
Item: 1/01
5-14 BECKET FOLD, HARROW, HA1 2LA **P/3102/10**
Ward GREENHILL

DEMOLITION OF TWO SINGLE STOREY TERRACES (COMPRISING 10 RESIDENTIAL UNITS); REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE PART 2/PART 3 STOREY BUILDING COMPRISING 13 RESIDENTIAL UNITS FOR OLDER PEOPLE; PROVISION OF 6 PARKING SPACES WITH ACCESS FROM COURTFIELD CRESCENT AND LANDSCAPING

Applicant: Harrow Churches Housing Association
Agent: jcmt architects
Case Gerard Livett
Officer:
Statutory Expiry Date: | 11-FEB-2011

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT permission subject to completion of a section 106 agreement and authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal Services to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement.

The S.106 Agreement Heads of Terms would cover the following matters:

- (i) Provision of 100% Affordable Housing (all general needs/social rented)
- (ii) Occupation of the development by people over the age of 60.
- (iii) Payment of Harrow Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the legal agreement
- (iv) Payment of £500.00 planning administration fee.

REASON:

The decision to grant permission has been taken on the basis that the redevelopment of the existing bungalows and their replacement with new elderly persons' accommodation would meet an identified need for such accommodation in the borough and is acceptable in principle on this previously developed site in accordance with Policies 2A.1 and EP20 of the LP and HUDP. The physical impact of the development on neighbouring residential properties, including the impacts from visitors to the site can be satisfactorily addressed by the development and through the conditions and s106 agreement. The design of the building, its size and siting are not considered to result in any unacceptable impacts upon the amenities of surrounding properties. The design and architectural style, whilst departing from the character of properties in Courtfield Crescent is considered to be acceptable and would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Having regard to the representations received and all other material planning considerations, the proposed development is therefore considered, on balance, to satisfy national and development plan policy objectives and the objectives of the adopted SPD's set out below.

Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing (2010)
Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2011)
Planning Policy Statement 22 – Planning for Renewable Energy (2004)

London Plan:

- 2A.1 – Sustainability Criteria
- 3A.1 – Increasing London’s supply of housing
- 3A.2 – Borough housing targets
- 3A.3 – Maximising the potential of sites
- 3A.4 – Efficient use of stock
- 3A.5 – Housing choice
- 3A.6 – Quality of new housing provision
- 3A.8 – Definition of Affordable Housing
- 3A.9 – Affordable housing targets
- 3A.11 – Affordable housing thresholds
- 3A.13 – Special needs and specialist housing
- 3A.17 – Addressing the needs of London’s diverse population
- 3C.1 – Integrating transport and development
- 3C.2 – Matching development to transport capacity
- 3C.23 – Parking Strategy
- 4A.1 – Tackling climate change
- 4A.2 – Mitigating climate change
- 4A.3 – Sustainable design and construction
- 4A.4 – Energy assessment
- 4A.7 – Renewable energy
- 4A.9 – adaptation to climate change
- 4A.11 – Living roofs and walls
- 4A.14 – Sustainable drainage
- 4B.1 – Design principles for a compact city
- 4B.8 – Respect local context and communities

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- S1 – The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use
- D4 – The Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 – Residential Amenity
- D9 – Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
- D10 – Trees and New Development
- H7 – Dwelling Mix
- H10 – Maintenance and Improvement to Existing Housing Stock
- H11 – Presumption Against the Loss of Residential Land and Buildings
- H13 – Sheltered Accommodation
- H17 – Access for Special Households with Particular Needs
- EP12 – Control of surface water run-off
- EP20 – Use of Previously Developed Land
- EP26 – Habitat Creation and Enhancement
- EP27 – Species Protection
- EP28 – Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
- T6 – The Transport Impact of Development Proposals
- T13 – Parking Standards
- C16 – Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (2010)
Supplementary Planning Document, Accessible Homes (2010)
Sustainable Planning Document, Sustainable Building Design (2009)
Interim London Housing Design Guide (2010)
Code of Practice for the Storage and Collection of Refuse and Materials for Recycling in Domestic Properties (2008)
Harrow Biodiversity Action Plan (2008)
London Biodiversity Action Plan (2000)
Manual for Streets (2007)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (The London Plan 2008, Saved Policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004 and any other relevant guidance)

- 1) Background and principle of development (PPS1, PPS3, PPG13, 2A.1, 3A.1, 3A.2, 3A.3, 4B.1, 4B.8, S1, EP20, D4, H11, H13, H17, SPD)
- 2) Character and Appearance of the Area (PPS1, PPS3, 4B.1, 4B.8, D4, D9, D10, SPD)
- 3) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers (D4, D5, SPD)
- 4) Housing Quality, Affordable Housing, Elderly person's housing (PPS3, 3A.1, 3A.2, 3A.3, 3A.4, 3A.5, 3A.6, 3A.8, 3A.9, 3A.10, 3A.11, 3A.13, 3A.17, D4, H7, H13, H17, C16, SPD)
- 5) Transport Implications (PPG13, 3C.1, 3C.2, 3C.23, T6, T13, MfS)
- 6) Sustainable Development (PPS22, 4A.1, 4A.2, 4A.3, 4A.7, 4A.9, 4A.11, 4A.14, EP12, EP26, EP27, EP28, D4, BAP)
- 7) S17 Crime & Disorder Act (D4)
- 8) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

This application is referred to the Planning Committee as it is major development recommended for approval and therefore is outside the scope of the Scheme of Delegation.

