

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 11th March 2020

2/03	<div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">ADDENDUM INFORMATION</div> <p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u></p> <p>The address on the title page to be changed to 11 Adelaide Close, Stanmore, HA7 3EL & 5 Aylmer Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3EJ</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 2:</u></p> <p>Condition 2 (Approved Drawing and Documents) to be altered as below to reflect the update in the site addresses:</p> <p>The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of 11 Adelaide Close, Stanmore, HA7 3EL & 5 Aylmer Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3EJ.</p> <p>REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 3:</u></p> <p>A late objection has been received from the occupiers of 14 Winscombe Way Stanmore which raises concerns that the outbuilding is used for 3 residential properties which they consider is not permissible under planning rules.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 4:</u></p> <p>A planning application was refused on the same structure on the site on 16/10/2018 (P/3786/18) for the following reason:</p> <p><i>The out-building, by reason of its siting in relation to the neighbouring site boundaries and its excessive scale and height, gives rise to a visually bulky and unduly dominant structure which is out of character with the pattern of development in the locality, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and the visual amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in particular no. 14 Old Forge Close, contrary to the high quality design aspirations of the National planning Policy Framework (2018), policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of The London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS1 (B) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local</i></p>
------	---

Plan (2013) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Design Guide (2010).

It is important to highlight that the current application differs to this application in that two properties are jointly applying to retain the structure whereas the previous application was solely made by the occupiers of 11 Adelaide Close. Officers have come to the view that, provided that it is conditioned to remove permitted development rights to prevent each of the properties from constructing any further outbuildings and that the use is conditioned to be purely ancillary to these dwellings as a shared outbuilding, the scale and bulk is acceptable. Both 11 Adelaide Close and 5 Aylmer Drive currently have permitted development rights. If it were desired the occupiers of no. 5 could build an outbuilding of a similar scale. The removal of permitted development rights for both properties safeguards the potential of either dwelling constructing outbuildings which could potentially cover up to 50% of the garden area. The applicant has submitted a planning statement which supports this argument.

A certificate of lawfulness has been issued for an outbuilding of a larger footprint on the site. The current structure has a maximum height of 2.67 beside the shared boundaries and as such is slightly over what is allowable under permitted development (2.5m). Due to the site circumstances, the harm to the occupiers of neighbouring properties is not considered to be significant and it has been deemed to be not expedient to take enforcement action. Planning Officers have therefore taken the view that the similarities to permitted development is a material consideration in the determination of the current application which has led to the recommendation to grant the application. In addition, due to the unique site circumstances this is not likely to set an undesirable precedent for the area and if both the properties do not construct further structures in the garden the impact on the character of the area is considered acceptable. An appeal at 1 The Spinney in Stanmore (APP/M5450/d/12/2175672) for a pool building of bigger dimensions than the application site was allowed which also supports the officer's recommendation for this application.

2/04

Addendum Item 1:

The date given in Recommendation B is incorrect, as are some policy references. This should read as follows:

RECOMMENDATION B

That if the Section 106 Agreement is not completed by 10th June 2020, or such extended period as may be agreed by the Interim Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, then it is recommended to delegate the decision to REFUSE planning permission to the Interim Chief Planning Officer on the grounds that:

The proposed development, in the absence of a Legal Agreement to provide appropriate improvements, benefits and monitoring through a Travel Plan that directly relates to the development, would fail to adequately mitigate the traffic and parking impact of the development on the wider area arising directly from the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 6.3, 6.9 and 6.13 of The London Plan (2016), policy T3 of the Draft London Plan (2019); Core Strategy (2012) policy CS1, and policies DM42 and DM50 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan.

Agenda Item 10 – Representations on Planning Applications

Item2/01	Proposed Article 4 Directions — Stanmore and Edgware.	Councillor Marliyn Ashton — Backbencher
Item2/03	11 Adelaide Close HA7 3EL and 5 Aylmer Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3EJ — P/5043/19.	Mr Robert Daboul — Objector Mr J Shah — Applicant Councillor Marliyn Ashton — Backbencher