

ITEM NO: 1/03

ADDRESS: HARROW VIEW WEST (THE FORMER ZOOM LEISURE SPORTS GROUND), HARROW VIEW, HARROW

REFERENCE: P/2982/15

DESCRIPTION: APPROVAL OF ALL RESERVED MATTERS FOR PHASE 1B ONLY (LAND WEST OF HARROW VIEW - FORMERLY ZOOM LEISURE SPORTS GROUNDS) AND DETAILS PURSUANT TO CONDITIONS 5(PHASING PLAN), 8(URBAN DESIGN REPORT), 9(ENERGY STRATEGY), 10(ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY), 11(CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN), 12 (HOUSING SCHEDULE), 13(DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT ASSESSMENT), 14(SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE STRATEGY), 15(Accessibility STRATEGY), 16(LIGHTING STRATEGY), 17(REFUSE STRATEGY), 19(ARBORICULTURAL STRATEGY), 20(LANDSCAPING), 21(TRANSPORT STRATEGY), 22(HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT), 23(LEVELS), 37(FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT) AND 42(SITE WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN) FOLLOWING OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION GRANTED UNDER P/3504/11 DATED 21.12.2012, WHICH WAS VARIED BY OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION P/0873/14 DATED 23.12.2014 FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE, PHASED, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AT HARROW VIEW AND HEADSTONE DRIVE

WARD: HEADSTONE NORTH

APPLICANT: PERSIMMON HOMES

AGENT: ICENI PROJECTS LIMITED

CASE OFFICER: SUSHILA BHANDARI

EXPIRY DATE: 30/09/2015

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT reserved matters permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to conditions, and approve the details submitted with this application.

REASON

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), the policies of The London Plan (2015), Harrow's Core Strategy (2012), the policies of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013) and the policies of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) listed in the informatives below, as well as to all relevant material considerations including the responses to consultation.

The principle of development has been established under outline planning application P/3405/11 which was approved by the Planning Committee in 2012. The outline permission was granted with all matters reserved for a comprehensive mixed use development of the Kodak Factory Site and the former sports ground (Zoom Leisure). Both sections of the site are divided by Harrow View. This reserved matters application solely relates to Phase 1B of the approved masterplan which relates to the land of the former sports grounds, Harrow View West, (HVW). Phase 1B seeks to provide up to 314 new homes and a minimum of 25,570sqm of open space including a 'Green Link' from Harrow View linking to Headstone Manor Recreation Grounds.

Since the time of the original permission, the Council has adopted the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan in 2013 and allocated the entire Kodak and Zoom Leisure site for a comprehensive redevelopment to help deliver a minimum of 985 new homes and 1,230 new jobs.

The applicant is now seeking approval of reserved matters relating to scale, appearance, access, layout and landscaping in respect of Phase 1B only. It also seeks to discharge a number of conditions that are required at reserved matters application stage. The proposed development is considered to be of a good design which responds positively to the character of the area due to the use of materials and scale that responds positively to its context and whilst providing a unique sense of place through the detailed design (brick detail and entrance detail). Further to this the proposed development is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character or setting of the grade I listed Headstone Manor. The overall landscaping masterplan is considered acceptable and in accordance with the perimeters approved in the outline permission. Similar the layout of the development and the appearance points would also accord with the agreed perimeters approved under P/3405/11. The proposals would not give rise to any unreasonable impact upon the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers and will provide satisfactory living accommodation for potential occupiers. It is considered that the external appearance, scale, layout, access and landscaping scheme submitted is acceptable and it is recommended that the application is approved.

INFORMATION

The application is reported to the Planning Committee because of public interest in this development, and therefore falls outside category E of the Scheme of

Delegation.

Statutory Return Type: Major Development

Council Interest: None

Gross Floorspace: TBC

Net additional Floorspace: TBC

GLA Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Contribution (provisional): TBC

Harrow CIL: TBC

Site Description

- The part of the site comprises the former Zoom Leisure Centre, which closed in September 2011, as well as car parking associated with this use and Kodak operations.
- Harrow View West is 7.9 hectares in area and comprises privately owned playing fields, tennis courts, bowls greens and indoor sports and leisure facilities, with associated hard surfaced parking areas.
- The site slopes up from south to north, with maximum levels difference of approximately 8.9 metres.
- The site benefits from two existing vehicle accesses from Harrow View. A further pedestrian access (via a locked gate) exists between the site and Headstone Recreation Ground.
- The site contains a number of trees, including a row of Lombardy Poplars adjacent to the western boundary of the site.
- The western part of the site is a designated flood plain (Flood Zones 2-3b), whilst the remainder of the site is in Flood Zone 1.
- The site lies within the wider Harrow and Wealdstone Opportunity Area, as defined in the London Plan 2015 and in terms of the local plan forms part of the largest strategic site in this designation.
- The site is separated from the Kodak factory site by Harrow View (A4008), which carries traffic from the north towards Harrow Town Centre.
- The H14 bus runs north-south along Harrow View, between Hatch End and Harrow Town Centre, and then on to Northwick Park Hospital.
- Headstone Lane station is located approximately 600 metres to the north west and is served by London Overground services.
- To the south are suburban residential areas comprising predominantly single and two storey semi-detached and terraced housing, as well as taller flatted developments fronting Harrow View (between three to four storeys in height).
- To the west of the site is Headstone Manor Recreation Ground, which is designated Metropolitan Open Land in the local plan and is occupied by Headstone Manor, a Grade I listed moated building with Grade II listed outbuildings. The Manor is used as a heritage and cultural centre. The Manor complex is also a designated Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- To the north of the site is suburban residential development on Pinner Park Gardens, Pinner Park Avenue and Holmwood Close, comprising predominantly two storey semi-detached housing.

Proposal Details

- The application relates to the submission of details in relation to scale, layout, appearance, access and landscaping which were reserved pursuant to the outline permission granted under P/3405/11.
- In addition to this, it is proposed to approve details pursuant to the following conditions, which are also required to be submitted with the reserved matter application:
 - Condition 5 – Phasing Plan
 - Condition 8 – Urban design report
 - Condition 9 – Energy strategy
 - Condition 10 – Ecology and biodiversity strategy
 - Condition 11 – Construction management plan
 - Condition 12 – Housing Schedule
 - Condition 13 – Daylight and sunlight assessment
 - Condition 14 – Surface water drainage strategy
 - Condition 15 – Accessibility strategy
 - Condition 16 – Lighting strategy
 - Condition 17 – Refuse strategy
 - Condition 19 – Arboricultural strategy
 - Condition 20 – Landscaping
 - Condition 21 – Transport strategy
 - Condition 22 – Heritage impact assessment
 - Condition 23 – levels
 - Condition 37 – Flood risk assessment
 - Condition 42 – Site waste management plan
- The proposed scheme would comprise a total of 314 new homes within single-family dwelling houses and proposed built apartment buildings.
- The heights of the buildings would range from two storeys to four storeys, with the latter being located along Harrow View.
- Of the 314 units a total of 67 would be flats located within three blocks fronting Harrow View, comprising of 1, 2 and 3 bed units.
- With regard to the house types, the applicant proposed six different types of houses. Within each house type there are further sub-house types that are reflective of the bedroom sizes and internal layout. The houses would range from 2 bed to 4 bed.
- In line with the perimeter plans approved under P/3405/11, the layout would include provision for open space of up to 25,570sqm, which would also include a 'Green Link' to Harrow View.
- As part of the landscape strategy, the proposal would include play space comprising five areas of local play areas (LAP), two areas that are locally equipped area for play (LEAP), one area of neighbourhood equipped area for play (NEAP), and a multi-use games area (MUGA).
- According to the proposed parking layout shown on drawing No.17431-HARR-5-

SK005 REV A, total of 445 parking spaces would be provided across the entire site for the houses and flats, which includes 4 disabled spaces for the flats, 19 disabled spaces for the dwelling houses and 35 visitor spaces. It also includes 32 tandem parking spaces for larger dwelling houses and 17 spaces that are undesignated.

Revisions to Previous Application

- n/a

Relevant History

P/1795/09

Change of use of vacant site for temporary open air market with 100 stalls including ancillary food sales and parking for 200 cars

Granted – 17/12/2009

P/2117/10

Variation of condition 5 attached to planning permission P/1795/09 dated 17/12/2009 to be changed from market on Fridays to market on Tuesdays

Granted – 14/12/2010

P/0813/11

Extension of time to planning permission P/1685/08CFU dated 20/06/2008 for 'highway works including 1) formation of roundabout 2) alterations to junctions to sports ground 3) temporary access to leisure facility 4) temporary contractors' compound 5) erection of brick piers and railings'

Granted – 21/06/2011

P/1294/11

Non-material amendments to conditions 2 and 5 attached to planning permission P/1685/08CFU dated 20/06/08 for 'highway works including 1) formation of roundabout 2) alterations to junctions to sports ground 3) temporary access to leisure facility 4) temporary contractors compound 5) erection of brick piers and railings'

Granted – 16/06/2011

P/3405/11

Outline planning application for a comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of land at Harrow View and Headstone Drive, as set out in the Development Specification (March 2012). The development comprises the demolition of existing buildings and structures (with the exception of the chimney and part of powerhouse) and redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses comprising business and employment uses (within Use Classes B1(a), B1(b), B1(c), B2 and B8 - up to 35,975sqm); residential dwellings (within Use Class C3 - up to 985 units); student accommodation (Sui Generis use - up to 220 units); senior living accommodation (within Use Class C2); assisted living care home (within Use Class C2) (total C2 uses up to 9,300sqm); retail and restaurant uses (within Use Classes A1, A2, A3,

A4 and A5 - up to 5,000sqm); commercial leisure uses (Use Class D2); community uses (Use Class D1); health centre (Use Class D1); a primary school (Use Class D1) (total D1/D2 uses up to 8,830sqm); energy centre (Sui Generis use - up to 4,500sqm); together with new streets and other means of access and circulation; highway improvements; associated parking; re-profiling of site levels; utilities diversions and connections; open space; landscaping and ancillary development including infrastructure, works and facilities.
Granted - 21/12/2012

P/0873/14

Minor material amendment to the outline planning permission P/3405/11 for the comprehensive, phased, mixed use development of land at Harrow View and Headstone Drive. Relocate the primary school (up to 3,630sqm) from development zone P to development zone A (in Phase 1) and to relocate the leisure use (up to 1,155 sqm) and community centre (up to 1,562 sqm) from development zone A to development zone P (in phase 2). Interim energy centre to be located within Zone A to supply Phase 1.

Granted - 23/12/2014

P/1590/15

Discharge of section 106 obligation dated 21.12.2012 relating to economic development strategy for all phases

Approved - 09/04/2015

P/2182/15

Modification to section 106 planning agreement relating to planning permission P/3405/11 dated 21 December 2012 as varied by a deed of variation dated 22 December 2014 to define and split the obligations between the East Land (Harrow View East) and West Land (Harrow View West)

Under Consideration

Pre-Application Discussion (Ref.) P/1078/15/PREAPP

- In March 2015, the applicant approached the local planning authority to discuss the requirement of bringing forward a reserved matters application pursuant to outline permission granted under P/3405/11. Persimmon entered into a formal Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to bring forward a reserved matters application relating to Phase 1B (former Zoom Leisure and sports grounds) of the extant permission. Matters relating to design, layout, landscaping and drainage were key points of discussion. The scheme that is before the LPA has been brought forward following in-depth discussions and preparations between both parties.

Applicant Submission Documents

Accessibility Strategy

Air Quality Assessment

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report

Ecology and Biodiversity Strategy
Energy and Sustainability Strategy
Flood Risk Assessment
Heritage Impact Assessment
Landscape Management Plan
Lighting Strategy
Noise Assessment
Refuse Strategy
Site Waste Management Plan
Statement of Community Engagement
Surface Water Drainage Strategy
Transport Strategy
Urban Design Report

Consultations

Drainage Authority

The volume of storage proposed for all four catchments is satisfactory.

Environmental Health Team

Noise

Overall satisfied with the noise report.

It identifies that acoustic treatment to windows, coupled with adequate mechanical ventilation, will be required for the first row of facades fronting Harrow View, with slightly less acoustic treatment for facades up to 100m from Harrow View. It is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring a detailed noise insulation scheme to be agreed prior to development. This should identify the individual flats concerned and the relevant treatment for each window plus details of mechanical ventilation.

A small number of properties (9) will have gardens subject to noise levels above those recommended in BS 8233. Overall I consider this acceptable, as there will be quieter amenity areas on the site, and also recognising the strategic desirability of residential development in this location. Also note that the buildings along Harrow view will provide considerable acoustic shielding for the rest of the development.

Air Quality

Confirm the report is satisfactory.

It concludes pollutant concentrations are expected to slightly exceed the relevant NO2 AQS objective at the façade of at least one property fronting Harrow View, due to the existing elevated background concentration. The predicted NO2 concentrations fall within the London Council's APEC-A or APEC-B banding, requiring consideration of appropriate mitigation to reduce exposure. Suitable mitigation measures have been considered to reduce the exposure of future occupants to pollution and improve the suitability of the development for its proposed use.

It is recommended that mitigation measures are indeed incorporated into the

development by condition.