a) Summary

Statutory Return Type:	Smallscale major housing
Site Area	1675 m ²
No. of residential units	13
Habitable Rooms	35
Density	209 hrph, 78 dph
Car Parking	Standard 11
	Justified 6
	Provided 6
PTAL rating	2
Lifetime Homes	13
Wheelchair Homes	2
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- The application relates to a 1675 sq.m. site, Becket Fold, with vehicle access from the north east corner of Courtfield Crescent, and pedestrian access from Richards Close to the south east. The site is currently occupied by ten studio bungalows (each with 30 sq.m. floorspace in one terrace of four and one terrace of six. The entrance to the site is between Nos. 6 and 7 Courtfield Crescent and would, in part, incorporate part of the former gardens of those properties.
- The site is bounded by amenity space associated with Duffield Close to the northwest, the garden area of Ewart House (on Richards Close) to the northeast, the flank wall and rear garden of No. 7 Courtfield Crescent to the southeast and the rear garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent and the rear and flank wall of No. 6 Courtfield Crescent to the southwest.
- There is a footpath, which is not a public right of way, at the southeast of the site which provided access between Courtfield Crescent and Ewart House and Richards Close.
- There is a large allotment garden area to the rear of Nos. 7 – 14 Courtfield Crescent and Richards Close.
- No 6 Courtfield Crescent is divided into two flats, and No. 7 Courtfield Crescent is a house in multiple occupation.
- The properties in Courtfield Crescent are two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses, with red brick finish on the ground floor and natural render on the upper floors, some of which have been extended with rear, side or with roof extensions.
- The properties in Duffield Close, to the northwest, comprise three flat-roofed three-storey blocks of flats. Beyond Duffield Close is Catherine Place, a three-storey block of flats with accommodation in the roofspace.
- Ewart House is a part three part four-storey building (with four storeys nearest to the site) with a flat roof with white rendered walls and contrasting blue tile surrounds on the recessed balconies.
- Courtfield Crescent itself is relatively narrow and has double yellow lines and no on-street parking provision.

c) Proposal Details

- Demolition of existing bungalows and redevelopment to provide a part two/part three-storey flat-roofed building containing thirteen flats, (9 two-bedroom and 4 one-bedroom) for affordable housing for independent elderly persons (over sixty years of age), six parking spaces and associated landscaping.
- The proposed building would be a maximum of 18.6m wide, 30m deep with the three storey element of the building being 9.7m high (excluding roof-mounted solar panels), and the two storey element being 6.9m high. The design incorporates a 3m deep and 5m wide two-storey rectangular bay projection at the front.
- The three-storey element of the building would be set 8m behind the front bay projection and would be set in from the front part of the two-storey element, by 2m at the western flank and by between 3m and 6m on the western flank.

- The building would be orientated roughly north-south and would be parallel to the western flank wall of Ewart House. The building would be set at an angle to the properties in Courtfield Crescent and Duffield Close.
- The proposed block of flats would at its closest point be 20m from the flank wall of Ewart House, 3.5m from the southeast corner of Duffield Close, 3m from the northeast corner of No. 7 Courtfield Crescent and 4.5m from the northeast corner of No. 6 Courtfield Crescent.
- The proposal would provide two one-bedroom wheelchair standard flats and three two-bedroom flats on the ground floor; two one-bedroom flats and three two-bedroom flats on the first floor and three two-bedroom flats on the second floor, with each flat, apart from two ground floor one-bedroom flats and one first-floor one-bedroom flat having more than one aspect. Access to the building would be from Courtfield Crescent, with the entrance to the building facing the vehicular access from Courtfield Crescent. Pedestrian access would also be provided from Richards Close
- The proposal would incorporate an accessible lift serving all floors; a covered canopy entrance area on the eastern side of the building (facing Ewart House) providing four spaces for parking and charging mobility scooters.
- The refuse storage would be in an integral enclosed area at the front of the property near the Courtfield Crescent entrance.
- The proposal would provide a total of six parking spaces in the western part of the site (near the rear garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent). Two of the spaces would be wheelchair accessible.
- The parking area would have a control barrier, to ensure that spaces provided are available only to residents of the development.
- The proposal would incorporate a high level of soft landscaping, including a sensory garden, a pergola area, and a minimum of 10 new trees to replace the four trees that would be removed to facilitate the development.
- The roof of the two storey part of the building at the front of the property would be a green roof, with access limited to maintenance only.
- The proposal would be built to Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and would achieve a 25% reduction in CO2 emissions above current Building Regulations standards. On-site generation would be provided through roof-mounted photovoltaic and solar water panels.

d) Relevant History

HAR/8355/B	Erect old peoples flatlets (outline)	GRANTED 19-FEB-65
LBH/666	Convert house to four flatlets and erect 10 flatlets	GRANTED 10-NOV-65
LBH/666/1	Convert house to four flatlets and erect 10 flatlets (revised)	GRANTED 02-JUN-66
WEST/497/94/FUL	Use of Warden's flat as administrative offices	REFUSED 26-SEP-94 APPEAL DISMISSED 20-SEP-95

Reasons for refusal:

The proposals would introduce commercial activity into a residential area which would be out of character and detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers

Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's minimum requirements in respect of the development, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway(s) would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highway and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The proposed change of use would result in loss of residential accommodation, contrary to the relevant policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

WEST/164/95/FUL	Continued use of Wardens flat as administrative offices for two year period (revised)	REFUSED 20-DEC-95
-----------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

As WEST/497/94/FUL

Planning permission P/2843/08 dated 28-Mar-09 granted planning permission for the redevelopment of the former two-storey blocks of flats on Richards Close to provide Ewart House, a three- and four-storey building providing 46 extra care units and 7 flats for affordable rent and Abigail House, a three-storey building providing 22 flats for shared ownership.

