Lack of public benefits for a scheme of this size

The letter of support was due to the proposal Improving the local economy given the uplift in the number of workers employed in the building, and the high quality of the proposed elevations.

Page 204 – Conditions:

Add following conditions:

Condition 36 - Temporary cycle provision

Condition 37 - Details on wind microclimate mitigation measures

Item 9 201A South Park Road, Wimbledon, SW19 8RY

Page 237 – Consultation:

Insert paragraphs below para 5.1.

Para 5.2: Further representations were received from the occupant of no. 203 South Park Road. The main points raised include:

- Concerns there are inaccuracies in the plans that are material.
- Gap between existing and proposed building (201 to 203) is less than 3m – an error in the plans.,
- Concerns regarding building profile of 203 wall length.
- The bay window at no. 203 is missing
- 201 existing floor levels are not 10cm (as per plans) see attached. Floor level is 30cm above ground. Many photos have been submitted.
- Existing height of 201 building as it faces 203 is actually 3.2m (not 2.8m)
- Changing ground levels are not taken into account in the plans and the fence actually steps down over the course of the length of 14.7m.
- The fence line height also changes between existing and proposed, In the interests of transparency, can you indicate why Merton has allowed this to change in the plans? Are they including changing the fence then? As part of the freedom of information act, can we please ask for details on the fence discussion you have had with the applicant, if there have been none, then the fence needs to be the same height in both plans. So this is another slight of hand.
- The side window of proposed plan is wrong as it if was accurately depicted it would show poor design.
- Concerns the accuracy of the stairwell window
- Clarification sought regarding condition 3 (external materials)
- A letter was received from a third-party surveyor (Schloeders Begg Surveyor) which presents discrepancies in measurements on the land of no. 203.

Para 5.3 A letter of objection was received from Barker Parry Planning Consultants on behalf of no. 199 South Park Road. The main points raised include:

- The only reasonable assessment of the current application is that it results in similar, if not identical, extent of harm as the previously refused April 2021 scheme (21/P0834).
- The Officer has not outlined how the omitted section of roof slope has tipped the level of harm caused by the extension height/length from unacceptable to acceptable. If such an assessment had been done, officers would not have been able to demonstrate or quantify how this has tipped the balance away from being too harmful.
- There are no planning benefits arising from the proposed development as the scheme simply extended an already extended open plan living area and consequently any resultant harm from the development cannot be outweighed. Therefore, this application must be considered to result in a level of harm upon the living conditions and enjoyment of 199 South Park Road which is unacceptable.
- There has been a clear history of incremental extensions and applications which, of those approved, have each resulted in an increase in harm to the

amenities of No.199 but not, when considered individually, an unacceptable level of harm.

- There is an obligation upon the decision maker to consider the cumulative impact of these reductions in outlook and amenity. There is also an obligation to be consistent with decision making and from any reasonable interpretation, the current application recommendation and assessment is not at all consistent with the approach and conclusions of either the 2021 refusal or the Inspector's 2011 refusal.
- There are other considerations associated with the currently proposed scheme which can be reasonably considered to be more harmful and less favourable than the previously refused scheme. Namely the resultant impact upon design quality and appearance of the proposed extension from artificially omitting the 3.7m extent of roof slope.
- It is considered that given the serious failings within the assessment of the current application, the Team Leader should take the opportunity to revisit the assessment and recommendation of the proposal.

Page 243 – Conditions:

Amendments to Section 9 (Conditions)

Amendment to condition 3:

The facing materials to be used for the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the application form unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Condition 6:

Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the stairwell window between ground and first floors in the east side elevation shall be glazed with obscure glass and shall permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities and privacy of the occupiers of adjoining properties and to comply with the following Development Plan policies for Merton: policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, policy CS14 of Merton's Core Planning Strategy 2011 and policies DM D2 and D3 of Merton's Sites and Policies Plan 2014.

Item 10. Planning Appeal Decisions.

Item 11. Planning Enforcement Summary.

This page is intentionally left blank