Construction management plan

Noise

Hours of working stated as 0730 – 1800 hrs. Mondays to Fridays. This is not acceptable and should be 0800 -1800 hrs. Monday-Friday for any works audible outside the site boundary, and at the perimeter of the curtilage of any occupied buildings within the development area. Saturday times 0800 – 1300 hrs., no work on Sundays or Bank holidays satisfactory.

States occasional working at other times may be required and kept to a minimum. This is not acceptable. Any works outside these hours should only take place with prior written agreement of the Environmental Health Department. Where emergency works have to be carried out as an exception, full details should be communicated to the Environmental Health Department as soon as possible thereafter.

The same needs to apply to deliveries. Where traffic considerations are an issue, a detailed case for exceptions should be made and agreed with the Environmental Health Department prior to such deliveries taking place

The plan also states it may be appropriate for contractors to undertake a full noise assessment when detailed information becomes available. This is understandable, but does leave it open. It is recommended that this should include words to the effect that, at all stages of the development once methodologies, plant, machinery and equipment are specified, all works of demolition, construction and associated works should be assessed in accordance with BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 “code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites” and best practicable means used for noise control..

Air quality and dust

Various mitigations are suggested for dust. However, there is no reference to the Mayor’s SPG “Control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition” 2014. The steps in this guidance should be followed to produce an air quality and dust risk assessment followed by production of an air quality and dust management plan demonstrating how the risks will be mitigated.

Note where there may be an overlap with the relevant section in the environmental impact assessment, there should be reference back to it to clearly show how the steps in the SPG have been followed throughout.

Lighting Strategy

This is inadequate. This merely provides technical details of suggested lighting to meet performance criteria for the various types of land surface. There is no comment on the effects on existing properties and the new buildings. It should demonstrate that the lighting design is in accordance with the guidance notes

recommended by the IPL (Institute of Lighting Professionals) for the reduction of obtrusive light, to avoid nuisance and loss of amenity. This should include identification of appropriate zoning, and that lighting meets the relevant standards for source intensity (glare), vertical illuminance and Upward Light Ratio.

Biodiversity Officer

Generally, levels of light above 1 lux (about the brightness of the full moon) act as a barrier for commuting and foraging bats. The brighter the light the more impervious the barrier. The interiors of areas of greenspace, which are shown crossing the site, are mostly below this threshold. However in the vicinity of footpaths and roads the lux levels far exceed 1 lux and in places exceed 6 lux. This means that bats could not use these darker areas to commute or forage and by implication would not use bat boxes incorporated into housing. This would even apply to the least light sensitive species such as pipistrelles.

Spectral analysis of the types of LED proposed show spikes in spectral power distribution at approximately 450 nm and about 600 nm. The least disruptive wavelengths for bats occurs at approximately 550 nm. As these luminaires have quite a wide emission spectrum the disruption of bat foraging and commuting is even more likely to occur.

Shorter wavelengths also tend to draw in insects towards the light source which leave bats in the darker areas with less potential prey. Bright lighting has also led to bats being predated by normally day-flying raptures such as sparrowhawks and kestrels.

It is recommended that paths and roads through greenspaces make use of amber (bat) lighting which will emit light at 550 nm. As a less satisfactory alternative roads and footpaths crossing greenspaces could be fitted with low-intensity warm-white LED bollard lighting. The use of warm-white lighting could be considered for street lighting throughout the proposed estate.

In a number of cases the lighting column is 8 m in height - can this be reduced to minimise horizontal light spill? In conclusion, the type of lighting currently proposed will not be conducive to attracting bats or enhancing biodiversity.

Advertisement

Major Development
Setting of Listed Building

Newspaper Advertisement

Posted: 16.07.2015

Expired: 06.08.2015

Site Notices

Posted: 13.07.2015

Expired: 03.08.2015

Notifications

Sent: 1733

Replies: 8

Expiry: 30.07.2015

Addresses Consulted

Consultation letters were sent out to a wide number of addresses surrounding the site.

Summary of Responses

Character

- The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.

Future Occupier Amenity

- The flats and houses are too small.

Traffic and Parking

- The width of the roads between parking spaces is too small and will lead to parking problems for the residents.
- Traffic near the site is already bad and the proposal will increase congestion and lead to further problems for residents.
- Lengthy construction period will lead to traffic problems
- Will there be an pedestrian access from the end of Edward Road to the new site?
- Concerned about construction noise and would like building to be weekdays only.

Neighbouring Amenity/Open space

- The parkland near Headstone Manors is for neighbouring amenity use and should not be absorbed in to private development
- The area next to Harrow View contains playing field and should be made available to local residents and not built over.
- Can a close boarded fence be planted next to theirs, rather than replacing existing fence, which will destroy their plants?

Trees/Wildlife/Neighbour Amenity

- Neighbours house backs on to the site - object to the proposed removal of the existing poplar trees on site as they provide privacy and seclusion for neighbours.
- The trees also provide a habitat for wildlife which will be lost.
- The loss of the poplar trees that border Kodak and Headstone Manor park land is not acceptable. It will lead to increased CO2 and global warming
- Object to loss of Leylandii and poplars and suggest additional planting.

Other matters

- Object to the proposed pond and potential for midges, flooding and subsidence.
- The length of time of the proposed development of 5 years is excessive and will lead to unacceptable noise, pollution and disruption to the lives of nearby residents.
- Lengthy construction period could lead to devaluing of nearby properties.
- The proposal will lead to an excessive strain on local infrastructure including parks , refuse collection and leisure collection especially with cuts in local government spending

APPRAISAL

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that:

'If regard is to be had to the Development Plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the Planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The Government has issued the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which consolidates national planning policy and is a material consideration in the determination of this application.

In this instance, the Development Plan comprises The London Plan 2015 and the Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF comprises The Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (AAP) 2013, the Development Management Policies Local Plan (DMP) 2013, the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) 2013 and Harrow Local Area Map (LAP) 2013.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of the Development
Character and Appearance of the Area
Residential Amenity
Impact on Heritage Assets
Traffic and Parking
Development and Flood Risk
Trees and Ecology
Accessibility
Sustainability
Air Quality
Housing Mix
S17 Crime & Disorder Act
Environmental impact Assessment (EIA)
Equalities Impact
Consultation Responses

Principle of the Development

The principle of redevelopment of the Kodak factory site and the former sports grounds was agreed in 2012 through the approval of the outline planning application P/3405/11. Therefore the principle to redevelopment and regeneration of the two sites has been established under this outline permission. Whilst it is noted that there have been changes within the development plan policies since the grant of this first outline permission, the thrust of achieving high quality development and increasing housing supply and increasing jobs remains broadly the same. At the time of considering the original outline permission, significant weight was afforded to the then emerging development plan policies which were at an advance stage of their formal adoption.

The former Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) has been replaced with Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF comprises The Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (AAP) 2013, the Development Management Policies Local Plan (DMP) 2013, the Site Allocations Local Plan (SALP) 2013 and Harrow Local Area Map (LAP) 2013.

The 2011 London Plan has also been subject to alterations since 2011 and an updated, consolidated plan was adopted in 2015.

The subject site is located within the Heart of Harrow which encompasses the two towns centres of Harrow and Wealdstone, Station Road corridor linking the two centres, and the industrial land and open spaces surrounding Wealdstone, including the Kodak site, Headstone Manor and the Harrow Leisure Centre. Following the 2015 consolidation of the alterations to the London Plan, the designation of Heart of Harrow has been changed from that of an Intensification Area to an Opportunity Area. This new designation offers significant opportunity for urban renewal and regeneration providing a stimulus to regenerate Wealdstone and rejuvenate Harrow town centre. The Opportunity Area designation is expected to, through higher density residential and mixed-use development on key strategic sites to contribute to the delivery of 3,000 jobs and a minimum of 2,800 new homes within the Area. Pursuant to the delivery of the spatial strategy for London, Policy 2.13 *Opportunity Areas and Intensification Areas* of the London Plan requires proposals to:

- *support the strategic policy direction for the Area;*
- *optimise residential and non-residential output and provide necessary infrastructure;*
- *contribute to meeting (or exceeding where appropriate) the Area's employment and housing outputs;*
- *promote inclusive access including cycling and walking; and*
- *support wider regeneration.*

In June 2014, the GLA produced a prospectus on Housing Zones which was informed by the then draft Mayors London Housing Strategy (LHS) (which was formally adopted in October 2014). These Housing Zones would help boost housing supply in London in recognition of the projected population growth anticipated

during the plan period. In all there would be a total of 20 Housing Zone over the a ten year period which would help deliver 50,000 new homes as part of the Mayor's efforts to double house building in London, including supporting 250,000 Londoners into low cost home ownership, through part rent, part pay, over the next decade. Priority will be given to bids that deliver significant amounts of intermediate and low cost market housing to buy. The Government and the GLA are jointly committing funding of £400m (in form of repayment investment, flexible funding and grant) for the 20 Housing Zones to help realise this vision. The consolidated London Plan 2015 sets out under policy 8.1B that the Mayor will work with the Government on implementing initiatives to realise the potential of large development areas through these Housing Zones.

Bids from London Authorities were invited in September 2014. In February 2015, the Mayor announced London's first 9 Housing Zones, of which the London Borough of Harrow was a successful bidder.

Following the Council's successful bid to the GLA, the entire Heart of Harrow Opportunity Area is designated as a Housing Zone, which will help unlock the potential to deliver more than 5,000 new homes over the next ten years. Housing Zones are designed to work flexibly depending on the local circumstances, however all new developments would need to be built to high quality standards and in compliance with all relevant policies contained within the development plan, including conformity to the London Housing Design Guide.

In particular, proposals will need to demonstrate how new homes will come forward in a master planned approach, delivering strong communities through urban design and achieving coherent neighbourhoods.

The subject site is identified as a development opportunity site in the AAP and falls within the Wealdstone West sub area Site 2 (Kodak and Zoom Leisure). The site allocates a minimum output of 1,230 jobs and 985 new homes to be achieved through a comprehensive mixed use led redevelopment of the site.

The subject site relates to Phase 1B of the wider Kodak site masterplan. The applicant is seeking approval of reserved matter relating to scale, appearance, layout, access and landscaping. Each of these matters is appraised in detail below and Officers consider that, subject to imposition of relevant conditions, the details before the local planning authority should be approved. In addition, to the reserved matters, the applicant is also seeking to discharge a number of planning conditions attached to the original outline permission that were required to be submitted with this reserved matter application. As discussed in detail below, Officers at the time of writing this report are seeking clarification on a few matters. It is anticipated that such matters would be reported by addendum, and, where considered necessary, seek to resolve the outstanding matters through the imposition of appropriate conditions. On this basis, Officers consider that such an approach would not prejudice the local planning authority in seeking to ensure that the detailed development meets the aspirations set out in the original masterplan.

Character and Appearance of the Area

The London Plan (2015) policies 7.4B and 7.6B set out the design principles that all boroughs should seek to ensure for all development proposals. The London Plan policy 7.4B states, *inter alia*, that all development proposals should have regard to the local context, contribute to a positive relationship between the urban landscape and natural features, be human in scale, make a positive contribution and should be informed by the historic environment. The London Plan policy 7.6B states, *inter alia*, that all development proposals should; be of the highest architectural quality, which complement the local architectural character and be of an appropriate proportion, composition, scale and orientation. Development should not be harmful to amenities, should incorporate best practice for climate change, provide high quality indoor and outdoor spaces, be adaptable to different activities and land uses and meet the principles of inclusive design.

Core Policy CS1.B specifies that ‘All development shall respond positively to the local and historic context in terms of design, siting, density and spacing, reinforce the positive attributes of local distinctiveness whilst promoting innovative design and/or enhancing areas of poor design; extensions should respect their host building.’

Policies AAP3 and AAP4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan 2013 seeks to ensure that all development proposals achieve a high standard design and layout. Development within all three sub areas of Wealdstone as set out in the AAP will be required to *inter alia* strengthen the district centre and improve the environment and identity of the Wealdstone area as a location for business and industrial activity and for family living. Criterion E of policy AAP3 sets out the design parameters that should be taken into consideration when assessing development proposals within Wealdstone West sub area, which *inter alia* includes the plan’s vision to improve the link between the west sub area of Wealdstone and the district centre, design which creates a sense of place that is related to and an extension of Wealdstone and make provision for community uses that are not appropriate to locate in the district centre.

The detailed design considerations for the Kodak site (including the Zoom Leisure site) are set out under Site 2 allocation under Chapter 5 of the AAP. This sets out a comprehensive list of design considerations.

Having regard to the above policies, each aspect of the reserved matters is appraised below. The applicant has also submitted a Urban Design Report (UDR) pursuant to Condition 8 which requires the following:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping shall be accompanied by an urban design report which explains the approach to the design and how it addresses the relevant Design Guidelines for that phase. This

document should also include measures to minimise the risk of crime in a visually acceptable manner and meet the specific security needs of that phase of development.

The UDR sets out how the proposed development would realise the visions set out in the approved Design Guidelines for that Phase.

Scale

The original outline permission fixes the maximum heights within each development zone. This was shown on parameter plan HV(00)AP106. For Phase 1B the prevailing height of buildings is limited to three storeys (max 15m) with two sections in Zones S and R fronting Harrow View permitted to go to four storeys (max 20m).