A Unilateral Undertaking dated 20-Mar-09 and attached to that planning permission committed the owner of the site known as 9-14 Becket Fold to redevelop the site for affordable housing within a ten-year period from the date of the Agreement, subject to funding from the Homes and Communities Agency being available. Should such funding not be available, then the owner committed to demolish all buildings on the site of 9-14 Becket Fold within that ten year period. This Unilateral Undertaking was secured to mitigate the overbearing impact of the four-storey development at Richard's Close on the occupiers of the bungalows at 9-14 Becket Fold.

e) Pre-Application Discussion

PAT/ENQ/00097/05/08/09 (Two options for a four storey building providing 26 flats)

Advice given included: Four storey building would be overdominant and out of context with surrounding properties; increased impact on Courtfield Crescent, poor relationship with Richards Close development; non-compliance with 45° code; no buffer between parking area and adjoining garden; advised to design a frontage that addresses the street scene in a more obvious way

HA\2009\ENQ\00097 (Three-storey block of 19 sheltered flats)

The principle basis of discussion was the proposed scale, form and siting of the three storey flats and the potential impact upon privacy and outlook from the surrounding properties and upon the character and appearance of the area. Advice included the need for greater sensitivity with regard to building form, layout and design. In particular, the orientation and apparent bulk of the block was considered inappropriate.

Any increase on overlooking of the gardens in Courtfield Crescent was also highlighted as a matter of considerable concern, and the proposed building's relationship to these properties and the development under construction (Ewart House) were thought to require further consideration.

HA\2010\ENQ\00048 (Three-storey block of 15 flats)

Issues raised included: scale and set back of two storey element; design of building and whether a pitched roof building could be considered; materials, location of windows. Amended plans were received showing reduction to 13 flats and reduced second floor area, though still maintaining flat roof design. The scale and mass of the building, in relation to Courtfield Crescent, more acceptable in relation to the scale of properties in this street, with the 3 storey element responding to the scale of Duffield Close flats. Revised orientation of building would respect 45° code; windows would not result in direct overlooking of neighbouring windows at a distance of less than 20m; the angle of the building on the site, distances to boundaries, and proposed landscaping mitigated the potential impact of this development. Concern highlighted particularly at second floor north facing windows, for some overlooking of the rear garden area for the Duffield Road flats.

On 4th November 2010 a public meeting was held at the Council, with the applicants agents attending, to outline the pre-application scheme and for residents to provide comments on the scheme. The issues regarding Phase 1, Richards Close development, were raised, however the focus of the meeting was clearly stated to be the proposals for Becket Fold. The following matters were raised and discussed:-

- Parking management
- Occupancy – age and level
- Building height
- Conflict with use of No.s 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent
- Roof design
- Overall Design
- Terraces
- Potential overlooking
- Distances to boundaries
- Relationship to Boundaries
- Quality of proposed plans online
- Construction Impacts
- Landscaping
- Parking management

The meeting was attended by 13 local residents and two ward councillors.

f) Applicant Statement

Design and Access Statement

Current bungalows are not suitable for modern needs

Demolition of bungalows is required by a Legal Agreement which also allows for the redevelopment of the site, subject to planning permission

Current proposal has been arrived at following pre-application advice from the local planning authority

Proposal would help meet Harrow's Older Person's Housing Strategy

Becket Fold is suitable for enhancement as it is close to the town centre, and residents would benefit from communal facilities at Richards Close extra care scheme

Site has good transport links

Area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings with some infill three and four-storey blocks of flats

Scheme would allow for improvement of pedestrian access and natural overlooking of paths

Design addresses layout of Courtfield Crescent

Proposal complies with 45 degree code and has a good orientation

Parking would be screened by landscaping

Height of building would be similar to nearby properties

Design of building takes its cue from surrounding properties and would have materials to match street properties and the nearby Ewart House

Alignment of building would avoid direct overlooking of neighbouring properties, but would provide natural surveillance of Courtfield Crescent

Building would comply with BRE requirements on sunlight and daylight in its own right and with respect to neighbouring properties

Proposal would protect existing trees

Proposal would provide improved landscaping

Part of building would have a green roof

Proposal would provide a mix of units, including two Wheelchair Standard Homes

Proposal provides six parking spaces and four mobility scooter spaces

Proposal would comply with principles and practices of safer places and secured by design

Proposal will achieve a high 'Building for Life' score

Proposal would meet Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and include on-site generation

Planning Statement

In addition to the points raised in the Design and Access Statement, the following comments have been included within the planning statement

Proposal is second phase of Richard's Close site.

