

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE: 20th January 2021

1/01	<p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u></p> <p>Consultation Responses Update – Section 4 of the report (pages 33-70).</p> <p>Since the agenda was published, a consultation response has been received in objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Summary of Comments: Officer report is full of subjective judgements seemingly politically pressured by NPPF 2019 and the Mayor of London; Design Panel consisting of members who are promoters and advisors to the developers, and who also chair the planning committee, and are also on the Standards Committee, makes one doubt that the adjudication of this and other Catalyst car park schemes will be free of conflicts of interest; whole sections of evidence in the report being lifted from the ‘expert advice’ from commissioned PR firms who claim to be able to get schemes through planning application, also makes the report highly suspect; The consultation was a farce, with the scheme being decided well before it was presented to the local residents, with no substantial changes that would have modulated the scheme to respond to local objections; sheer architectural and planning vandalism, dictated to by political pressure to bolster housing numbers; This scheme, if it proceeds will literally wreck the heart of Canons Park environs and would be a disaster inflicted by bureaucracy rather than the proper humane ideals of planning; Would be a crushing blow to long-standing residents of Canon Park, of every political persuasion; urge the planners at this late stage, to rescind their report, and request the Planning Committee to refuse this bulky overdevelopment that the officers have recommended for grant, and to completely redesign the scheme to the proper scale and character of the site.</p> <p>I hope you will support the human rights of local residents and people of Harrow to a decent living environment and preservation of their's and one of the Borough's most cherished assets, the historic Canons Park, which is at risk of having it's setting and surroundings destroyed by this ghastly proposal; The views of Historic England, The Garden Trust, the London Parks and Garden Trust and the Conservation Area Advisory Committee, Friends of Canons Park, Canons Park Residents' Association, Wyel Lodge, Canons Park Close and the End House, together with the huge number of objectors and petitioners in the area who all provide compelling reasons to refuse the scheme; It is risible to claim that the design “embraces and complements the heritage setting of the site enlivening Donnefield Avenue and activating the entrance to Canons Park’ when such an overbearing and massive cliff towering over the narrow road, which actually destroys the whole aspect of the site and the relationship with</p>
------	---

Canons Park; This site merits special consideration and this project must not be allowed to proceed in this form.

The design simply is not “sympathetic or complementary to the historic context of the adjacent Canons Park” and consultants MOLA leave out important viewpoints, such as the view looking towards the site when entering from Whitchurch Lane; the proposed housing scheme of urban-scaled mansion buildings will tower over the landscape, ruining the harmony and atmosphere of the park; only 22 out of 118 units for ‘affordable rent’, (18.6%, much less than the earlier 33% promised) even less than has been allocated in some earlier schemes, which does not justify the claims that this is generally an affordable project; the public benefits are relatively no better or worse than any other scheme that could be built elsewhere in the Borough; this scheme as with most of the car park TfL schemes being forced through throughout London does not fit the bill, and using a not-fit-for-purpose Planning Framework which allows the Councils or developers to use the NPPF para 196 that would allow any scheme to claim such a benefit; one cannot balance out the benefits of the meagre units of real affordable housing to a borough or London wide community, which can presumably be obtained by building on the many other sites on offer; seems odd that we hear that the Rayner’s Lane car park development proposal, which would ideally take a much larger development has been shelved or deferred, when this very special and sensitive site at Canons Park is being bulldozed through with great urgency;

There are so many contradictions, mitigations, off-sets, trade-offs and managing of details to make this scheme comply, indicate the real underlying lack of sustainability and acceptability to planning norms required for such a sensitive site when proposing such a scheme; This development is anything but sustainable and must be refused and totally reconsidered in response to local residents’ recommendations; Please urge the Planning Committee to refuse this awful and inappropriate scheme and call for a redesign limited to three storeys and a more imaginative use of architecture, possibly with terraces and planted balconies, creating the effect of a ‘hanging garden’ to relate to the historic park and its landscape.

1/02

Addendum Item 1:

Consultation Responses Update – Section 4 of the report:

Comments received from LBH Environmental Health Officer:

There are some concerns in relation to the development’s close proximity to Waitrose in relation to plant noise, deliveries etc. Therefore, if Committee is minded to grant permission conditions should be attached.

Addendum Item 2:

Replacement of Condition 14 with the following wording:

No air extraction system shall be used on the premises until a scheme for the control of noise and odour emanating from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include such combination of measures as may be approved by the LPA. Thereafter, the scheme shall be implemented and maintained in full compliance with the approved measures.

Addition of pre-commencement condition: Demolition and Construction Management Plan

Prior to development commencing, the applicant shall submit a demolition and construction management plan to the Local Planning Authority for its approval. The plan shall detail:

- (i) The hours during which development works will occur (Mon-Fri 8-6pm, Saturday 8-1pm, no noisy works Sundays or bank holidays).
- (ii) A programme to demonstrate that the most valuable or potentially contaminating materials and fittings can be removed safely and intact for later re-use or processing.
- iii) Traffic management and access arrangements (vehicular and pedestrian) and parking provisions for contractors during the development process (including measures to reduce the numbers of construction vehicles accessing the site during peak hours).
- (iv) The storage of demolition/construction materials on site. The approved details shall be implemented and maintained throughout the duration of the demolition and construction process.

REASON: To ensure that measures are put in place to manage and reduce noise, vibration and health risks during demolition and construction and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Addition of operational condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the following has been completed in accordance with the specified supporting plans and/or documents:
Noise Assessment - Report ref 193000-04.

Thereafter the development shall be retained/maintained in accordance with these details for as long as the development remains in existence

REASONS: To protect the amenities of existing and future occupiers.

Addendum Item 3:

Dwelling mix updated on page 7 (Planning Fact Sheet) of Delegated Officers Report:

Unit Type	No.	%
Studio	10	5%
1 bed (2 person)	83	43%
2 bed (4 person)	70	37%
3 bed	28	15%
Total	191	100

Addendum Item 4:

Paragraph 4.7 updated to stated **4 objections** were received after the second round of consultation.

Addendum Item 5:

Proposed birds eye view of development updated in Appendix 4 of Delegated Officers Report:



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) Mike Turner (Objector) Steve Skuse (Agent for Applicant) David Wakeford (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)
2/02	Bankfield Cottages, Ass House Lane (P/3983/20)	Cllr Stephen Greek (Back Bench)