The proposed development would predominantly consist of two/ three storey dwellinghouses, with the two blocks of flats at four storeys in height fronting Harrow View (located on the both sides of the main site entrance from the roundabout on Harrow View). There would be a further three storey block of flats located on the Harrow View frontage. The height of the four storey flatted element would approximately be 11.5m which would be in accordance with the approved parameter plans. The height of the three storey flatted block would be approximately 9.5m, which would also comply with the fixed parameter plans. The heights of the dwellinghouses would all be all well below the maximum threshold of 15m set by the parameter plans. The size of the different house types is noted under the residential amenity section below, including the height and number of storeys. This demonstrates that the overall scale of the development would accord with the approved parameter plan.

The density of the development would be 39.7 dwellings per hectare which would be in accordance with the density range recommended in the approved DG for this site.

Whilst it is noted that the approved design guidelines (March 2012)(DG), designates Phase 1B as a block with houses only, the DG does set out that there will be some flexibility to have taller buildings along Harrow View. The DG sets out that the block typology for this zone, in terms of its density and massing, would need to have regard to the Grade I listed Headstone Manor and the surrounding low density development. Given that the southern section of Harrow View predominately consists of flatted development ranging from three to four storeys in height, the proposed blocks of flats along Harrow View would be acceptable in context of the existing pattern of development in the area. Furthermore the approved parameter plans only fix the height limits within each zone and quantum of development/ use permitted within each zone. Therefore, notwithstanding the guidance contained in the DG, the overall scale if the proposed development would be acceptable within the context of the surrounding area.

Layout

The layout of the primary and secondary routes would be in accordance with the approved parameter plans. Where possible the layout has sought to meet the specific design guidelines approved in the original permission. The parameter plans fixes the primary access point into the site which has a 5m deviation limit at either side. It also fixes the secondary route from Harrow View and the routes to the south of the 'Green Link' which also have a 3m deviation built in at either side. The proposed layout of the primary and secondary routes would broadly follow the approved parameter. It is noted that the width of the primary road has been reduced from the 7.5metres recommended in the design guideline to 6m. However, this would not prejudice the free flow of traffic and given that these routes would primarily only serve the development itself (as there is no through access from the site to existing roads to the south of the development site), it is considered that the layout of the main access routes would be acceptable. The proposal also shows the layout of the tertiary access roads from the main routes. The layout shows that the amount of open space and the green link from Harrow View would be in accordance with the approved parameters. The shared access routes which would accommodate, vehicular, pedestrian and cycle traffic is also shown in an acceptable manor and in accordance with the relevant design guidelines.

The internal highway network, including the shared surfaces areas would be flanked by residential development. The dwellinghouses that flank the green link would maintain a 2m buffer zone in form of a front garden from the proposed shared surface. It is noted that the approved design guidelines sets out that the dwellings located on the south side of the green link should have a 2m defensible zone, then a 2m planting zone in between this defensible zone and shared surface. However, in order to ensure that the shared surface can be accessible by emergency and service vehicles, the width of the shared surface has been increased to 3.7m at either side of the soft landscaped areas of the green link. This has meant that the 2m planting zone along the southern side of the green link has not been possible to achieve. Notwithstanding this, Officers consider that the resultant layout would still maintain the key principle of providing a defensible zone between the residential elements and the public realm to safeguard the future occupiers of the development and therefore support the layout being proposed. Furthermore, the layout would not prejudice the provision of the green link.

The layout of the dwellinghouses along the primary route would maintain a separation distance of at least 23m between the building frontages. This would be in accordance with the design guidance. The dwellinghouses along the secondary and territory routes would in general meet the 16m separation distances between buildings frontages recommended in the design guidelines. It is noted that the two of the access routes located to the south of the green link would not meet the recommended 16m separation. However, the design guidelines do not specify a minimum distances between building frontages along these routes. Notwithstanding, this a minimum distance of 14m would be maintained between building frontage which Officers consider to be sufficient.

The layout of the dwellinghouses would ensure that the buildings are orientated to front the primary routes as approved under the parameter plans.

With the exception of the shared surface routes fronting the green link and the open space, where on street parking bays have been shown these would be interspersed with soft landscape planting in from of shrub planting and street trees.

Overall it is considered that the layout of the development would be consistent with the suburban character of the surrounding area and the proposals broadly comply with the approved parameter plans.

Access

As noted above the primary access route to and from the site would be from the existing four arm roundabout. There is a further secondary access point to the north of this primary access, which would only although access from the site heading north along Harrow View. These routes would also provide pedestrian access into the development site. The shared surfaces across the site would serve pedestrians, cyclists and motorcars, with preference given to the former two users. The green link would provide the main link from Harrow View to Headstone Manor for both cyclists and pedestrians. In order to guide such users to this route appropriate wayfinding signage would be incorporated into the transport strategy to encourage active use of this green link. Pedestrian access will also be provided from existing residential streets adjoining the southern boundary (Fairfield Drive, Edward Road and Sidney Road).

Overall the access to and from the site would be broadly in line with the versions set out in the design guidelines. Accessibility to buildings and open space is dealt with under the relevant section of the appraisal.

Appearance

The design guidelines set out the relevant character zones for the masterplan. Phase 1B draws its main character zone from the Headstone Manor Influence Zone. The guidelines set out that that the following architectural features should be referenced to when considering the detail design stages:

- Simple windows in large plain walls
- Simple and angular massing
- Strong control of materials

It goes on to further state that simple massing with angular elements such as pitch roofs and walls with articulation which complements architectural language set by the Headstone Manor should be used in Character Zone 1. Materials such as brick, render and a small quantity of timber with careful designated glazed elements can be used.

The proposed design has evolved during on-going discussion with the applicant during the pre-application proposal. The applicant seeks to use brick throughout the

development. The specific brick type is yet to be agreed, however it is envisaged that some form of light buff and a contrasting dark brick type would be appropriate to create variation within specific zones of the development. The walls would be simple in terms of their architectural expression with clear simple lines. The facade of some house types would include some brick banding. It is also proposed to include some form of recessed brickwork to provide some articulation to the building in terms of emphasising the verticality of the built form, in particular with regard to the apartment blocks. All windows would be recessed to provide an appropriate reveal and it is intended to use some form of powder coated grey aluminium window set. (Colour to be confirmed). All balconies would also be fixed into the recessed opening so that they appear flush against the building. Again the details of the balconies are to be agreed by condition.

In terms of roof form, there would be three specific forms of roofs which would have slight variations depending on the house type and location of unit. The apartment blocks would all have flat roofs, which is consistent with many of the existing apartment blocks located to the south of the subject site. The dwelling houses would either consist of a mono-pitched roof form or a gabled roof form. Some unit types would also consist of front dormers. The gable roof form would respond to the Headstone Manor architectural character zone, in which the Manor House itself is depicted by a gable roof form. The mono-pitched roof form would add variety to the built form of the development and introduce a modern form of roof design.

Overall it is considered that the appearance of the development would be consistent with the surrounding suburban character and pattern of development which is characterised by dwellinghouses from the Metroland era and post 1950's development.

No details of the arrangements for the accommodation of external services (telecommunications equipment, any extraction plant etc) have been submitted with the application. However it is considered that such details can also be adequately controlled by condition.

Landscaping

As part of this reserved matter application the applicant is required to discharge the following condition

Condition 20:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout and landscaping shall explain the approach to the landscaping for that phase in relation to the landscape principles set out in the Design and Access Statement and Design Guidelines (February 2014), including planting plans, a schedule of plants, including plant sizes and proposed numbers, as well as details of hard landscape materials, boundary treatments and street furniture.

The applicant has submitted a detailed landscape management plan including a detailed planting schedule. The proposal sets out all hard and soft landscaped works for all public areas as well as all private areas. This includes details for all the play spaces required by the parameter plans and the forms of play equipment that is to be installed; details of all the swales and the feature pond in the main open space. The proposal would include the removal of all the trees along the western boundary to facilitate the connecting of the new open space with Headstone Manor Recreation grounds to also open up the views to the Grade I listed building, which is one of the key aspirations for this site in the AAP. Whilst It is noted that there have been a number objections raised by local residents with regard to the loss of the trees around the site boundaries, it is considered that in order for the site to integrate with its surrounding and to promote access to the Headstone Manor grounds it is vital that the tree are removed. As noted elsewhere in this appraisal the trees along the western boundary (Popular Lombardy) are not high amenity value trees and have a short life expectancy (10 years in the case of the trees on the site as identified in the applicant's Arboricultural Report). Furthermore, the Council's ambitions for this site have always been to create a seamless connection between the two parcels of land and the connections of the Harrow View West open space to the Council led reed bed project.

A number of trees are proposed across the site which would include a number of native species which would enhance the ecological value of the site. Trees would also be planted within the rear gardens of some of the proposed dwellings where suitable.

Overall the Council's Landscape Architect is satisfied with the proposed hard and soft landscape works and considers that the requirement of Condition 20 have been broadly met. However there are some outstanding matters relating to the proposed hard surface works relating to the highways, parking spaces and footpaths which have all been shown in tarmac across the site. Officer's consider that the amount of tarmac across all the entire site to be excessive and that some form of variations in surface material is required to define each element of the hard area more clearly. In view of this Officers recommend a condition requiring details for hard surface works to be submitted for approval.

In terms of the boundary treatment, the applicant has shown indicative boundary treatment in their landscape strategy. The individual dwellings would be enclosed by either close board or larchlap fencing in the rear gardens. Where dwellings have return frontages, a brick wall is proposed to provide privacy to those units. The front gardens would be enclosed by a landscaped border to provide some form street scene greenery. In cases of the dwellinghouses with no curtilage parking, the front gardens would be shallow in depth and therefore there would be limited scope to provide soft landscaping as well as accommodating refuse stores. The proposal to include boundary hedging would enhance the appearance of the dwellings in the streetscene.

With regard to the apartment blocks that front Harrow View, a 0.4m high metal post with metal railing is to be provided along the boundary with the footpath. This would support the proposed boundary hedge along this frontage. It is considered that a landscape boundary along Harrow View would seek to enhance the overall appearance of the development when seen from Harrow View.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed landscape works would meet the aspirations set out in the approved design guidelines by creating a landscape green link and open public space.

Refuse

Condition 17 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, access and landscaping shall be accompanied by a detailed Refuse Strategy for that phase. This document shall explain:

- (a) the storage and disposal arrangements for refuse and waste associated with private buildings, including vehicular access thereto;*
- (b) the storage and disposal arrangements for refuse and waste associated with proposed public realm areas, including vehicular access thereto;*
- (c) the hours of proposed waste collection; and*
- (d) the proposed Waste Management Plan for public realm areas.*

London Plan Policy 5.13 requires development to minimise the generation of waste and maximise reuse or recycling. These sentiments are echoed in Core Strategy Policy CS1 X. Policy DM45 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan document requires proposals to make satisfactory provision for general waste, the separation of recyclable materials and the collection of organic material for composting. Detailed local design guidance is set out in the Council’s *Code of Practice for the Storage and Collection of Refuse and Materials for Recycling in Domestic Properties* (2008).

The Code of Practice recommends a ‘two bin’ system for blocks of flats, comprising storage provision for general waste and recycling. Provision should be made for large blue bins for recycling (1280 litre) and large dark grey bins (1100 litre) for every eight flats. Based on this code of practice the development would require the following provision:

Block	Required	Provided
Block 1 – 19 Flats	3 x 1100 litre 3x 1280 litre	Total of 12 x 1100 litre bins shown in two separate enclosures
Block 2 – 26 Flats	4 x 1100 litre 4 x 1280 litre	Total of 10 x 1100 litre bins shown in two separate enclosures
Block 3 – 22 Flats	3 x 1100 litre	5 x 1100 litre bins

	3 x 1280 litre	provided
--	----------------	----------

As noted from the above table, the provision for Blocks 1 and 2 would exceed the required amount, whereas for Block 3 the total number of bins would not be sufficient to serve this block. Furthermore, notwithstanding what is noted in the applicant's Refuse Strategy (which references to the provision of 1100 and 1280 litre for the flats – but no quantum given), the submitted drawings show the provision of 1100 litre bins to all apartment block. In order to address this discrepancy, a condition is imposed requiring the correct size and numbers of refuse bins to be shown for the apartment blocks.

There would be adequate access to the refuse storage from within the building itself and from outside for refuse collectors.

With regards to the individual dwellings, the applicant has shown the provision of 3 bins per dwellinghouses which would be located within the front garden in a designated store. The applicant's Refuse Strategy provides tracking data to demonstrate that on most highway route the refuse trucks should be able to collect the refuse bins. Where the refuse truck is unable to access the road, such as the section of the highway fronting the open space nearest to the western boundary and the cul-de-sac located in the far south-east corner of the site, the individual home owners will be responsible to bring their bins up to the bin collection points shown on drawing No.17431-HARR-5-SK004.