Harrow Churches Housing Association delivers affordable housing for older people

Becket Fold development will be for people aged 60 years and over

Mix of properties will cater for differing family circumstances, including couples who may not be able to share a room due to care needs or who need a spare room for a carer or family member

Proposal is in accordance with national, regional and local planning policy and guidance

Proposal has been the subject of considerable pre-application negotiation

Construction Method Statement (Appendix 6)

Vehicular access will be from A409 Sheepcote Road, Bonnersfield Lane, Courtfield Avenue and Courtfield Crescent

Site will operate a 'no parking' restriction for supply chain operatives. Other parking arrangements will be off street

Normal working hours will be Monday to Friday 0800 – 1730 with Saturday working by exception and no working on Sundays

Notification of residents will be given for demolition, noisy activities, road and footpath closures if required and specialist equipment deliveries

Storage and construction activity will be limited to the site

Arboricultural Implications Assessment

Trees on site are a mixture of B and C class trees

Four trees would need to be removed

Protection for retained trees to BS 5837:2005 would be in place throughout the construction process

No storage of potentially injurious materials would be permitted within 15m of any stem, and no fires would be lit within 5m of drip line of any retained tree

Renewable Energy Feasibility Report

Wind turbines would not be appropriate for this project

Photovoltaics could be a viable option

Solar thermal could also be viable, but would not achieve full 20% renewable energy requirement and would need additional renewable sources

Biomass heating or biomass combined heat and power would be difficult to deliver given the constraints of the site and would not be feasible for this project

Ground source heat pumps could make a contribution to the sustainability of the project, but would have costs associated with geotechnical survey and boreholes

Sustainability Report

Proposal would meet Code Level 3

Proposal would incorporate solar water heating and solar photovoltaic tile

Proposal would incorporate soft landscaping and a green roof

Proposal would use sustainable materials and sustainable construction methods

Daylight and Sunlight Report

Assessment has been carried out with respect to Ewart House, 19-24 Duffield Close, 5-8 (inclusive) Courtfield Crescent.

No site facing windows are orientated within 90 degrees of due south and are therefore not material for assessment in sunlight terms.

Ewart House is BRE compliant in daylight terms

19-24 Duffield Close have no windows facing onto the site and will be BRE compliant in daylight terms

5 Courtfield Crescent: Proposed development falls below a 25 degree angle from the lowest site facing window, and development is unlikely to have a substantial effect on diffuse skylight.

6 Courtfield Crescent: One habitable room window would suffer a loss of daylighting, but this would be to a secondary window serving that bedroom. 6 Courtfield Crescent will be BRE compliant in daylight terms

7 Courtfield Crescent: No first floor habitable windows face onto site. Ground floor kitchen/dining room window faces the site, but this is a secondary window.

8 Courtfield Crescent: No windows in this building face the site, so it will be BRE compliant in daylight terms.

The proposal as a whole would result in fully BRE compliant levels of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing.

Transport Statement

Proposal site has good public transport links with buses, underground and overground services nearby

Immediate area has robust parking controls

No specified cycle routes in proximity of site

Access to site is 3m wide

Proposal would generate a maximum additional 6 morning peak trips (2 by car) and 8 afternoon trips (3 by car)

Local roads have parking stress levels between 33% and 100%

Council's standards for Sheltered Housing would require four spaces and one warden space

Access to car park would be barrier controlled

Sufficient parking is available within a four minute walk to accommodate over-spill parking

Generated peak hour traffic flows can be accommodated on existing highway network without any adverse impact

Community Involvement Report

Consultation began in September 2010 and included a public exhibition, contact with councillors and a door to door resident's survey.

800 leaflets delivered to local community on 23 September 2010.

Second leaflet distribution on 7 October 2010

Public exhibition with 28 attendees on 28 September 2010

g) Consultations

Courtfield Residents Association: This proposed development involving the replacement of 10 single storey, one room flatlets (max 10 persons) by a three storey block of 16 x one & two bedroom flats represents an unacceptable increase in the local population, possibly as many as 50 residents as opposed to the existing 10.

The proposed design for the building of three storeys is out of character for the neighbourhood where all original properties are two storeys. It is too big, too high and the site is too crowded.

Proposed design is out of character with 1920s built, two storey 'Villa' style properties and is visually unsympathetic, out of character with the locality and intrudes well above the existing roof lines.

The proximity of the proposed building to other properties in the street will result in overlooking and a loss of privacy for residents in these properties.

There is confusion in the planning application whereby potential residents are sometimes referred to as 'Elderly', implying that would be different to 'normal' people, e.g. being very quiet, not requiring cars and so on. Other times they are referred to as 'over 55s', ordinary people free to own as many cars and make as much noise as they like. This association would ask for clarification on precisely the criteria on which potential residents will be selected.

There is a significant lack of parking facilities for the large numbers of likely residents. Unless residents are specifically forbidden from owning cars there could be as many as 30/40 vehicles competing for the few available parking spaces. When needs of visitors, including doctors, nurses, social workers, healthcare workers, cleaners, administrators and friends and family are considered, demand for parking will far exceed the allocated spaces. All the adjacent streets are 'double yellow lines' a restriction introduced to allow access for emergency vehicles due to the narrow roads. Without adequate parking within Becket Fold visitors will almost certainly block access and cause damage to grass verges and problems for highway safety.

A previous planning application for no 6 Courtfield Crescent was turned down on parking grounds.

Residents of 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent habitually use the parking facilities at Becket Fold.

Noise and disturbance will almost certainly increase. Apart from the large number of residents and visitors, the regular refuse collections from the enlarged site will certainly cause added nuisance.

Courtfield Crescent and Courtfield Avenue were constructed during the 1920s as part of the 'Metroland' expansion of greater London. The two roads were an idyllic backwater with pleasant front gardens, grass verges and tree-lined streets. Cars being an indulgence of the wealthy, very few had garages.

At its conception the area backed onto fields and orchards, providing the perfect environment for the new middle-classes to bring up their children.

The passage of time has seen this idyll destroyed. Front gardens have been turned into parking spaces, verges turned into muddy approaches and many of the trees dying and not replaced.

