

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 9th December 2020

<p>1/01</p>	<p>Addendum Item 1:</p> <p>Consultation Responses Update – Section 4 of the report (pages 33-70).</p> <p>Since the agenda was published, a further 3 consultation responses have been received which have raised an objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Summary of Comments: <u>Canons Park Estate Residents Association</u> The blocks are too high and will look bulky and out of character certainly not convivial in a Grade 2 Conservation Area. No provision has been made to accommodate a lift nor an escalator for those who find it difficult to walk up nor those disabled and in a wheelchair.</p> <p>Please accept this note on behalf of the Canons Park Estate as a refusal to the application for this development</p> <p><u>Aylward Estate Residents Association</u> There should be no development of Canons Park Station car park – or indeed any station car park at all. The car park is full every day (in normal times) so there is evidently no lack of demand. The whole point of station car parks is to encourage people to journey into London by public transport, and to merely state that ‘people should use other forms of transport to get to the station’ is disingenuous. The whole scheme should be cancelled.</p>
<p>2/03</p>	<p>Addendum Item 1:</p> <p><u>Condition on Levels of Occupancy:</u></p> <p>The following condition is recommended:</p> <p>7. <u>Occupancy</u> The House of Multiple Occupancy hereby approved must be occupied by no more than 8 persons at any time. REASON: To protect the amenities of future and neighbouring residential occupiers, in accord with Policy 7.6 of The London Plan (2016), Policy D6 of The Draft London Plan (2019) and Policies DM1 and DM30 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).</p>

2/05	<p>Addendum Item 1:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1. The date of the decision of planning application P/4469/19 corrected from 16/12/2020 to 16/12/2019.</p>
2/06	<p>Addendum Item 1:</p> <p>Due to an administrative error the report for this case was not published in the agenda. Therefore, this case will be reported to committee in January.</p>
3/01	<p>Addendum Item 1:</p> <p>GLA Stage 1 Response</p> <p>Summary of response:</p> <p>Principle of development: The proposal would result in the loss of land designated as open space, the applicant must explore opportunities to provide alternative and or enhanced sports or recreational provision with clear public benefits outweighing this loss. The proposal seeks to introduce a range use that are inappropriate for an out-of-centre location. GLA officers require further discussions with both the Council and the applicant on the rationale for the combination of uses proposed, and the appropriate scope and nature of the sequential site selection test. Whilst elements of the healthcare and educational components of the proposal may be supported where these can be demonstrated to be sustainable, there is a strong policy presumption against the hotel and student housing components.</p> <p>Affordable Student Housing: The proposals do not include details of provision of affordable student accommodation. In the event the student housing proposals are progressed, the applicant should seek to meet the 35% threshold level of affordable student accommodation to be eligible to follow the Fast Track route. Should the scheme fail to meet the 35% threshold, the scheme must follow the Viability Tested Route, a financial viability assessment must be provided, and early and late stage viability reviews must be secured.</p> <p>Urban design: Notwithstanding the impact of the proposals on designated open space, the proposals do not raise strategic concern in terms of overall scale, massing and design.</p> <p>Climate change: The application should be supported by an outline energy strategy and commitment to addressing all required energy policies as required by the London Plan and energy assessment guidance.</p> <p>Transport: Insufficient information has been provided in respect of the transport impacts of the proposals. The applicant must provide a transport assessment to enable detailed assessment of the impacts and transport policy implications.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That Harrow Council be advised that the application does not comply with the London Plan and the Mayor's Intend to Publish London Plan, for the reasons set out in paragraph 51; however, the possible remedies set out in this report could address these deficiencies.</p>

Addendum Item 2:

Legal opinion submitted from the applicant concerning reason for refusal No. 2

Summary of points raised:

- *It is important to note the physical form which the new buildings will take. They would be constructed on land between the ends of stadium stands, in part used as an internal access road, in part for open air storage, turnstiles and in part as parking space. The approach is therefore similar to that taken to the earlier built form, approved on appeal in 2018.*
- *The Planning Statement also argues that the proposals would be ancillary rather than detrimental to the open space and therefore in accordance with the Development Management Policies DPD. The argument is put in terms that the land concerned is of no public value and does not present opportunities for sport and recreation so that there is no conflict with policy.*
- *On the assumption that the proposals are found not to accord with the development plan, that is not the end of the matter because members must go on to consider whether material considerations indicate otherwise – the planning balance.*
- *In my view, the officer’s report is materially deficient, and members should consider the Sport England response and the rejection of the officer’s approach to the application of the open space development plan policies carefully. Similarly, the officer does not engage with the previous appeal decision.*

Addendum Item 3:

**See additional separate letter: “Final ME+ Prince Edward Playing Fields”
(Attached)**

Addendum Item 4:

**See additional separate letter: “6055 Letter and Report”
(Attached)**

AGENDA ITEM 10 – REPRESENTATIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Agenda Item	Application Address	Speakers
1/01	Canons Park Station Car Park (P/0858/20)	Shirley Sackwild (Objector) Steve Skuse (Agent for Applicant) Cllr Ameet Jogia (Back Bench) Cllr Amir Moshenson (Back Bench) Cllr James Lee (Back Bench)
2/01	Land South of Anmer Lodge (P/3109/20)	Theo Demolder (Objector) Lotte Hirst (Agent for Applicant)

2/03	3 Lyncroft Avenue (P/2173/20)	Robert Bruce (Objector) Cllr Richard Almond (Back Bench)
3/01	Prince Edward Playing Fields (P/1564/20)	Sean McGrath (Agent for Applicant)