The applicant has provided a tracking layout to demonstrate how a large refuse truck can manoeuvre along the various roads within the development site. It is noted that the 'Code of Practice required a minimum road width of 5.5m for the refuse truck to operate on. Most of the internal road would be able to achieve this width. However, the shared access routes would only have a width of 3.7m. Notwithstanding this, the dimensions of the truck used to undertake this tracking layout would broadly meet the dimensions set out in the Code of Practice and the layout of these shared access routes would incorporate passing-by bays. In view of this the access arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

In terms of public realm waste collection, the accompanying refuse strategy provides details of the siting of the public waste bins along the green link and public open space. The level proposed and the locations are considered to be acceptable. The applicant's refuse strategy states that these bins would be emptied by the management company on a weekly basis and that litter pick will be undertaken on a weekly basis. The garden waste from public areas would also be removed by the management company responsible for the upkeep of the landscapes areas. From the details submitted, it is not clear how the waste arising from the public bins would be removed from the site. It is not clear whether such waste would be held on site in a temporary location for a contractor to remove or would this waste be removed on the day by the management company. However it is noted that condition 25 attached to the outline permission requires the submission of a Public Realm

Management Plan which includes the following:

- a) *details of the contractual arrangement between the developer and the management company;*
- b) *details of a scheme for waste management in the public realm;*
- c) *details of proposals for landscape management in the public realm, including long term objectives, responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all public realm areas; and*
- d) *a maintenance and management plan for the non-adopted drains and SUDS systems.*

As such Officers consider that the limited information relating to the waste management of the public bins at this current stage would be adequately dealt with under condition 25.

External Lighting

Condition 16 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, access, appearance and landscaping shall be accompanied by a detailed Lighting Strategy for that phase in line with the Code of Practice for the Reduction of Light Pollution issued by the Institute of Lighting Engineers. This document shall explain:

- (a) the lighting proposed for public realm areas and streets, including relevant justification;*
- (b) the proposed external building lighting.*

The applicant has submitted a lighting strategy for all public realm areas and has confirmed that there is no external lighting being proposed to the buildings. The Council's Environmental Health Officer had originally raised concerns with regards to the strategy in that the information provided only relates to technical information and that there is no comment in respect of how the lighting affects the existing properties or the proposed development. The EHO further states that the lighting design should demonstrate compliance with the recommendations set out by the Institute of Lighting Professionals (IPL) for the reductions of obtrusive light, to avoid nuisance and loss of amenity. Following this, the applicant has sent through a revised strategy and has confirmed that the lighting has been designed in accordance with the guidance set out by the IPL. *The applicant states that the design has been undertaken to light the highways for safety, with due regard to the aforementioned standards. All of the lighting contours and technical information to allow Harrow Council to review the scheme, is included on the drawing. DW Windsor has also confirmed that the selection of the luminaire, lamp type, wattage and mounting height is strictly in accordance with the Highway Lighting Engineer's standard requirements. It is important to note that guidance for lighting of highways advises an even spread of light and that the layout submitted has been designed to meet this guidance. The positioning of lights has been undertaken in accordance with the required standards. To avoid any perceived glare, baffles have been*

indicated on the drawing, which will limit directional light spread on the amended design.'

Upon review of the revised submission, the Council's EHO is not satisfied with the information being submitted, In addition to this, the Council's Biodiversity Officer has also stated that the proposed lighting would not be conducive to attracting bats or enhancing biodiversity. In this regard, Officers consider it necessary to re-attach this condition.

Whilst it is noted that the applicant has stated that there is no external lighting to be proposed on the individual buildings or the apartment block, Officers consider this to be an unacceptable strategy. One of the requirement of the new technical guidance to meet 'accessible and adoptable dwellings' is that all entrance will need to comply with Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, which in the case of communal and private entrances requires the provision of automatic lighting. Furthermore, external lighting maybe required to illuminate the private rear amenity areas (gardens and balconies), details of which the applicant has failed to provide in accordance with the requirement of condition 16. In this regard, it is considered necessary to re-attach this condition requiring these details to be submitted.

Phasing Strategy

Condition 5 requires:

Notwithstanding the phasing of the development hereby approved, a Phasing Strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority prior to commencement of each phase of the development hereby permitted. This document shall also explain how the proposed community centre in Zone P, Phase 3 (serviced land) and community centre/cafe/chimney in Zone F, Phase 3, are to be safeguarded and provided.

The Phasing Strategy shall be implemented as approved.

The applicant has submitted a phasing plan which shows the development site split into 5 different phases. However, the applicant has failed to provide details of the development programme for each phase and approximate commencement and completion times for each phase and the development as a whole. Furthermore it is not clear whether the phasing would be carried out in a sequential order, as currently the site compound is shown in Phase 4. It is not clear where the sited compound would be located when Phase 5 is under construction. Whilst it is noted that the applicant refers to in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) that the materials would be stored near the site compound, however, given the distances between the compound office and each phase, it not clear whether it would be practically possible to store all materials near the site compound. Each phase of the development could potentially require its own temporary materials holding area. The applicant has not provided detail on part of the development programme the open space would be delivered. The green link is proposed to be delivered under Phase 4, but no information has been provided in terms of how this green link would be protected against construction activity during the course of

delivering Phase 5. It is considered that the phasing strategy fails to provide adequate level of information for Officers to be satisfied that the development can be delivered in the manner shown and that there would be no impact on the wider environment. In view of this, Officers recommended that this condition be re-attached.

Residential Amenity

Residential Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy 7.6B, subsection D, of The London Plan (2015) states that new buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing, wind and microclimate.

There are no specific policies within the AAP which deal with safeguarding residential amenity but it states that development proposals would be required to meet policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), which seeks to ensure that “proposals that would be detrimental to the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers, or that would fail to achieve satisfactory privacy and amenity for future occupiers of the development, will be resisted”.

Policy 3.5C of The London Plan requires all new residential development to provide, amongst other things, accommodation which is adequate to meet people’s needs. In this regard, minimum gross internal areas (GIA) are required for different types of accommodation, and new residential accommodation should have a layout that provides a functional space. Table 3.3 of The London Plan specifies minimum GIAs for residential units and advises that these minimum sizes should be exceeded where possible. The use of these residential unit GIA’s as minima is also reiterated in Appendix 1 of the Residential Design Guide SPD. This is supported by policy AAP13 of the AAP. Further detailed room standards are set out in the Mayors Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012.

On 25 March 2015 through a written ministerial statement, the Government introduced new technical housing standards in England and detailed how these would be applied through planning policy.

Given that the national standards come into effect on the day after the Committee meeting, the local planning authority considers that it would appropriate to consider this application against the new national standards instead of the current London Plan standards. Furthermore, the imposition of any conditions requiring compliance with specific policy standards relating to new housing would need to be considered against the national standards.

These standards will come into effect on the 1st of October 2015. From this date relevant London Plan policy and associated guidance in the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) should be interpreted by reference to the nearest equivalent new national technical standard. The Mayor intends to adopt the

new standards through a minor alteration to the London Plan. In the interim the Housing Standards Policy Transition Statement (October 2015) should be applied in assessing new housing development proposals. This is also set out in the draft Interim Housing SPG.

Therefore from October 2015, policy 3.2 (c) will require that table 3.3 to be substituted with Table 1 of the nationally described space standards, which is set out in the table below. Policy 3.8 (c) of the London Plan relating to Housing Choice, from the 1 October should be interpreted as 90% of homes should meeting building regulations M4 (2) – ‘accessible and adopted dwellings’. Policy 3.8 (d) will require 10% of new housing to meeting building regulations M4 93) – ‘wheelchair user dwellings’. The accessibility requirement of the scheme is considered under section 8 below.

Bedrooms	Bed spaces	Minimum gia(sq m)			Built – in storage (sq m)
		1 storey dwellings	2 storey dwellings	3 storey dwellings	
1b	1p	39 (37) *			1.0
	2p	50	58		1.5
2b	3p	61	70		2.0
	4p	70	79		
3b	4p	74	84	90	2.5
	5p	86	93	99	
	6p	95	102	108	
4b	5p	90	97	103	3.0
	6p	99	106	112	
	7p	108	115	121	
	8p	117	124	130	
5b	6p	103	110	116	3.5
	7p	112	119	125	
	8p	121	128	134	
6b	7p	116	123	129	4.0
	8p	125	132	138	

*where a studio has a shower room instead of a bathroom, the floor area may be reduced from 39sqm to 37sqm. The Gross Internal Area of a dwelling is defined as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls that enclose a dwelling. This includes partitions, structural elements, cupboards, ducts, flights of stairs and voids above stairs. GIA should be measured and demoted in square metres (m²).

The spaces standards applied to living/ dining/ kitchen area will be removed when the new national standards come into force. However the space standards to bedrooms would be retained, although the national standards would be less than the current LP standards. Double bedrooms (including twin bedroom) should be 11.5sqm and single bedrooms should be 7.5sqm. the national standards further prescribe that one double or twin bedroom should be at least 2.75m wide and every other double or twin should be at least 2.55m wide, in most of the length of the room.

In assessing this scheme against the above national standards, each different house type would have the following internal space standards

House Type	No. of Bedrooms/ occupancy	GIA (sqm)	Bedroom size (sqm)	Living Room (sqm)	Kitchen (sqm)	Bathroom (sqm)	No. of Storeys
B	2B/ 3P	74	11.7 11.3	17	6.6	4.3	2
D	3B/ 5P	99.8	13 10.3 9	14	18.3 (inc. dining)	3.8	2
E	3B/ 5P	121	18.6 12.5 9.4	18.9	10.2	4.5	2.5
F	4B/ 6P	115.6	13 10.7 8.6 8.2	16	25.6 (inc. dining)	4.1	2
G	4B/ 5P	115.9	12.7 8 10.6 7.6	22.6	18.4 (inc. dining)	4.3	2
H	4B/ 6P	132.6	11.7 11.6 9.7 11.1	20	10.7	4.4	3

As noted from the above table, all of the proposed house types would meet the space standards set out in the national standards. It is noted that House Type B is shown as a 2 bed, 3 person unit, however, the bedroom sizes proposed would be indicative of a 4 person units. The national standards require a minimum GIA of 79sqm for a 2 bed, 4 person unit. Whilst this would show a shortfall of 6sqm, given that this dwelling type would provide adequate living space in all other regards, a refusal on grounds of not meeting the national standards would not be warranted in this case.

With regards to the proposed apartment block, these are shown to have the following GIA'S:

Block 1 would comprise of:

19 x 2 bed, 3 person unit. The GIA to these units range from 70.4sqm to 75.8sqm.

Block 2 would comprise of:

22 x 2 bed, 4 person unit. The GIA to these units range from 70.2sqm to 74.4sqm.

4 x 3 bed, 5 person unit. The GIA to these are shown as 86sqm.

Block 3 would comprise of:

4 x 1 bed, 2 person unit. The GIA to these are shown as 50.2sqm.

14 x 2 bed, 4 person unit. The GIA to these units range from 70.2sqm to 70.4sqm.
4 x 3 bed, 5 person unit. The GIA to these units are 86sqm.

The overall GIA's to each of the units would comply with the national standards. The bedrooms to each of these units would also meet the national standards and each unit would make adequate provision for storage for the future occupiers.

Layout, Stacking and Privacy (Flats)

Paragraph 4.55 of the Residential Design Guide SPD specifies that 'the vertical stacking of rooms between flats should ensure that bedrooms do not overlap living rooms, kitchens and bathrooms on other floors. Where possible, the horizontal arrangement of rooms between flats in a block should also avoid bedrooms adjoining neighbouring living rooms, kitchens and bathrooms, as well as communal areas such as halls and stairs'.

The proposed development would stack appropriately in a vertical fashion therefore there would be no vertical stacking issues. All of the units would be dual aspect.

The layout of the units would in general ensure that the privacy of individual units would be maintained. Where there are instances when two balconies adjoin, these would be provided with a brick wall to protect the privacy of the occupiers of each respective unit.

The layout of the blocks have been designed to ensure that any return stepped element does not give rise to any undue overshadowing/ loss of outlook to any adjoining unit.

It is noted that the ground floor windows located in the eastern elevations of the apartment's blocks would front the footpath to Harrow View and therefore the aspect and outlook to these windows would to some degree be affected. However, it is considered that the landscaped boundary treatment along the frontage would frontage some buffer from the public highway.

Privacy (Houses)

It is noted that there are a number of units that would have short gardens and therefore the back to back distances between the dwellings would be quite short which could give rise to some mutual overlooking between the proposed dwellings. However, it is considered that the level of overlooking that would prevail would be no greater than the level that would exist in a suburban setting.

Outdoor Amenity Space

Policy DM1 of the DMP seeks to *inter alia* ensure that development proposals provide an appropriate form of useable outdoor space. This is further reinforced under paragraph 4.64 of the SPD requires that residential development should provide appropriate amenity space. In case of town centre locations, alternative forms of outdoor amenity such as balconies should be explored.

All of the dwellinghouses have been shown to have access to a private rear gardens. Some gardens are shown to be small. However, given that the overall area would be in accordance with the Mayors SPG and there would be access to public open space on the site, Officers are satisfied with this aspect of the proposal is acceptable.

With regards to the apartment blocks, 5 units out the 19 units within Block 1 would have access to a private amenity area. In Block 2, 24 out of the 26 units would have access to a balcony and in Block 3 18 out of the 22 units would have access to a balcony. However the depth for the balconies would not meet the minimum of 1.5m set out in the Mayors SPG. Notwithstanding this, given that the site would have access to the green link and open space which would also provide dedicated play space for future occupiers, it is considered that a refusal on grounds of none conformity to the SPG standards could not be substantiated in this case. Likewise, the lack of access to a private amenity area to some of the flats could not be substantiated in this case given the site circumstances noted above.