Becket Fold - an HCHA development in the back gardens of nos 6 and 7 Courtfield Crescent and the opening of the footpath to the Elmgrove area increased the number of pedestrians enormously.

Duffield Close in the 1960s added another 30 or so flats to the area.

In the 1980s the destruction of the Herga Tennis and Squash Club resulted in the development of two further blocks of flats at Middlesex Court and three more at Catherine Place.

More recently the construction of Richards Close with its hideous design and without proper consultation has blighted the neighbourhood.

The members of this Residents Association understand the pressure to develop more housing resources in the Harrow area but feel that this area in particular has suffered severely from overdevelopment in the past and that this should now stop.

It should be added that we do understand that the existing properties at Becket Fold are not acceptable by modern standards and accept that they need replacing, but would suggest a new single storey or maximum two storeys accommodating no more than the current number of tenants and with adequate parking facilities.

Environment Agency: Proposal has a low environmental risk

Thames Water: There are public sewers crossing the site

Drainage Engineers: Conditions required for foul and surface water drainage and surface water storage and attenuation.

Waste Management: Proposals are acceptable

Housing Enabling: This application contributes towards meeting the needs identified in the 2005 review, and confirmed in the Supported Accommodation Strategy 2010, and is therefore supported by Housing.

Planning Policy: Principle of replacement of C3 use with C3 use is acceptable

Highways Engineers: Proposal would result in a net increase of three units. Allocated parking provision is within UDP and London Plan maximum standards. This is acceptable given low car ownership anticipated by this type of development and stringent on-street parking controls in wider area. Internal road layout conforms to Manual for Streets provisions. Additional generated traffic can be accommodated by existing infrastructure. No highways objection.

Landscape Architect: Proposal acceptable in principle, but landscaping conditions required

Planning Arboricultural Officer: Proposed landscape plans are acceptable, provided tree protection measures and new planting are implemented

Building Control: Proposals would comply with Level 3 of Code for Sustainable Homes

Advertisement: Major Development Expiry: 16-DEC-10

Notifications:

Sent : 224

Replies : 14 (at 16-02-11)

Expiry: 17-FEB-11

Includes 4 representations in support of the proposal

Neighbours consulted:

Richards Close: Hines Court, Fenn Court, Challiner Court, Price Court (all flats)

Becket Fold: 1-14 (consecutive)

Courtfield Crescent: 2-20 (consecutive)

Duffield Close: 1-24 (consecutive)

Courtfield Avenue: 42-64 (even)

Elmgrove Crescent: 45-107 (odd)

Grange Road: 33-75 (odd)

Hill Crescent: 31-41 (odd)

Hill Road: 1-23 (odd)

Catherine Place: Leaf House (flats 1-24)
Greenhill Allotments

Summary of Responses:

- Proposal represents back garden development, contrary to planning policy
- Original restrictions on what had been garden land limiting it to single-storey have lapsed and allowed this to become a three-storey building. Proposal should be limited to a single storey
- Local opposition: Proposal does not take into consideration the views of the local community.
- Lack of consultation on phase one has created mistrust with the Council and the applicant
- No proper community engagement before the proposals were submitted. There was no resident input in the design stage. An alternative scheme suggested by a resident was not considered.
- A meeting organised by the Council was only one week before the plans were submitted
- Residents not involved in pre-application process
- Phase one of the development (Richards Close) has created an overdevelopment in the area: Phase two will add to this overdevelopment in a suburban space
- Taking into account the 76 dwellings in Phase 1, Harrow Churches will have an overdominating presence in Courtfield Crescent
- Both phases should have been submitted together
- Demolition of garage at No. 7 was done to enlarge the proposal site
- Overdevelopment of the site, raising the number of occupants from 10 to a maximum of 44
- Proposed building would be too high and out of scale with two-storey houses in Courtfield Crescent
- Out of character as three-storey building with solar panels on roof would not complement two-storey dwellinghouses and materials palette does not complement nearby dwellinghouses
- Materials out of character with housing in Courtfield Crescent
- Proposal would be visually intrusive
- Bin storage area would have 9m long metal grilles at high level which would be out of keeping with frontages in the area. Bin store should be relocated.
- Use of flat roofs with parapet is out of character with Courtfield Crescent
- Forty-five degree code has been applied simplistically to maximise site coverage and results in the corners of the building being too close to the boundaries of the site
- Flat roof design has been used to maximise floorspace
- Design of building is out of character with Courtfield Crescent or Duffield Close. Ewart House should not set a precedent
- Layout and siting inappropriate in itself and in relation to adjacent buildings, spaces and views

- Land should be used for green space to provide better amenity space for Ewart House
- Three-storey building would ruin skyline and would result in perceived overlooking and overcrowding
- Proposed block of flats, by virtue of its bulk, massing and position, would be overbearing from rear gardens, especially when viewed in conjunction with Ewart House
- Proposal will exacerbate feeling of over-building and overdominance following Richard's Close
- Loss of privacy from overlooking of back gardens
- Noise and disturbance as parking area would be adjacent to gardens
- Disturbance and disruption from increased people on the site, vehicle and pedestrian movements and service vehicle activity
- Age restrictions will apply to main tenant only and could result in younger people or even children living there
- Potential for age restriction and tenure type to be removed, leading to general market housing
- Proposal description on application form is wrong as the whole development would not be for independent older people as main tenant only has to satisfy age restriction
- Insufficient parking which could lead to illegal parking on double yellow lines or blocking driveways and potentially block emergency service vehicles, especially as 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent have no parking spaces
- Inevitable overspill parking on Courtfield Crescent
- Previous decisions refused a change of use of first floor of 6 Courtfield Crescent to office use due to inadequate parking provision
- Loss of garage at No. 7 Courtfield Crescent
- Problems with access to the site by construction vehicles, especially if they are queuing to enter the site
- Construction method statement does not address issues of how much plant will be required, sizes of vehicles, mud deposits on the carriageway
- Problems with access by emergency vehicles and to owners of properties in Courtfield Crescent
- Representations have also included comments on the handling of the Phase 1 development
- In addition to the objections to the scheme, four representations supporting the proposal have been received. These note that the previous bungalows were no longer suitable and that the new accommodation at Ewart House is of a high standard, and that updated accommodation at Becket Fold would represent a significant improvement in terms of housing quality.

