

Planning Committee

ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 20 February 2013

This page is intentionally left blank

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 20th February 2013

1/02	<p>Additional Consultation response:</p> <p>Crime Prevention Design Adviser: I have met with the developer and have made recommendations in relation to Secured by Design. It is recommended that the Community Safety Secured by Design Condition as below is attached to the application to ensure that the security needs of the development are met and to minimise the risk of crime.</p> <p>Based upon the CPDA response above, the recommendation is amended to provide for an Additional Condition no 24:</p> <p>24. Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, measures to minimise the risk of crime in a visually acceptable manner and meet the specific security needs of the application site / development shall be installed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Any such measures should follow the design principles set out in the relevant Design Guides on the Secured by Design website: http://www.securedbydesign.com/guides/index.aspx and shall include the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. all main entrance doorsets and communal entrance doorsets shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in PAS 24:2007 or WCL 1 'Security standard for domestic doorsets'; 2. all windowsets on the ground floor of the development and those adjacent to flat roofs or large rainwater pipes (downpipes) shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in BS 7950:1997 or WCL 4 'Security standard for domestic windowsets'. <p>Following implementation the works shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>REASON: In the interests of creating safer and more sustainable communities and to safeguard amenity by reducing the risk of crime and the fear of crime, in accordance with Policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan, and Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.</p> <p>Additional Informatives:</p> <p>7. INFORM47_M - Community Safety 1</p> <p>INFORMATIVE:</p> <p>In aiming to satisfy the Community Safety condition(s) the applicant should seek the advice of the Borough Crime Prevention Design Advisors (CPDA). They can be contacted through the Crime Reduction Unit, Harrow Police Station, 74 Northolt Road,</p>
-------------	--

	<p>Harrow, Middlesex, HA2 0DN, tel. 020 8733 3465. It is the policy of the local planning authority to consult with the Borough CPDA in the discharging of this / these condition(s).</p> <p>For additional information, please contact the Borough Crime Prevention Design Advisor through the Crime Reduction Unit, Harrow Police Station, 74 Northolt Road, Harrow, Middlesex, HA2 0DN, tel. 020 8733 3465.</p>
<p>2/02</p>	<p>Following the site visit on 16th February, and in response to questions raised by members at that meeting regarding the “right of way” the following information is provided:-</p> <p>Page 49 Relevant History</p> <p>WEST/94/93/FUL – Front Gates and Brick Piers Granted – 4-Aug-1993</p> <p>Commentary</p> <p>The Highway Authority has confirmed the existence of a public right of way (ref footpath120) for pedestrians along Brickfields. This right of way is obstructed by the vehicle gates erected pursuant to WEST/94/93/FUL. It appears that following the erection of those gates, pedestrians used (and it is alleged, continue to use) the pedestrian path (which broadly runs parallel to the public footpath) as a means of access onto the right of way (ref footpath120). It is this access point which is the subject of the current application for a gate.</p> <p>The Highway Authority are entitled to enforce the free passage of pedestrians via the existing vehicle gates and they have written to the owners and applicants of the land, to make clear that the obstruction of the right of way needs to be rectified. They have also advised that as the Highway Authority, further obstruction so as to prevent free passage by pedestrians will not be permitted, regardless of the outcome of the planning application.</p> <p>The committee report highlights that the appearance and form of the gate, and its impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area, are acceptable. The assessment of planning merit, also makes clear that <i>provided that the gate does not represent an obstruction to pedestrians, it is acceptable <u>in planning terms</u> subject to a condition.</i> Approval of the application for planning permission does not supersede or replace the additional requirement to secure the approval of the Highway Authority under the Highway Act 1980. An informative drawing the applicant’s attention to this fact will also be included.</p> <p>Whilst acknowledging the concerns in the representations in this regard, the recommendation accordingly remains for approval of the <i>planning application only</i>.</p> <p>Additional Informative:</p> <p>This planning permission is without prejudice to any requirement to secure consent under the highways Acts to the erection of the gate hereby approved.</p>
<p>2/04</p>	<p>Additional consultation response:-</p> <p>Conservation Area Advisory Committee: It is impossible to comment on the</p>

landscaping scheme without the buildings shown on it. It is not possible to separate from the buildings the proposal for landscaping. The building would create a corridor effect when you come out of the station. The building should be on the other side. This blocks the whole of the open space. This creates a space that is not visible. This creates something that is an invitation to anti-social behaviour and crime. The buildings should be dug in. The building could happily run along the side that is parallel to the station. That leaves the maximum amount of space open. How does this meet Secure by Design? Outside a station this would increase anti-social behaviour. The earlier consultation scheme did not show this. If the buildings are not part of the application they should not be on the plans as it is confusing. If this is MOL it should not be proposed on the land.

Why should it be recommended for grant before it comes to this committee? If the Council is serious about consultative processes like this the report should not already be written. Could the planning officer come to the next meeting to discuss?

The main criticism of the previous application for a college building was that it blocked out views of the grove and the hill. The same comments apply here in that it will block views.

What is the proposal in terms of the cars? There is no drop off point shown. The new pathway will help the access into the park but it seems there is not a direct pedestrian route to the station.

Response: This is phase 1 of the project at Lowlands Recreation Ground and the proposal is for the earthworks, retaining wall and associated landscaping only. The buildings shown on the drawings are for reference only and are not part of this current planning application, therefore the planning merits of the buildings are not part of this planning application. These will be subject of a separate planning application in a further phase. The reason that this application is required to be sent to planning committee is due to the fact that the land is owned by the Council and due to complex funding requirements and a tight timescale. The officer's recommendation to planning committee is to delegate power to the Divisional Director of Planning to determine this planning application once the period of consultation expires. This will permit the necessary time in order to consider any further responses from third parties before a decision is finally made under delegated powers.

AGENDA ITEM 9

ADVANCE WARNING GIVEN OF REQUESTS TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative (who has advised that they would wish to reply)
1/02 Marlborough Primary School, Marlborough Hill, Harrow	Mrs Howarth	Marcus Toombs
2/02 Glasfryn Court, Brickfields, Harrow	Alan Evans	To be advised

This page is intentionally left blank