Circulation

The entrance to each of the buildings is well defined by incorporating entrance lobbies to each core. Each block would have at least cores. This is to allow the layout of the units to be dual aspect. Each block will have a core entrance located at the rear of the building. However, these would be naturally overlooked by the dwellinghouses located opposite to these blocks.

Overall, the internal circulation areas would achieve a good standard of layout for the future occupiers of this development.

Daylight

The applicant has submitted a Sunlight and Daylight assessment pursuant to condition 13 to assess the daylight to the proposed development.

In order to assess the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) to all habitable rooms including kitchens, the applicant has used the Hea 01 Calculator tool. In order to comply with this award, the following criteria must be met:

- Kitchens achieve a minimum daylight factor of at least 2%
- Living rooms and dining rooms achieve a minimum daylight factor of at least 1.5%
- Bedrooms achieve a minimum daylight factor of at least 1%

The following table demonstrates that the kitchens to a number of house types would fail to achieve the required percentage of daylight factor. (It should be noted that these kitchens generally are below 13 sq.m, and are therefore not considered to be habitable rooms) Similarly, there are bedrooms in a number of house types that would also fail to achieve the minimum daylight factor for bedrooms.

Average Daylight Factor							
Type	K	L	D	Bed 1	Bed 2	Bed 3	Bed 4
B1	1.51%	2.99%	2.99%	2.26%	0.92%	-	
B2	1.51%	2.99%	2.99%	2.16%	0.88%	-	
B3	1.51%	2.99%	2.99%	1.95%	0.8%	-	
D	2.53%	2.15%	2.53%	1.4%	1.65%	1.8%	
E1	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	0.57%	1.3%	1.43%	
E1.1	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	0.41%	1.3%	1.43	
E2	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	1.14%	1.53%	1.71%	
E2.1	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	0.7%	1.53%	1.71%	
E3	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	2.18%	1.3%	1.43%	
E3.1	1.68%	3.33%	3.33%	1.78%	1.3%	1.43%	
F2	2.38%	2.0%	2.38%	2.21%	1.72%	2.0%	1.85%
G1	2.14%	2.74%	2.14%	0.9%	3.96%	1.53%	3.12%
G2	2.14%	2.8%	2.14%	0.78%	2.38%	0.88%	2.66%
H.1	1.79%	3.25%	3.25%	1.56%	1.47%	1.74%	1.78%
H1/H2/H3	1.59%	3.25%	3.25%	1.56%	1.47%	1.55%	2.13%

Given that the living rooms and dining areas which are considered to be rooms that are most frequently used by occupiers and where occupiers are likely to spend considerable time in (with the exception of bedrooms for sleeping) these are all shown to exceed the minimum requirement. Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

With regard to the flats, the table below shows this shows that there would be some kitchen and bedrooms that would not meet the minimum requirements. It is noted that in the applicants report that the percentage shown for the living rooms and dining rooms for flats types D2 and D3 are highlighted as being lower than the minimum standard of 1.5%, however upon examination of the results the percentage shown are above the 1.5% minimum as such these would meet the minimum requirement. As such, the table below has been adjusted to reflect this. Overall the units would be dual aspect and Officers consider that the development would achieve a satisfactory layout.

Type	K	L	D	Bed 1	Bed 2	Bed 3
D1	2.54%	2.54%	2.54%	2.62%	0.52%	-
D2	1.86%	1.86%	1.86%	0.66%		-
D3	1.51%	1.51%	1.51%	2.1%	1.59%	0.56%
D4	3.08%	3.08%	3.08%	2.42%	0.5%	-
D5	2.37%	2.37%	2.37%	2.78%	0.94%	-
D6	3.38%	3.38%	3.38%	2.42%	2.37%	-
D7	1.74%	1.74%	1.74%	2.19%	2.46%	-

As such the details submitted in respect of condition 13 can be approved.

Open Space

Policy 3.6 of the London Plan requires that development proposals for housing to make provision for play and informal recreation, based on the expected child yield for the development.

Policy AAP11(B) *Provision of Open Space* requires major developments within town centres to secure the provision of appropriate civic space and sets out criteria for the local and layout of new open space.

Policy AAP11(C) requires all major development to provide sufficient play space on site to meet the needs of the development, whilst policies AAP13 B(d) and DM 28 *Children and Young People's Play Facilities* reiterate the need for children's play space. The Council's Planning Obligations SPD, informed by Harrow's PPG 17 Study, sets a quantitative standard of 4 square metres play space per child.

The outline permission fixes the amount of play space provision that would be required for the projected child yield from this development. This was fixed at providing 6 Local Areas of Play (LAP's), 3 Local Equipped Area For Play (LEAP's), and 1 Neighbourhood Equipped Area For Play (NEAP).

The submitted drawings show the provision of 6 LAP's, 2 LEAP's and 1 NEAP, the third Leap is provided in the form of the multi-use games area (MUGA). In this regard, the proposed play space provision is considered to be acceptable with regard to the above policies.

Noise Impact

Policy DM1 of the DMP, states under sub-section D (h) that when assessing privacy and amenity it will have regard to the impact of proposed use and activity upon noise, including hours of operation, vibration, dust, air quality and light pollution.

This is further supported under The London Plan policy 7.15B.

Due to the siting close to a busy road, the applicant has submitted a noise assessment report to determine whether any mitigation is necessary to achieve reasonable internal and external noise levels.

The report identifies that acoustic treatment to windows, coupled with adequate mechanical ventilation, will be required for the first row of facades fronting Harrow View, with slightly less acoustic treatment for facades up to 100m from Harrow View. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has recommended that a condition be imposed requiring a detailed noise insulation scheme to be agreed prior to development. This should identify the individual flats concerned and the relevant treatment for each window plus details of mechanical ventilation.

It is noted that a small number of properties (9) will have gardens subject to noise levels above those recommended in BS 8233. Overall the Council's EHO consider this acceptable, as there will be quieter amenity areas on the site, and also recognising the strategic desirability of residential development in this location. Furthermore, the buildings along Harrow view will provide considerable acoustic shielding for the rest of the development. Subject to the imposition of an appropriate condition, the proposed development would give rise to no conflict with the above stated policies.

Impact on neighbouring properties

In assessing the impact on the neighbouring properties, the applicant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight report pursuant to Condition 13 which states:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout and scale shall be accompanied by a detailed Daylight and Sunlight Assessment for that phase. This document shall explain:

- (a) the impact of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties;*
- (b) the impact of the proposed development on daylight and sunlight to properties within the development itself;*

In assessing the impact of the proposed development on the properties in Pinner Park Avenue and Holmwood Close, given the depth of the rear gardens of these properties, it is considered that the proposed houses located along the northern and western edges of the development would give no rise to any unreasonable level of loss of outlook or privacy.

With regard to No. 50 Edward Road, this dwelling would be sited to the south of proposed dwelling house on plot 49. A distance of at least 6m would be retained between the proposed dwelling and the site boundary abutting No.50 Edward Road. There are no protected windows in the facing flank elevation of No.50 Edward

Road. Given the orientation to the south, the proposed development would give rise to no unreasonable impact upon in terms of loss of outlook or light. There are no windows proposed in the flank wall of Plot No.49 as such the proposal would not give rise to any unreasonable overlooking of No.50 Edward Road. Any overlooking of the rear garden would be at an oblique angle.

With regard to No.35 Edward Road, this would also be sited to the south of plot Nos.48 and 29 and as such the proposed dwellings would give rise to no loss of light. There are no protected windows in the facing flank elevation of this neighbouring dwellinghouse. It is acknowledged that the outlook from No.35 Edward Road could be affected due to the siting of plot 29, however it is considered that the landscaping proposed along the boundary with this neighbouring dwellinghouse would help mitigate any perceived impact. Any overlooking of No.35 Edward Road would be at an oblique angle and would be mitigated by the proposed tree planting along the boundary.

With regard to No.45 Stanley Road, this dwellinghouse would be located to the south of plot Nos. 28 and 29 and there are no protected windows in the facing flank elevation of this neighbouring dwellinghouse, as such the proposed development would give rise to no unreasonable impact in terms of loss of light. Any overlooking from the rear facing windows would be at an oblique angle. Although plot no.29 would permit some overlooking of no.45 Stanley Road, the level of overlooking would be no greater than what would be commonly found in a suburban setting.

With regard to No.46 Stanley Road this would be separated from the boundary of plot No.23 by the access road to Downing Close and would also be sited to the south of the proposed development. As such it is considered that there would be no unreasonable impact upon this dwellinghouse in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

With regard to the block of flats located in Downing Close, this would be sited to the south of plot Nos.5 and 11 and would primarily face the shared access road at this end of the development site. There are a number of windows in the facing flank (north) elevation of this building which would have an outlook over the proposed development. According to records held by the Council, these windows serve kitchens and bedrooms. The proposed development would not be sited in the direct sight line of these windows. Due to the orientation of these windows and the proposed siting of the dwellinghouses on this section of the site, it is considered that the proposed development would give rise to no unreasonable impact upon these windows in terms of loss of light or privacy.

Impact on Heritage Assets

Relevant policy and guidance includes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 131 which states 'In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of: the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses

consistent with their conservation'. Similarly, paragraph 132 applies, stating 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset'. Paragraphs 133 and 135 are also relevant.

Policy 7.8 (C) of The London Plan states: 'Development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets, where appropriate' and 'Development affecting heritage assets...should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail'.

Policy DM7 of the DMP in assessing proposals that affect heritage assets, including non-designated heritage assets, seeks to secure the preservation, conservation or enhancement of a heritage asset and its setting, or which secure opportunities for sustainable enjoyment of the historic environment

Condition 22 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of Development Zones C, J, L, Q, R, S and T as shown on Plan HV(00)AP102 REV 101 shall be accompanied by a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment for that phase. This document shall explain how the proposed development addresses the setting and special interest of the heritage assets adjoining these zones

The heritage statement provided shows this proposal would cause some harm to the setting of the nearby designated heritage assets namely two scheduled monuments (the medieval moated site of Headstone Manor, Pinner Deer Park Pale), the grade I listed Headstone Manor, grade II* listed Headstone Manor Tithe Barn, two grade II listed buildings (Headstone Manor Barn and Former Granary at Headstone Manor). However, the approved parameter plans agree the scale and broad location of development, and , as the reserved matters are in accordance with the parameters set in the outline approval, it would be unreasonable to raise an objection on these grounds,

The proposed development will not physically affect the assets given the distance between them. However, there will be some loss of openness due to the proposed houses. Mitigation has been proposed though in the form of planting scattered vegetation in between the buildings within the proposed development and the scheduled moated site. Also, the creation of an open space here will help to partially mitigate the loss of open spaced with currently occupies the site. The formal lines of sight towards the manorial complex will enhance the setting of the assets. On balance therefore the proposal will preserve the setting.

Whilst reference is made in the heritage statement provided to the loss of an ancient hedgerow this comprises Lombardy poplars which are no more than 100

years old. Their loss would not result in loss of an ancient hedgerow.

Based on the above factors, Officers recommend that details pursuant to Condition 22 can be approved.

Traffic, Parking, Access, Servicing and Sustainable Transport

The NPPF sets out the overarching planning policies on the delivery of sustainable development through the planning system. It emphasises the importance of reducing the need to travel, and encouraging public transport provision to secure new sustainable patterns of transport use.

The London Plan Policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13 seek to regulate parking in order to minimise additional car travel, reduce trip lengths and encourage use of other, more sustainable means of travel. The Parking Addendum to Chapter 6 of The London Plan sets out maximum parking standards for new development dependent upon their use and level of public transport accessibility. It is noted that at supporting paragraph 6A.3A to the Parking Addendum sets out that there is scope for greater flexibility to the parking standards in different parts of London having regard to patterns of car ownership and use, levels of public transport accessibility, the need for integrated approaches to on-site and off-street parking, efficiency in land use and overall impact upon environment and the transport network.

Policy AAP 19 of the AAP seeks to limit on site car parking and development proposals to support the use of sustainable modes of transport, in particular in areas that have a high level of public transport accessibility. Policy AAP 20 (Harrow and Wealdstone Green Travel Plan) seeks to ensure that all major developments produce a site specific travel plan to demonstrate how the development would meet the wide Green Travel Plan provisions.

Condition 21 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout and access shall be accompanied by a detailed Transport Strategy. This document shall explain:

- (a) *a detailed Parking Management Strategy for that part of the development (including car club provision);*
- (b) *details of cycle parking provision for each of the proposed uses;*
- (c) *details electric car charging points;*
- (d) *details of pickup and drop off facilities for the primary school (in applications relating to the primary school only);*
- (e) *details of motorcycle and scooter parking;*
- (f) *details of pedestrian and cycle routes throughout that part of the scheme and how this relates to the overall site-wide approach as set out in the Design Guidelines;*
- (g) *details of pedestrian and vehicle signage and wayfinding within the development;*
- (h) *details of enforcement procedures for parking offences on unadopted roads;*

- (i) a full multi-storey car park management plan where applicable;
- (j) a summary of how the approach relates to the original Transport Assessment; and
- (k) a summary of how the proposed Strategy relates to the Travel Plan to be submitted under the S.106 agreement.