APPRAISAL

1) Background and principle of development

The proposals are for the redevelopment of previously developed land at Becket Fold to provide new residential accommodation. National Planning policies PPS1 and PPS3, the London Plan (2008) and local policies are broadly supportive of the provision of new residential development within sustainable locations such as this site. As previously developed land, the proposals would comply with the aims of PPS3, London Plan policy 2A.1 and UDP policy EP20. There would be no net loss of residential accommodation, in accordance with the aims of UDP policy H11, and the proposal would contribute to the supply of new housing in the Borough, in accordance with the aims of London Plan policies 3A.1, 3A.2 and 3A.3.

The applicants have stated that the existing bungalows are no longer suitable for the particular client group and fall well short of current standards. Policy H17 of the Harrow UDP seeks to ensure that new housing is provided to meet the boroughs housing needs. The Councils Supporting Older People Strategy (2010) highlights provision of supported accommodation for elderly people as an area of particular priority in the borough. Given that there is an identified need within the borough for affordable housing for independent older people, the provision of new, tailored housing to replace the existing bungalows, is therefore acceptable in principle.

Representations have been received noting that the Becket Fold site used to be part of the garden of No. 6 Courtfield Crescent, and includes part of the side and rear garden of No. 7 Courtfield Crescent. The representations argue that the proposal effectively amounts to 'garden grabbing'. Despite the removal of residential gardens from the definition of previously-developed land in the 2010 revision of PPS3, in this case the majority of the site is considered to be previously-developed land as the current layout of bungalows and communal car parking space has been in place since the 1960's. Part of the side and rear garden of No. 7 Courtfield Crescent, to be included in the new development site, is currently in use as part of the shared garden to that property. The majority of this part of the site would be landscaped as part of the curtilage of the new development. The corner of the building (2 storeys) would nevertheless project some 1.8m into this garden area. The revision of PPS3 does not however contain an automatic presumption against the development of garden land. Instead, the impacts of developing on garden land need to be objectively assessed against any benefit.

Recent appeal decisions within and outside the borough have explored the implications of the changes to PPS3 and officers note that this area is still subject of some debate. Inspectors have concluded that where no explicit policy objectives are contradicted, development in gardens may still be appropriate in the context of making effective use of land within urban areas.

Within Harrow, development is steered towards previously developed land by Policy EP20 – and officers consider that the comprehensive re-development of the bungalows, with their communal garden space and shared parking, falls under this description. The Development Plan for Harrow also contains policies that support the delivery of appropriate affordable housing, including sheltered housing for elderly. Policy 3A5, 3 A13 and H13 of the London Plan and Harrow UDP respectively, reflect this objective.

The majority of the side garden of No. 7 that has been included in the application site would not be built on, and would be landscaped to provide part of the setting of the proposed development. The balance of policy objectives served by the development and the relationship with PPS3 (as revised) is a matter of interpretation (of national policy) and judgement, (based upon the weighting of the impacts and development plan policy objectives). In this case, the use of this part of the garden for such purposes is overall considered to be acceptable given the extent to which the use supports the delivery of development plan policy objectives focused upon new sheltered residential accommodation within an relatively accessible location.

The number of units proposed for the site would result in an increase of three (from 10 to 13), with the number of habitable rooms increased by twenty-five (from 10 to 35). Although this could be considered to be a material increase, the resultant residential density would be within the range, of 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare, outlined in table 3A.2 attached to policy 3A.3 of the London Plan, and is appropriate for this location. The increase in the number of habitable rooms is in part a result of the need to meet current standards for affordable housing, particularly for the identified group, and the move to replace the existing studio units.

Representations have been received noting that this is the second phase of a more comprehensive redevelopment which included the properties on Richards Close. The two applications, although they have been made by the same applicant, are separate and this current application must be considered on its merits and in accordance with planning policies, unless material considerations dictate otherwise. In this case, the previous development at Richard's Close is a material consideration in the context of considering the character of the area and the impact of further development on the amenities of neighbours, which is considered later in this report.

An increase in the number of residential units, and the change in the housing types, will have an effect on the nature and intensity of the residential use on the site. However, the current residential density, of 60 habitable rooms per hectare, is towards the lower end of residential densities considered appropriate by the London Plan for locations of this type and arguably represents an underdevelopment of the site. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with the principle of making efficient use of the land, as required by policy 3A.3 of the London Plan.

The existing buildings on the site have an area of 380m², which represents 23% of the site area, and the existing hard surface covers 370m² (22% of site area). The proposal would result in 29% of the site being covered by buildings (490m²), and 18% covered by hard surfaces (305m²). The net effect would be that an additional 45m² of the site would be covered by buildings and hard surfaces. This increase in site coverage is considered acceptable. The existing hard surfaces are impermeable, whereas the proposed hard surfaces would be permeable.

