



Planning Committee Meeting Supplemental Addendum

Date: Wednesday 17 March 2021

HARROW COUNCIL

SUPPLEMENTAL ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 17th March 2021

<p>1/01</p>	<p><u>ADDENDUM ITEM 1:</u></p> <p>Harrow on the Hill Trust objection, the planning issues are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed tall building is outside the intensification area. • Inconsistent with planning strategy, out of scale with the height of neighbouring residents. • Significantly impacts the Roxborough Park and Grove CA, and would be visible from 4 out of 6 panoramic views. • Significant impact on the Harrow on the Hill Village CA. Would be the only building visible above an otherwise unbroken tree line. • Impact to the Harrow Recreation Ground protected view, contrary to DM3. • Light pollution introduced against the night sky would extend the duration and reach of its harm. • Massing and elevational sculpting is clumsy, fussy. • Proposed treatment of the façade in the chosen colour creates an aggressive appearance. • Harm is not offset by substantial public benefit, contrary to the NPPF. The public benefit is less than the extant scheme – less CIL money and affordable housing.
<p>2/03</p>	<p><u>ADDENDUM ITEM 1:</u></p> <p>Add additional consultee comment to table at 4.3.</p> <p><u>Internal layout</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD states that “...the design and layout of development should also minimise the potential for noise transfer between new homes”, also “.....the technical provisions of the Building Regulations should be supplemented with the careful arrangement of rooms.” In the proposal the resulting configuration means that the first floor open-plan living room/dining room/kitchen is adjoining to the neighbour’s bedroom. Similarly, on the ground floor the neighbour’s living room is adjoining to the bedroom of the ground floor flat. This will inevitably cause disturbance and potential distress to residents. The Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD states “.....the horizontal arrangement of rooms between flats in a block should also avoid bedrooms adjoining neighbouring living rooms, kitchens and bathrooms”.

Officers response: The SPD is a guide and does not set the planning policy for which the proposal must be assessed. Internal layouts adjoining party boundaries which are typically thicker in construction are considered to be an appropriate layout. It should be noted that it is entirely possible for rooms within an existing single family dwelling to be switched over without the need for planning permission. For example the front downstairs living room could be an additional bedroom. It is not possible to design out every instance of such rooms being adjacent to neighbouring uses when the buildings are existing. Therefore the habitable rooms sited on the party wall are not considered to cause unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance and a reason for refusal on these grounds would not be justified in policy.

2/05

ADDENDUM ITEM 1:

Consultation Responses Update – Section 4 of the report (page 316).

A further comment has been received which provides a response to the addendum to the original report. Officer comments are provided in italics.

Summary of Comments:

- Formally, in this application the planners do not know the adjacent land owner identity
An additional site plan has been provided which shows the land owned by the Council outlined in blue. Furthermore, there is a current application (reference P/3959/19) which shows the land in question is in ownership by the Council
- It is not true that surface water is being contained for the site; there are football pitch drainage pipes connected to existing outfall, with attenuation basins (swales) to temporarily hold overflows; the applicants surface water needs to be drained away
The Council's Drainage Authority has advised that the objector is confusing the two applications. The football pitches have attenuation basins (storage) to hold surface water run-off for 1 in 100 storm + cc connected to the local watercourses with discharge restricted to greenfield run-off rate. This application for conversion to café has no surface water drains nor watercourses nearby, hence the need to contain surface water within the site using a soakaway. As suggested before, the applicant could connect an overflow from the proposed soakaway to foul system with Thames Water permission, but this option was not accepted by Thames Water so an alternative solution was required. Nevertheless, each application is assessed on its own merits and the Council's Drainage Engineer has advised that the details submitted would be acceptable in this instance
- Why does the unreferenced 'rule of thumb' over-ride the applicant's calculation method?
The Council's Drainage Authority has advised that this is the method recommended to the department in line with Building Control Regs; it is suitable for minor developments rather than undertaking expensive infiltration tests with close to nil soakage results on most sites in Harrow.

	<p><u>ADDENDUM ITEM 2:</u></p> <p>Informative Update (Page 319)</p> <p>Update informative 3 (Plan Numbers) to include the following: C20-001/1703 (site plan)</p>
2/08	<p><u>ADDENDUM ITEM 1:</u></p> <p><u>Consultation Responses Update – Section 4 of the report:</u></p> <p>Since the agenda was published, a letter addressed to Councillors from the applicant in support of the application has been submitted. The letter states the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adult Gaming Centres are an established town centre use recognised by the NPPF complementing retail and service uses, the proposal by being a recreational/leisure use will add variety and activity to Burnt Oak District Centre. - The existing unit had operated as a pawnbroker for more than ten years and has been vacant since September 2019. The proposal will return use to the unit contributing to high levels of footfall, linked trips and job creation. - The high street location features a mixture of evening and night time uses. The submitted noise assessment has assessed the impacts of the use in the area and concluded the 24 hour operation would not adversely impact noise sensitive properties. Irrespective, the applicant agrees to restricted opening hours between 09:00-00:00 and will control activity through a Noise Management Strategy. - Committed to safe and accessible venues, the applicant has engaged with the Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Team (SBD) and has resulted in agreement with an SBD plan and schedule to be implemented. - Adult Gaming Centres are not betting shops and the proposal does not feature Fixed Odds Betting Terminals (FOBTs). Machines offer low stakes ranging from 10p to a maximum of £2 with a large proportion of Bingo machines. - The client has secured a license for 24-hour gaming operation (exclusive of bingo that operates to midnight). The Licensing Authority were content that the proposal is located in an appropriate location and adequate measures to promote licensing objectives and comply with the Gambling Act 2005. - The proposal does not incorporate any external alterations and therefore would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
2/09	<p><u>ADDENDUM ITEM 1:</u></p> <p>Paragraph 6.4.7 The occupancy level of 4 of the bedrooms has been corrected.</p> <p>Ground floor bedrooms 2 and 3 has been corrected from 1 person to 2 persons and first floor bedrooms 3 and 4 has been corrected from 2 persons to 1 person. The minimum GIA for ground floor bedroom 2 has also been corrected from 7.5sqm to 11.5sqm. The maximum occupancy level remains at 9 persons.</p>

AGENDA ITEM 10 – REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Agenda Item	Application	Speakers
1/01	Vaughan Road Car Park P/3497/20	Cllr Kairul Marika (Back Bench) Cllr Adam Swersky (Back Bench) Cllr Christine Robson (Back Bench)
1/02	Halfords P/3305/20	Luisa Keig (Objector) James Smith (Objector) Nick Cuff (Agent for Applicant)
2/01	Northcote P/2567/20	Nisha Chauhan (Objector) Ian Gilbert (Agent for Applicant) Cllr Norman Stevenson (Back Bench)
2/02	Northcote P/2785/20	Nisha Chauhan (Objector) David Dixey (Agent for Applicant) Cllr Norman Stevenson (Back Bench)
2/03	64 Durley Avenue P/2534/20	Cllr Richard Almond (Back Bench)