Criteria(a)

With regard to requirement (a) – the applicant has provided a breakdown of the parking spaces to be provided which is set out below:

Total number of dwellings	Total number of spaces	Total visitor spaces	Total disabled spaces	Total motorbike spaces	Active electric spaces	Passive electric spaces
314	363	32	37	18	36	36

Total number of spaces = 442

Parking for Houses

House Type	Number of houses	Min Spaces	Max Spaces	Actual Spaces	Visitor Spaces	Electric Spaces	Disabled Spaces
2 bed	27	24	24		3		
3 bed	74	74	111		7		
4 bed	146	219	292		15		
Total	247	317	427	330	25	32	33

Parking for Flats

Flat Type	Number of flats	Spaces	Visitor spaces	Disabled spaces	Electric spaces
1 bed	4	2			
2 bed	55	27			
3 bed	8	4			
Total	67	33	7	4	4

The London Plan (2015) sets out the following requirements under Table 6.2 (Car Parking Standards)

For 4 bed or more – up to 2 spaces per unit

For 3 bed – up to 1.5 per unit

For 1 – 2 bed – less than 1 per unit

Applying the above standards to the proposed development would provide the following:

4 bed = 146 x 2 = 292 spaces

3 bed = 82 x 1.5 = 123 spaces

2 bed = 82 x 0.5 = 41 spaces

1 bed = 4 x 0.5 = 2 spaces

Total maximum for the development should be = **458 spaces**

Having regard to the fact that the proposed development is located in an area with a low public transport accessibility level (PTAL), it is considered that a higher level of parking spaces for the smaller units (i.e. 1 space per unit) could be supported in this case. The total number of spaces provided would not exceed the maximum standard set out in the London Plan. It is further considered that the level of parking proposed would be required to ensure that there is no displacement parking by residents on to nearby residential roads.

Criteria (b)

With regard to cycle parking for the development (requirement (b)), the applicant's strategy sets that cycle storage for the flats would be provided within designated communal cycle storage rooms located at ground floor. The storage rooms would be equipped with vertical bike storage furniture to secure bikes to racks. In terms of the dwelling houses, this would be provided with covered designated storage within rear gardens and communal areas. Sheffield style hopes will be provided. Additional cycle parking would also be provided next to the proposed MUGA.

The supporting strategy fails to provide any quantum of actual spaces to be provided, something which has been highlighted by the Council's highways authority. However having looked at proposed floor plans for the flatted elements and the overall landscape plan for the site, Officers have been able to ascertain that the flatted element of the development would have a total of 120 spaces. If applying the 2011 version of the London Plan cycle standards, the requirement would be to provide 78 cycle parking spaces. When applying the current 2015 London Plan standards the requirement for the flatted blocks would be 130 parking spaces, a shortfall of 10 spaces. Having regard to the fact that the application was granted when the 2011 standards were in operation, the level of cycle parking proposed would be generous and not so greatly deficit to the current 2015 standards.

The 2015 London Plan standards also require a provision of short term cycle parking spaces at a rate of 1 space for every 40 units. No such requirement existed for residential developments under the 2011 London Plan standards. Details shown on the landscape masterplan indicate that the proposal would have a total of 11 spaces located around the open space and green link. The level proposed would exceed the requirement of 7 short term spaces required for this development.

It is noted that with regard to the houses, cycle parking would be provided in the rear gardens. However, no quantum of provision has been provided and none of the accompanying drawings submitted with this application provide any details of the storage for cycles (such as garden sheds – which would require planning permission in light of permitted development restriction). In the absence of this information, Officers have sought clarification on this matter, the outcome to which will be reported via the addendum.

Criteria (c)

With regard to electric car charging point, the applicant's strategy states that 20% of the spaces would have electric charging points. It goes on to state that such electric points would be located in visitor spaces and spaces allocated for flats, not individual spaces for dwellings. The strategy eludes that the designated spaces are shown on the accompanying parking strategy layout. However, Officers at the time of writing this report have been unable to ascertain the exact location of these electric charging points. The London Plan (2011 and 2015 versions) requires that all development make provision for 20% active electric parking spaces and 20% passive spaces for the future. The Council's highways engineer has highlighted that it is not clear where the 20% electric parking spaces would be located and how the applicant seeks to meet the requirement for 20% passive electric spaces. In this regard, Officers have sought further clarification from the applicant on this matter, the outcome to which will be reported via the addendum.

Criteria (d)

Is not applicable for Phase 1B of the approved masterplan as the school would be located on the east side of the masterplan.

Criteria (e)

This requires the development to make provision for motorcycle parking. The applicant has shown a provision of at least 18 parking spaces for such users across the site. This would amount to 1 in every 20 spaces provided for motorcycles (based on the figure of 363) which would be in accordance with policy DM42 of the DMP.

Criteria (f)

The applicant has provided details of all the primary pedestrian route and cycle routes within the development site. This is considered to be acceptable.

Criteria (g)

The Council's Highways Authority has confirmed that the roads within the development boundary are not adoptable standards, as such the signage within the development site would be the responsibility of the developer. The applicant has shown on plan the locations of the signs along the green link and open space directing cyclists and pedestrians through the site. However, the Council's Highways Authority has requested examples of the signs to be used to ensure that they are compliant with the Borough's standard. In this regard a condition is recommended.

Criteria (h)

The applicant's strategy states that the parking associated with the houses and flats would be allocated and marked accordingly. Visitor space will not contain any marking. A management company would manage the parking for the site and appropriate signage would be displayed to discourage inappropriate parking.

Residents will be advised on visitor parking.

Officers consider that there is limited visitor parking provided in the southern section of the site and this could give rise to displacement parking on to nearby roads. However it is noted that there is provision within the extant section 106 agreement, whereby a contribution of £37,700 is payable by the West Owners towards the introduction of a CPZ or other general parking controls in the area. A further contribution of £5,800 is allocated for the monitoring of CPZ. In view of this, Officers are satisfied that there is some method of controlling displacement parking already in place.

Criteria (i)

This relates to the multi-storey car park and therefore no applicable to this Phase.

Criteria (j)

It is noted that the Highways Authority have raised an objection with regard to the information submitted for this section and have stated that the original Transport Assessment (TA) would not be appropriate as this has been superseded by recent versions. The recent TA that has been referred to relates to the current application for the Kodak site (P/2165/15), which has been submitted as a standalone application independent to the current reserved matters application relating to Harrow View West. The developers of the Kodak application have submitted an up to date TA to reflect the increased density to their development proposal.

At the time of the original outline application a TA was submitted and approved which covered the impact of the proposal based on the quantum of development prevailing at that time. The TA is an approved document and informed the decision making process relating to the outline application and therefore it would be unreasonable to request the applicant to provide an up to date TA to reflect the new development proposal on the East side of Harrow View.

The applicant has shown, although very briefly, a summary of how the proposed development would meet the requirement of the approved TA. Notwithstanding the Highways Authority's comments above, Officers are broadly satisfied that the requirement of the above condition has been met.

Criteria (k)

The applicant has provided a brief summary of what would be included as part of their Travel Plan (TP). As the details for the TP are required by a section 106 obligation, it is considered that the content of this TP can be thoroughly assessed and negotiated at that time.

In general, Officers are satisfied that the details submitted can be approved, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to details for cycle parking for the houses and the signage examples.

Condition 11 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission shall be accompanied by a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) for that phase. This document shall explain or include:

- (a) the proposed Best Practice Measures (BPM) to be implemented during construction to suppress dust and minimise noise and vibration associated with demolition/building works;*
- (b) a full detailed noise and vibration assessment;*
- (c) the measures proposed to reduce and remove risks to the water environment and reduce flood risk during construction;*
- (d) a full Construction Logistics Plan, which demonstrates how the impact of construction vehicles would be minimised;*
- (e) details of proposed hours of work for construction activity; and*
- (f) a summary of how the measures proposed address the mitigation identified in the Environmental Impact Assessment.*

The applicant has submitted an updated CEMP for the development, which have been assessed by the Council's Environmental Team, Highways Team and Biodiversity Officer. In general the CEMP is sound in regards to criteria a), c), e) and f).

It is noted that for criteria b) the submitted CEMP states that a Noise Assessment has been prepared and is provided as a standalone report. However, the Noise report provided only assess the impact of the surrounding noise on the proposed occupiers of the development and does not assess the impact of noise and vibration caused by construction activity and its impact on existing neighbouring occupiers. In this regard, this element of the condition has been re-attached.

In relation to criteria d), the Highways Authority has stated that the level of details provided is not sufficient in terms to it to be regarded as a full Construction Logistic Plan. Whilst it is noted that a phasing strategy has been submitted for this site, for the reasons already discussed under section 2 of this report, the level of information is insufficient. In this regard, this element of the above condition has been re-attached.

Development and Flood Risk

London Plan Policy 5.12 *Flood Risk Management* states that development proposals must have regard to measures proposed in Catchment Flood Management Plans. It is noted that the EA's Thames Catchment Flood Management Plan (2009) focuses on the adaptation of the urban environment to increase resistance and resilience to flood water, and that this objective informed the preparation of Harrow's Local Plan policies on flood risk management.

Core Strategy Policy CS1 U undertakes to manage development to achieve an overall reduction in flood risk and increased resilience to flood events. Policy AAP9

of the AAP calls for major development to: reduce surface water run-off; utilise sustainable drainage systems; ensure adequate arrangements for management and maintenance of on-site infrastructure; use appropriate measures to prevent water pollution; and where appropriate, demonstrate that the proposal would be resistant and resilient to flooding from all sources.

London Plan Policy 5.13 states that development should utilise sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) and should aim to achieve greenfield run-off rates and this objective is reiterated in Policy AAP9. Policy 5.13 of the London Plan sets out a drainage hierarchy to manage surface water run-off as close to its source as possible.

Condition 14 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout and landscaping shall be accompanied by a detailed Surface Water Drainage Strategy for that phase. This document shall explain:

- (a) the proposed use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) to manage surface water run-off, including the provision of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands;*
- (b) surface water attenuation, storage and disposal works, including relevant calculations;*
- (c) works for the disposal of sewage associated with the development.*

The applicant has submitted a detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and a detailed drainage layout, which includes the provision of swales and ponds. The drainage strategy submitted has been amended during the course of this application to meet the requirements of the Council's Drainage Authority. The proposed development now seeks to drain part of the surface water from the site towards Headstone Manor and will connect into the proposed reed bed project that the Council will be undertaking on the Headstone Manor Recreation grounds. The remaining part of the development would drain towards Harrow View. The applicant has amended the attenuation discharge rates to 5 litres per second per hectare, which is in line with Council's Drainage Authority requirement to ensure that during periods of heavy rainfall that the water is held on site in storage tanks and discharged to the main drains at a prescribed rate of discharge. The Council's Highway Engineer is satisfied with the information submitted and therefore the details submitted in respect of the above condition can be approved.

Trees and Ecology

Condition 10 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the public realm shall be accompanied by a detailed Ecology and Biodiversity Strategy for that phase. The Ecology and Biodiversity Strategy shall explain:

- (a) the incorporation of bird boxes, bat roosts and other wildlife features on*

buildings;

(b) the creation of wildlife habitats within the public realm, integrated into the detailed SUDS designs (i.e. standing and running water, grassland, log piles, green/brown roofs); and

(c) the management arrangements for these features.

Condition 19 requires

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission shall be accompanied by a detailed Arboricultural Report for that phase. This document shall explain how the trees outlined in purple on the Application Plan HV(00)AP003 (20.03.2012) are to be retained, together with measures for their protection during the course of the development. If any trees outlined in purple on the Application Plan HV(00)AP003 (20.03.2012) are to be removed, lopped or topped, a full justification must be provided within the Arboricultural Report. This document shall also explain the total numbers of trees to be removed, together with details of proposed replacement tree planting, to ensure an overall increase in the number of trees across the site.

The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Report and an Ecology Report in support of the above application. As noted under section 2 of the above appraisal, the proposal would include the inclusion of new native tree planting, bat and bird boxes, logs, boulders, a pond and swales to enhance the ecological value of the site. The proposal would also include the provision of brown roof over the garages.

As such it is considered that the requirement of condition 10 has been met.

With regards to the impact on the existing trees, the submitted assessment concludes that a number of trees on the site would be removed with the exception of the following trees which are either along the boundary or just outside of the site boundary:

T36 – Field Maple – This is located just outside of the site boundary and on the furthest north east corner.

T37 x 2 – Leyland Cypress – These are located just outside of the boundary and along the eastern edge of the northern boundary.

T39 and T40 – Crack Willow – These are located just outside of the boundary and centrally along the northern boundary.

T60 and T61 – Sugar Maple and Field Maple – These are located outside of the boundary and along the eastern section of the southern boundary.

H1 – Western Red Cedar – This is located on the boundary along the eastern section of the southern boundary.

All other trees would be removed from the site. It is noted that a number of residents have raised concerns over the loss of the Lombardy Poplar trees located along the western boundary of the site. The subject site does not benefit from a tree preservation order (TPO) as such the loss of these trees would not be protected.

Furthermore, the Council's Tree Officer and Landscape Officer have confirmed that these trees are of low amenity value and would only have a life expectancy of another 10 years before these trees start to keel over. Furthermore, these are not native species and therefore have no ecological value.