Comments were made in response to consultation, and as part of the pre-application consultation process, regarding the Unilateral Undertaking to demolish the bungalows. Concerns have been expressed that this development is being considered solely because of this undertaking and that without the undertaking, the redevelopment of this site would not be considered. For the reasons stated above, as previously developed land, the principle of the redevelopment of this site, regardless of the S106 is entirely consistent with the aims of local and national planning policies, and the principle of the scheme could be supported, even if the Unilateral Undertaking had not been provided.

2) Character and Appearance of the Area

London Plan policy 4B.1 requires developments to maximise the potential of sites and to promote high quality design. This overarching policy is supported by other London Plan policies, including policy 4B.8 which requires development to respect local contexts and local distinctiveness. These policies are also supported by saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan, which requires a high standard of design and layout, and saved policy D9 which seeks to achieve a high quality of streetside greenness and forecourt greenery.

The guiding principle of planning is that development should achieve a high standard of design. This is highlighted in national Planning Policy Statement 1 which states, at paragraph 33, that, 'good design is indivisible from good planning.'

Good design does not necessarily mean replicating the architectural style or character of other developments in the vicinity. However, any design needs to be based upon an understanding of context, including the development constraints and opportunities and an understanding of the character (and appearance) of an area. The Council has recently adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (2010) for all residential development that makes this objective clear. Matters of siting, orientation, form and scale, together with architectural style and character must therefore be carefully addressed, particularly where clearly defined characteristics are evident.

The layout and orientation of the proposed development has been designed to reflect the constraints of the site: its length, width and orientation is delineated by 45 degree splays from the corners of nearby properties (meeting the SPD requirements), and the height is constrained by a requirement not to have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or occupiers (and meet BRE and SPD requirements).

The proposed two- and three-storey block would be set at an angle to the two rows of houses that comprise 1 – 6 and 7 – 12 Courtfield Crescent. It is not however considered to be unusual for buildings on corner plots to be set at an angle so that they address and respond to both adjoining building lines. In this case, the main front elevation would be set 8m behind the front corners of Nos. 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent, with the front bay projection at the centre of the entrance to Becket Fold, but set back 12m from the rear line of the footway.

When viewed from approaches on Courtfield Crescent, the proposed block would therefore appear as a subordinate feature behind the regular spacing of suburban houses in the street as it would be set back from the building lines of properties adjacent to both No. 6 and No. 7 Courtfield Crescent. The three-storey element would be set even further back from the corner.

In terms of the height of the proposed building, the overall height of the building, at 9.7m, is slightly greater than the ridge heights (9.2m) of nearby two-storey dwellinghouses in Courtfield Crescent, with the two storey part of the building, which is that part of the building that addresses Courtfield Crescent, being slightly higher than the eaves heights of existing properties on this road. Given the set back of the building on the site, it is not considered that this additional height would be readily apparent within the whole of the street. The proposed set back of the top floor would mean that, notwithstanding the markedly different style of the building, the proposals, in relation to Courtfield Crescent, would not appear over dominant. .

The design and style of the building has been the subject of pre-application discussions with the local planning authority and the community. Particular concerns have been raised regarding the contemporary flat roof design, and the applicant was asked at the pre application stage to consider an alternative, pitched roof design. At the residents meeting held at the Council in November a mansard roof design was also suggested. The applicants have however chosen to continue with a style and design that reflects the more contemporary form of Ewart House and the flat roof blocks to the south and east of Courtfield Crescent at Duffield Close and officers must consider the proposals on this basis.

The contemporary flat roof design would broadly follow the form of the adjoining flats at Duffield Close, and the new development at Ewart House. The proposed block of flats would be a step down from the 13m high four-storey Ewart House and would represent a transition between that development and the suburban inter-war development in Courtfield Crescent.

The proposed materials for the development include facing bricks for the ground floor, part of the second floor, the front bay projection, and a three-storey feature projection at the rear. The remainder of the walls would have a rendered finish. It is considered that this treatment of the external appearance of the property would, subject to suitable materials being used, not be inconsistent with developments in the vicinity.

A specific concern has been raised that the design of the bin store at the front of the building would be out of keeping with the design of other properties in Courtfield Crescent. That this does not replicate traditional dwellinghouses is recognised. However, the location of the refuse storage area is, in part, dictated by servicing requirements and the integration of the refuse store into the building envelope is preferred to the use of a stand-alone enclosure. The design of the refuse storage area is considered acceptable and reflects the overall design of the building.

In terms of the impact the proposal would have on the visual amenities of the area, the proposed development would be visible from Courtfield Crescent, Duffield Close, Richards Close, Catherine Place and Elmgrove Crescent.

From Courtfield Crescent, the development would have a lesser impact on the street scene, increasing as the viewer got closer to the entrance at the Corner of Courtfield Crescent between Nos 6 and 7. Although the proposal would, to a certain extent, close this gap, this is considered acceptable given the set back from the footway and the design of the building with a recessed second floor, which would still result in a clear and evident "break" in the building line at this corner. Views from the rear gardens of properties in Courtfield Crescent (especially Nos 2 to 12 would be contextualised by the backdrop of Ewart House and flats in Duffield Close, together with the proposed and existing trees.

From Duffield Close, the proposed block of flats would be more readily visible, but would be 18m from the nearest public viewpoint. The building façade that would be presented to Duffield Close would be articulated and the changes in building height between the two and three-storey elements would be more visible. Given the existing flats in the foreground, forming the context of such views, it is considered that the development would be complementary to the existing pattern and character of development as it is appreciated from that viewpoint.

