



**STRATEGIC PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY 2008

ADDENDUM

This page is intentionally left blank



HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY 2008

Section 2

2/02 RECOMMENDATION

Amend Plan Numbers to read as follows:

'Plan Nos: 2430/11 Rev B; 2430/13 Rev A; 2430/14 Rev A (All received 15-Jan-08); Design and Access Statement; Arboricultural Method Statement'

Delete Condition 4

c) Revisions to Previous Application – Add

Key differences between P/2619/07/DOU (previous refused scheme) and P/4068/07/DOU (current scheme)

- Footprint of the two schemes would be identical
- Appearance of bulk on the frontage has been reduced
 - Previous scheme had a full height gabled roof with a crown section and four front dormers and a central front door
 - Current scheme has a front gable on the left hand side which breaks up the frontage and articulates the appearance of the building making it more in sympathy with the urban grain in the vicinity
- Roof profile of revised scheme has pitch angles of 47° from the horizontal
- The previous scheme had a steeper roof profile (60° from the horizontal), which added to the appearance of bulk
- The internal layout of the flats in the current scheme is more coherent and complies with the Lifetime Homes standard, which the previous refused scheme did not.

d) Relevant History Amend to read

P/2619/07/DOU	Outline for layout, scale, appearance & access: redevelopment to provide a detached three storey block of 8 flats, new vehicular access and basement parking	REFUSE 05-NOV-2007 An appeal has been lodged.
---------------	--	---

f) Consultations Amend to read

Notifications:

Sent:	Replies:	Expiry:
74	5	03-JAN-08

Summary of Responses:

Traffic hazards; over-development; out of character; loss of green space; prejudicial to preserved trees; increased noise and activity

7) Consultation Responses: Amend to read

Apart from the points raised in the above sections, other issues raised are:

- None

2/03

RECOMMENDATION

Add condition 3:

The development hereby permitted shall retain provision for people with mobility impairments, to gain access to, and egress from, the building without the need to negotiate steps.

REASON: To ensure that the development will be accessible for people with disabilities in accordance with the policies of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

2/05

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN BY APPLICANT

Section 3

3/01

RECOMMENDATION

Delete plan numbers and replace with the following plans:

100.1 Rev E, 100.2 Rev D, 101.0 Rev 3, 105.3 Rev C, 106.3 Rev C, 107.3 Rev C, 109.0 Rev 6, 111.0 Rev 4, 116.1 Rev 02, 116.2 Rev 4, 116.2.1 Rev1, 116.2.2 Rev 1, 131.0 Rev A, 136.0 Rev 1, 139.0 Rev 1, 139.1 Rev 2, 139.2 Rev 3, 154.1 Rev e, Planning Statement (received 19 December 2007), Design Statement (received 8 January 2008), Access Statement (received 8 January 2008), letter from Roger Pidgeon dated 1 October 2007, Agreement Between Adjoining Property Owners dated 5 May 2006

Delete refusal reason 2 and replace with the following reason for refusal:

2 The proposed development, by way of poor roof design, higher eaves, and higher front and rear parapet walls, would poorly relate to the adjoining properties and detract from the character and appearance of the building and wider street scene contrary to policies 4B.1 of the London Plan 2004, D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004, Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Delete refusal reason 3 and replace with the following reason for refusal:

The proposed development, by way of poor internal layout and inadequate room size, would produce unacceptable standards of accommodation and fail to meet requirements of Lifetime Homes Standards and Wheelchair Homes Standards, contrary to policies 3A.4 of The London Plan 2004, D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004 and Accessible Homes Supplementary Planning Document (April 2006).

**Consultations:
Notifications**

Amend to read –Replies : 25

Summary of Responses to read: '7 letters in support of proposal, 18 letters in opposition to proposal'

APPRAISAL – Amend title to read

1) Design & Character of Area

Delete paragraph 6 and replace with:

The bulk and massing of the development is further exacerbated with the rearward projection of the 1st and 2nd floor element of the building extending out a further 3m than the rear 1st floor habitable room at number 116 Headstone Road, clearly contravening the 45° Code.

2) Residential Amenity

Delete the words '*both Elizabeth Mews and*' from paragraph 1

Delete paragraph 2 and replace with:

The proposal is larger than the approved development for 12 flats from 2003. The building extends further rearwards than the scheme approved. This is noticeable when compared to the rear extension of 116 Headstone Road where the building comes out a further 3m (approx) at 1st, and 2nd floor level than that of 116 Headstone Road. On the consented scheme this was stepped to ensure compliance with the 45° Code. This increase in bulk further emphasises the bulk and massing of the building and also adversely affects neighbouring outlook and amenity.

ADVANCE WARNING OF REQUESTS BY OBJECTORS TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

There have been no requests for representations by Objectors

This page is intentionally left blank