It is noted that in the approved parameter plans noted in the above condition, showed a group of trees along the western boundary (centrally positioned), a group of tree along the southern boundary near No.35 Edward Road, a group of trees along the eastern boundary (southern section) fronting Harrow View and a group of trees along the northern boundary (centrally positioned and where retained trees T39 and T40 are located) were to be retained. The condition also requires that if such tree cannot be retained then full justification should be provided. As already stated above, these trees are not subject to any TPO's. The applicant has provided justification as to why these groups of trees cannot be retained for the purposes of the new development and the Council's Tree Officer is satisfied with the approach. Furthermore, as noted above, the proposal would include replacement tree planting of better quality of trees.

Officers consider that the details submitted in respect of the above conditions can be approved.

Accessibility

Policy AAP4 of the AAP, policy DM2 of the DMP and policies 3.5 and 3.8 of The London Plan (2015) seek to ensure that all new housing is built to 'Lifetime Homes' standards. Furthermore, The London Plan policy 7.2 requires all future development to meet the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion.

Policy CS1.K of the Harrow Core Strategy requires all new dwellings to comply with the requirements of Lifetime Homes. Supplementary Planning Document *Accessible Homes 2010* (SPD) outlines the necessary criteria for a 'Lifetime Home'.

Condition 15 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, access and landscaping shall be accompanied by a detailed Accessibility Strategy for that phase. This document shall explain:

- (a) how the proposed public realm areas would be accessible to all, including details of finished site levels, surface gradients and lighting;*
- (b) how each non-residential building would be accessible to all, including details of level access and internal accommodation arrangements;*
- (c) that each of the residential dwellings would comply with Lifetime Homes standards, with 10% Wheelchair Homes compliance.*

Condition 23 requires:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission shall be accompanied by a detailed Levels Plan for that

phase. This document shall explain details of the levels of the buildings, roads and footpaths in relation to the adjoining land and highway(s), and any other changes proposed in the levels of the site.

The applicant has provided details of the levels for all public realm areas which set out the finished site levels and the surface gradients. This is considered to be acceptable and therefore the requirements of condition 23 have been met.

With regards to meeting Lifetime Homes standards as noted under section 3 of the above report that the government have introduced new national space standards which come into force from 1 October 2015. This requires development proposals to meet Part 4(2) (accessible and adaptable homes) of the buildings regulations and Part 4(3) (wheelchair accessible homes) of the building regulations. The Mayor has published a draft interim Housing SPG to reflect these changes.

The applicant has shown some elements of lifetime homes on the submitted plans and has provided a checklist with this application to state that the proposal would meet Lifetime Homes Standards. However, it is not clear from the submitted drawings of the accompanying Accessibility Statement how the proposed development would satisfactorily meet all of the 16 Lifetime Homes Standards or the Wheelchair Homes standards. For example the flatted blocks do not incorporate step-free access. It is not clear from the details submitted whether step free entrance to all building, including individual units would be achieved. Likewise it is not clear of access to rear gardens would be level access. As noted under section 2 of this appraisal, not of the buildings would have automatic lighting to the entrances.

In view of the above, it is considered that the requirements of condition 15 have not been met and therefore this condition has been re-attached.

Sustainability

Section 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to promote low carbon and renewable energy, including decentralised energy. This includes requiring local planning authorities to have a positive strategy to deliver low carbon and renewable energy infrastructure and for these matters to be considered as part of any planning application.

London Plan Policy 5.2 (Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions) requires new development to minimise carbon emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy of be lean (use less energy), be clean (supply energy efficiently) and be green (use renewable energy). The policy sets targets for carbon emission reductions, with a 40% reduction required relative to the 2010 Building Regulations for both residential and non-residential development (this is equivalent to a 35% reduction over the more recent 2013 Building Regulations). The policy outlines the requirements for energy statements and indicates that the carbon reduction targets should be met on-site.

Policy 5.5 (Decentralised Energy Networks) requires developers to prioritise connection to existing or planned decentralised energy networks where feasible, with Policy 5.6 (Decentralised Energy in Development Proposals) requiring the evaluation of the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems in new developments and where such a system is appropriate, the examination of opportunities to extend the system beyond the boundary to adjacent sites. The policy also requires development to prioritise connection to existing heating and cooling networks, followed by a site wide CHP network, and lastly communal heating and cooling.

Policy 5.7 (Renewable Energy) requires new development to provide a reduction in expected carbon emissions through on-site renewable energy, where feasible. The supporting text to the policy indicates there is a presumption that the reduction achieved through on-site renewable energy will be at least 20%.

Harrow Local Plan policy largely cross-refers to the London Plan requirements with respect to carbon emissions [see Core Strategy Policy CS1 (T), Policies DM12 Sustainable Design and Layout, DM13 Decentralised Energy, and DM14 Renewable Energy Technology]. Within the Harrow and Wealdstone AAP, Policy AAP4 (Achieving a High Standard of Development throughout the Heart of Harrow) also cross-refers to the London Plan. Policy AAP10 (Harrow and Wealdstone District Energy Network) recognises that the nature and scale of development envisaged within the AAP area is likely to be conducive to the establishment of a district energy network and requires all new development to prioritise connection to existing or planned decentralised energy networks, where feasible. Where such a network is not feasible at present, development proposals should ensure the design of the development would facilitate connection in the future. Furthermore, the policy requires that all new major development includes on-site heating and cooling networks linking all buildings on-site and prioritising CHP where applicable and served by a single energy centre. The policy establishes a hierarchy for the selection of heating and cooling systems, as follows: connection to existing CCHP/CHP distribution networks; site-wide CCHP/CHP powered by renewable energy; gas-fired CCHP/CHP or hydrogen fuel cells, both accompanied by renewables; communal heating and cooling fuelled by renewable sources of energy; and finally, gas fired communal heating and cooling.

This application has been submitted under the extant permission, the requirement of the Condition 9 is as follows:

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale and appearance shall be accompanied by a detailed Energy Strategy. The Energy Strategy shall explain:

- a) how the proposed building design(s) realise(s) opportunities to include design and technology energy efficiency measures;*
- b) the reduction in carbon emissions achieved through these building design and technology energy efficiency measures, compared with the emissions*

- permitted under the national Building Regulations prevailing at the time the application(s) for approval of Reserved Matters are submitted;*
- c) the specification for any green and/or brown roofs;*
 - d) how energy shall be supplied to the building(s), highlighting:
 - i. how the building(s) relate(s) to the site-wide strategy for district heating incorporating tri-generation from distributed combined heat and power; and*
 - ii. any other measures to incorporate renewables.**
 - e) how the building(s) have been designed to achieve at least the minimum requirement under BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes (or an equivalent assessment method and rating) prevailing at the time the application(s) for approval of Reserved Matters are submitted.*

The original energy statement submitted with the application for outline planning permission for the entire site (i.e. the subject site and the Kodak site to the east of Harrow View) recognised that the proposed phase of the development to the west of Harrow View was characterised by detached and semi-detached residential development with a low energy demand density. The statement indicated that the Kodak site to the east of Harrow View, as well as the flats on the Harrow View site were suitable for supply from a decentralised heat network. The residential units on the remainder of the West site were proposed to be supplied by building specific low carbon technology, namely air source heat pumps. The report indicated that the decentralised energy centre was to be located on the Kodak site, with a spur from that site across Harrow View to serve the flats on the subject site. It was recognised that it would not be possible to immediately connect the flats on the subject site to the proposed decentralised energy network due to phasing considerations (i.e. the Kodak factory remaining on site would prevent the necessary pipework from being able to be cost effectively laid. Consequently it was proposed that until such a connection was possible, the Harrow View West flats would be supplied from a high efficiency gas boiler communal heating system that was future proofed to allow connection to the district heating network when it was delivered. The report indicated that such future proofing of this system should as a minimum include space allowance for the district heating interface in the flats' communal heating plant room(s) and a reserved route to allow the district heating pipes to be retrospectively connected to the communal heating plant rooms(s).

In accordance with the condition on the outline planning permission, a further energy strategy has been submitted to accompany the applications for approval of Reserved Matters for the Harrow View West. The strategy outlines the following proposals:

- a. The buildings' fabric shall be constructed to a high performance standard, achieving high levels of thermal insulation and low air permeability. Energy efficient lighting and appropriate controls shall be employed throughout the development. These measures achieve carbon emissions better than that required by the 2013 Building Regulations, reflecting the London Plan requirement that compliance with the Building Regulation is achieved through

energy efficiency measures alone.

- b. No Combined Heat and Power (CHP) powered site-wide heat network is proposed, due to the low energy demand / single use nature of the development.
- c. For the purposes of hot water and space heating, the energy statement proposes highly efficient conventional gas-fired boilers. For the flats, the heating system will be provided in a centralised location with space provided for heat exchangers to enable connection to any future district energy network that may serve the site in the future. No detail of the energy centre or potential pipe network routes have been provided apart from its location on the subject site.
- d. The energy statement considers a number of potential renewable energy technologies (the third and final element of the energy hierarchy), including solar thermal, solar photovoltaic (PV), ground, air and water source heat pumps, biomass boilers / CHP, and wind-power. The statement indicates that the substantial majority of the carbon emissions reductions (relative to 2013 Building Regulations) required by Policy will be achieved through solar PV panels; this contrasts with the air source heat pumps proposed in the original energy statement. The statement indicates that the solar PV panels are proposed to be applied extensively on the roofs of the buildings although the positioning will be sensitive to the views from Headstone Manor to the west of the site and that it is therefore expected that residential units on the western boundary of the site will not have PV on the western roof elevation.

The total carbon emissions reductions achieved through the proposals outlined above is 35%, which meets the required 35% reduction (relative to the 2013 Building Regulations) in London Plan Policy 5.2. The energy statement seeks to prioritise energy demand reduction measures first, with these achieving carbon emissions reductions better than that required by the 2013 Building Regulations, thereby meeting the London Plan preference that the emissions levels required by the Building Regulations are met through energy-efficiency measures alone.

It is accepted that a CHP network (i.e. low-carbon technology, the second element of the energy hierarchy) for Harrow View West alone is not viable given the low-density, single use nature of the site compared to the adjoining Kodak site. The proposal to make provision for potential connection to the future heat network on the Kodak site accords with London Plan policy and the previous energy statement. The current application on the adjacent Kodak site recognises this potential and proposes that the energy centre and associated infrastructure is be designed to enable the proposed Kodak site-wide network to be extended to serve at least Harrow View West. The new energy statement for Harrow View West does not provide a detailed plan of the proposed on-site energy centre to indicate that it has been designed with sufficient space and that an agreed route for infrastructure to the boundaries of the site / break-through points in the building fabric to ensure that

it would be technically feasible to extend the proposed combined heat and power network to serve the remainder of the allocated site and beyond. Such an approach should be secured by planning condition, requiring a commitment by the developer to make reasonable endeavours to co-operate with the operator of the heat network on the Kodak site to agree terms pursuant to a connection between the Kodak site-wide CHP system and the Harrow View East site. The energy centre is located on the frontage to Harrow View, meaning that it should be relatively straight forward to connect this across the road to the proposed heat network on Harrow View East.

The proposed use of solar PV panels instead of the air source heat pumps proposed in the original energy statement is acceptable as solar PV is a proven technology and is likely to have a lower visual impact than air source pumps.

It should be noted that the Council is preparing an energy master plan to fully consider the feasibility of establishing a district energy network within the Harrow and Wealdstone AAP area (i.e. the London Plan opportunity area / Housing Zone), consistent with the commitments given in the Core Strategy and the AAP. This work will be complete by the end of 2015 and will address the technical and economic feasibility of establishing such a network. Should such a network be demonstrated to be potentially feasible, more detailed work would be undertaken with respect to designing and procuring construction of the network. The Harrow View West scheme therefore needs to be designed to enable future connection to any district energy system and the proposal to enable future connection to the adjacent Harrow View East site should facilitate this. Accordingly, it is considered that a Planning condition should also be sought requiring that an agreed route for infrastructure to the boundaries of the site, to ensure that it would be technically feasible to extend the proposed combined heat and power network to enable a connection to any future district-wide decentralised energy network. Furthermore, the obligation would include a commitment by the developer to make reasonable endeavours to co-operate with the Council (or its agent) to agree terms pursuant to a connection between the site-wide CHP system and a future district-wide decentralised energy network.

In view of the above, Officers consider that the details pursuant to Condition 9 could be approved, subject to there being a condition imposed firstly requiring a detailed plan of the proposed on-site energy centre to indicate that it has been designed with sufficient space and that an agreed route for infrastructure to the boundaries of the site / break-through points in the building fabric to ensure that it would be technically feasible to extend the proposed combined heat and power network to serve the remainder of the allocated site and beyond. Secondly a condition requiring that an agreed route for infrastructure to the boundaries of the site, to ensure that it would be technically feasible to extend the proposed combined heat and power network to enable a connection to any future district-wide decentralised energy network.

Air Quality

Policy 7.14B of the London Plan seeks to minimise exposure to existing poor air

quality and make provision to address local problem of air quality. It goes onto stated *inter alia* measures to reduce emissions during demolition and construction; proposals to be 'air quality neutral' and not to lead to further deterioration in air quality; ensure on-site provision of measures to reduce emissions; and assessment of the air quality implications of biomass boilers. Policy DM1 (D.h) of the DMP also reinforces the view of assessing the impact of proposal on *inter alia* vibration, duct and air quality.

Whilst not required by a planning condition, the applicant has submitted an Air Quality Assessment to consider the air quality impact on the future occupiers of the site.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer as reviewed this and concludes that suitable mitigation measures have been considered to reduce the exposure of future occupants to pollution and improve the suitability of the development for its proposed use. In view of the Officers would recommend that a condition is imposed to ensure that the appropriate mitigations are carried out in accordance with the recommendations set out in the Air Quality Assessment.

Housing Mix

London Plan policy 3.8 and policy AAP13 of the AAP require new development to provide a range of housing choices, in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types, taking account of the housing requirements of different groups.

Condition 12 requires

Applications for approval of Reserved Matters for each relevant phase submitted pursuant to this permission relating to layout, scale and appearance (excluding where housing is not proposed) shall be accompanied by a detailed Housing Schedule for that phase. This document shall explain:

- (a) the type and mix of units proposed;*
- (b) whether the units are to be provided as affordable or not and if so what tenure;*
- (c) the gross internal floor areas of each dwelling; and*
- (d) the number, mix and tenure of all residential units known at the time of submission of the reserved matter.*

The applicant has provided a schedule of the type and mix of units to be proposed across the site, which includes, 1 bed (2 person), 2 bed (3 and 4 person), 3 bed (4 and 5 person) and 4 bed (5 and 6 person) units. The applicant has set out that of the 314 units 60 units would be affordable housing which would include a mix of flats and houses. The applicant has provided the GIA for each unit type which has been considered to be acceptable in terms of the national space standards.

The proposed unit mix is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the above stated policy. The level of affordable housing was agreed through the outline permission, and the current proposals are in accordance with that agreed level of

provision.

S17 Crime & Disorder Act

Policies 7.3.B and 7.13.B of The London Plan and policy AAP 4 of the AAP require all new developments to have regard to safety and the measures to reduce crime in the design of development proposal.

The applicant has not specifically referred to the prevention of crime in the design proposal, but it is considered that the development design would not result in any specific concerns in this respect. The main entrances to each of the buildings would benefit from natural surveillance. The ground floor flats have been designed with defensible area to ensure security and privacy. The public pedestrian route through the site would be lit and afforded natural surveillance from the dwellinghouses.

Nonetheless, it should be demonstrated that the development would accord with 'Secured by Design' principles. It is considered that this requirement could be secured by condition. Accordingly, and subject to a condition, it is considered that the proposed development would not increase crime risk or safety in the locality, thereby according with the policies stated above.

Environmental impact Assessment

The Council provided a scoping opening in relation to the original outline application and the subsequent s.73 application (P/0873/14) under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England) Regulations 2011 (as amended) and the Council concluded that the development does constitute Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Development due to the quantum of development being proposed which could give rise to impact on the wider environment. Both applications were submitted with Environmental Statements (ES), which covered the following topics:

- Transport;
- Air quality;
- Noise and vibration;
- Ground conditions;
- Water Environment;
- Biodiversity;
- Landscape and Visual Assessment;
- Socio-economic;
- Archaeology and cultural heritage;
- Waste; and
- Daylight.

The ES sets out the impact of the development upon each of the areas above and recommends what mitigation would be required to address each impact. Accordingly, appropriate conditions were attached to the original outline application.

As this is a reserved matters application there is no further ES required to be submitted under the above regulations.

Equalities Impact

Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-

(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

(a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;

(b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;

(c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

When making policy decisions, the Council must take account of the equality duty and in particular any potential impact on protected groups. It is considered that this application does not raise any equality implications.

Consultation Responses

- *The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.*

The density of the development has already been agreed in principle through the approval of the outline application and the overall density would accord with the London Plan standards

- *The flats and houses are too small.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *The width of the roads between parking spaces is too small and will lead to parking problems for the residents.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above. The widths of the road have been agreed at outline application stage.

- *Traffic near the site is already bad and the proposal will increase congestion and lead to further problems for residents.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *Lengthy construction period will lead to traffic problems*

The applicant is required to produce a detailed Construction Logistic Plan to ensure that construction traffic does not impact upon local traffic.

- *Will there be an pedestrian access from the end of Edward Road to the new site?*

Yes – this has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *Concerned about construction noise and would like building to be weekdays only.*

The CEMP accompany this application sets out the hours of construction operation which would be in accordance with the Considerate Contractors Scheme which does permit weekend working for half day on Saturday. The Council's Environmental Health Officer is satisfied with this.

- *The parkland near Headstone Manors is for neighbouring amenity use and should not be absorbed in to private development*

The proposed development would not encroach upon the recreation development.

- *The area next to Harrow View contains playing field and should be made available to local residents and not built over.*

The principle of development has already been established at outline application stage. The sports grounds were private grounds and not open to general public. This site is now an allocated site in the development plan for residential development.

- *Can a close boarded fence be planted next to theirs, rather than replacing existing fence, which will destroy their plants?*

This is a matter between the individual homeowner and the developer.

- *Neighbours house backs on to the site - objects to the proposed removal of the existing poplar trees on site as they provide privacy and seclusion for neighbours.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *The trees also provide a habitat for wildlife which will be lost.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *The loss of the poplar trees that border Kodak and Headstone Manor park land is not acceptable. It will lead to increased CO2 and global warming.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *Object to loss of Leylandii and poplars and suggest additional planting.*

This has been addressed in the appraisal above.

- *Object to the proposed pond and potential for midges, flooding and subsidence.*
The pond is designed to enhance the ecological value of the site. Flooding has been addressed above. Subsidence is not a material planning consideration.

- *The length of time of the proposed development of 5 years is excessive and will lead to unacceptable noise, pollution and disruption to the lives of nearby residents.*

Whilst this is noted, construction activity would be temporary.

- *Lengthy construction period could lead to devaluing of nearby properties.*

Valuation of existing properties is not a material planning consideration.

- *The proposal will lead to an excessive strain on local infrastructure including parks , refuse collection and leisure collection especially with cuts in local government spending*

The extant permission secured appropriate contribution via the section 106 agreement towards off-site infrastructure which includes highways contribution, contribution towards Headstone Manor and the recreation grounds and contribution towards sports and leisure.

CONCLUSION

The proposals would not give rise to any unreasonable impact upon the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers and will provide satisfactory living accommodation for potential occupiers. It is considered that the external appearance, scale, layout, access and landscaping scheme submitted is acceptable and it is recommended that the application is approved.

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), the policies of The London Plan (2015), Harrow's Core Strategy (2012), the policies of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013) and the policies of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) listed in the informatives below, as well as to all relevant material considerations including the responses to consultation.

CONDITIONS

General

1 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings listed below.

To follow

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, and to ensure that the development is carried out to the highest standards of architecture and materials in accordance with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) and Policies AAP 4 and AAP 6 of the Local Plan (2013).

Pre-Commencement Conditions

2 Notwithstanding the details submitted with the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan, no development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a construction logistics plan has first been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. The plan shall detail the arrangements for:

- a) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) storage of plant and materials used in construction the development;

- d) the erection and maintenance of security hoardings including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing;
- e) wheel washing facilities; and
- f) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.
- g) measures for the control and reduction noise and vibration associated with demolition, earthworks and construction.

The demolition and construction of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the plan so agreed.

REASON: To ensure that the transport network impact of demolition and construction work associated with the development is managed in accordance with Policy 6.3 of the London Plan (2015).

3 Notwithstanding the phasing strategy submitted with this application, no development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a revised Phasing Strategy has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The Strategy should include full timescales for construction of each phase including the sequence of how each phase would be delivered, details of site compound, materials storage (permanent during construction and any temporary areas within each phase, and the method of protection of the green link and open space during the construction of the different phases. The Phasing Strategy shall be implemented as approved.

REASON : The submitted Phasing Strategy is inadequate and a revised strategy is required to ensure that the likely impacts on the highway network and amenities of neighbouring occupiers during the construction phase of the development are minimised, in accordance with the Environmental Impact Assessment, in accordance with the NPPF, policies 6.3, 7.14 and 7.15 of The London Plan (2015), policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy AAP19 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013).

Progression-Point Conditions

4 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, the development hereby approved shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until samples of the materials (or appropriate specification) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority:

- a) facing materials for the buildings (including any boundary walls that front a highway)
- b) windows/ doors
- c) roof materials
- d) balcony screens including balustrade detail and privacy screens
- e) ground surfacing including all footpaths, parking bays, kerbs and highway
- f) raised planters
- g) external seating
- h) proposed screening for the refuse area for the dwellings houses
- i) proposed cycle storage for individual houses (in form of a lockable shed)

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so agreed and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality and to ensure a satisfactory form of development in accordance with policy 7.4B of The London Plan (2015), policy CS.1B of the Harrow Core Strategy and policies AAP 1 and AAP 4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013).

5 The development relating to the buildings fronting Harrow View hereby approved shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until a report identifying those residential premises within the development that require mitigation of external noise levels and detailing the mitigation required to achieve satisfactory noise levels within those premises (and to their private balcony areas, where relevant) has first been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. The report shall also detail the arrangements for ventilating the residential premises so identified. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the report so agreed, and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To ensure that potential adverse noise impacts to residential premises within the development are mitigated in accordance with Policy 7.15 of the London Plan (2015), and to ensure a high standard of amenity for future occupiers in accordance with Policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

6 The development hereby approved shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until details of a strategy for the provision of communal facilities for television reception (eg. aerials, dishes and other such equipment) for the apartment blocks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the specific size and location of all equipment. The approved details shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the relevant phase and shall be retained thereafter. No other television reception equipment shall be introduced onto the walls or the roof of the building without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that any telecommunications apparatus and other plant or equipment that is required on the exterior of the buildings preserves the high quality design of the buildings and spaces in accordance with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2015), Policy AAP 4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013) and DM 49 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), and to ensure that the development achieves a high standard of amenity for future occupiers the buildings in accordance with Policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

7 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plan, the development shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until detailed layout/ specifications for the proposed 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and 'wheelchair user dwellings' in accordance with the requirements of Part M4(2) and M4(3) of the Building Regulations have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so

agreed and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To ensure provision of accessible, adaptable and wheelchair standard housing in accordance with policies 3.8 and 7.2 of The London Plan (2015), Policy AAP 4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Homes (2010).

8 Notwithstanding the lighting strategy submitted with this application, the development shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until a detailed Lighting Strategy in line with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (IPL) for the reductions of obtrusive light, to avoid nuisance and loss of amenity. This document shall explain:

(a) the lighting proposed for public realm areas and streets which shall have regard to crime and safety as well as ensuring that the lighting does not detract but activity on the site, including relevant justification;

(b) the proposed external building lighting (including all entrances to houses and communal areas and balconies).

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so agreed and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON : To ensure that the development is adequately lit in order to minimise the risk and fear of crime, whilst ensuring that the proposed lighting would not unduly impact on local character, amenity or biodiversity, in line with the recommendations policies 7.3 and 7.19 of The London Plan (2015), policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy AAP4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013).

9 Notwithstanding the details shown in the refuse strategy and the approved plans submitted with this application, the development shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until revised drawings have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority showing the correct bins sizes and adequate provision for the apartment blocks. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details so agreed and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To ensure adequate provision for refuse bins to serve the development and to safeguard the appearance and character of the surrounding area, in accordance with policy 7.4.B of The London Plan 2011 and ensure a high standard of residential quality in accordance with Policy AAP 4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013).

INFORMATIVES

1 The following policies are relevant to this decision:

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) 2015

Policies 2.13, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8, 3.11, 3.12, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.7, 5.11, 5.12, 5.13, 5.18, 6.3, 6.9, 6.13, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.8, 7.13, 7.14, 7.15,

The Harrow Core Strategy (2012)
Core Policies CS1

Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013)
Policies: AAP 1, AAP 4, AAP 5, AAP 9, AAP 11, AAP 13, AAP 19, AAP 20

Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013)
Policies DM 1, DM 2, DM 7, DM 10, DM 12, DM 14, DM 28, DM 42, DM 49

Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (2010)
Supplementary Planning Document – Accessible Homes (2010)
Code of Practice for Storage and Collection of Refuse and Materials for Recycling in Domestic Properties (2008).
Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012)

2 CONSIDERATE CONTRACTOR CODE OF PRACTICE

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

3 PARTY WALL ACT:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
- and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

“The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: Explanatory booklet” is available free of charge from: Communities and Local Government Publications, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Please quote **Product code:** 02 BR 00862 when ordering

Also available for download from the CLG website:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/133214.pdf>

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: communities@twoten.com

4 COMPLIANCE WITH PLANNING CONDITIONS

IMPORTANT: Compliance With Planning Conditions Requiring Submission and Approval of Details Before Development Commences

- You will be in breach of planning permission if you start development without complying with a condition requiring you to do something before you start. For

example, that a scheme or details of the development must first be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- Carrying out works in breach of such a condition will not satisfy the requirement to commence the development within the time permitted.
- Beginning development in breach of a planning condition will invalidate your planning permission.
- If you require confirmation as to whether the works you have carried out are acceptable, then you should apply to the Local Planning Authority for a certificate of lawfulness.

Plan Nos: TBC

ROYAL NATIONAL ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL, BROCKLEY HILL, STANMORE