Catherine Place is approximately 50m from the development site, and comprises a three-storey building with accommodation in the roofspace. The view of the building from this street would be contextualised by the flats at Duffield Close. The sense to which the development complemented or harmed the character of the area would, it is considered, be similar to that from Duffield Close.

The development would also be visible from the southwest corner of Elmgrove Crescent and the block of flats would be approximately 30m from the nearest public viewpoint (which is a parking area). This viewpoint would also benefit from the articulation in the building façade and changes in building heights.

The overall proportions, articulation and treatment of the building elevations is considered to be consistent with the architectural style and character chosen for the building by the architect.

The development results in well-lit internal accommodation meeting lifetime homes standards and providing landscaped outlooks for those who are likely to be less mobile. The design of the building is considered to satisfy the objectives in the London Plan, UDP and Residential design SPD for high quality design. The effect of the proposals would be to introduce this distinct, contemporary building into an area of mixed character. The distinct form has prompted considerable comment from residents of Courtfield Crescent who suggest that a more sympathetic style, reflecting the more conventional suburban properties in Courtfield Crescent should have been pursued. The siting and configuration of the building, its height and orientation are nevertheless considered to be acceptable. The way in which the building complements the character of the area is dependent upon viewpoint. The building setback means that it would not form part of the established character of Courtfield Crescent, when viewed from within the street. From back gardens, the context and character changes, to include 3 storey flats and the recently completed Ewart House. From Duffield Close and Elmgrove, these buildings already play a part in defining a more mixed character. On this basis, officers consider that the design and style of the development, whilst controversial, is appropriate and would therefore meet the policy objectives set out in national and Development Plan policies.

The applicants have supplied a tree constraints plan, an arboricultural implications assessment and a landscape plan, which indicate that the proposal would achieve a high standard of hard and soft landscaping associated with the development. The plans also indicate that there would be a green roof on the second floor of the block of flats. However, given that the details in the landscape plan do not include a full planting specification, a condition requiring a fully detailed landscape plan to be submitted and approved prior to first occupation of the development would be required, together with an operational condition requiring the approved details to be implemented and maintained for a minimum of five years. The details required would need to include all hard and soft landscaping works, including vehicle barriers and external lighting.

The landscape masterplan also includes details of measures to protect existing trees on and near the site that are to be retained. These details are considered sufficient to safeguard these trees. Therefore, a condition requiring the tree protection measures to be implemented is attached.

In addition to the landscaping conditions, conditions requiring site levels and drainage to be approved are also recommended to ensure a satisfactory form of development and to ensure that the proposal does not produce surface water run-off, as required by London Plan policy 2A.1 and saved policy EP12 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

As noted above, a condition requiring external materials to be approved is recommended, together with a further condition requiring details of extract flues, ventilation systems and rainwater goods to be submitted and approved to ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance.

A proliferation of television aerials or satellite dishes could also detract from the appearance of the building, and therefore a condition requiring details of a shared television reception system to be submitted, approved and implemented is also recommended.

3) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers

Loss of light

The proposed block of flats has been designed to comply with the 45 degree code from the nearest first floor corners of neighbouring properties, as described in paragraph 4.68 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (SPD).

The applicants have submitted a daylight and sunlight report in accordance with BRE guidelines which examines the impact of the development on 5, 6, 7 and 8 Courtfield Crescent, upon 19-24 Duffield Close, and the new development at Ewart House. The report concludes that the proposed development would meet Building Research Establishment guidelines on sunlighting and daylighting at those properties nearest to the site and would not therefore result in a significant loss of light to neighbouring properties. As such, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any undue loss of light or overshadowing to neighbouring properties and gardens.

Overlooking

With respect to overlooking of or by neighbouring properties, the proposed development faces directly towards the new flats in Ewart House. The windows in the western elevation of Ewart House would face directly onto the windows in the eastern elevation of the proposed block of flats. However, these windows would have a separation of 20m. This separation distance is comparable to the normal separation between dwellinghouses on the opposite sides of a suburban street and is considered sufficient to minimise any adverse effect from intervisibility.

With respect to other nearby properties, including those at Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 Courtfield Crescent and the flats at Duffield Close, the orientation of the proposed block of flats means that the windows would be at obtuse angles to each other, between 125 and 140 degrees. The upper floors of the building contain no balconies or terraces. When taken into consideration with the separation between windows, it is considered that there would be no material intervisibility between windows of these properties. Considerable concern has nevertheless been raised previously regarding overlooking between the recently constructed Ewart House and properties in Courtfield Crescent and Elm Grove. The proposal is not however considered to result in a material increase in overlooking of these properties, over and above the existing levels. Whilst the perception of overlooking by existing residents close to the development are acknowledged the actual increase from indirect views from within the building are not expected to exceed levels already possible from existing surrounding properties to a point where refusal would be justified.

Although the rear garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent is 15m from the nearest ground floor window at the proposed block of flats, and the garden of No. 7 Courtfield Crescent is 7m from the nearest ground floor window, it is considered that any potential overlooking of the proposed ground floor flats from neighbouring gardens could be avoided through the use of suitable boundary treatment. A condition to this effect is therefore recommended.

Overbearing impact

The proposed development would result in a building that would be of greater scale than the existing bungalows, in terms of both the footprint and the height. Representations have been received objecting to the increased height of the proposed building compared to the existing bungalows and the overbearing impact the building would have on the existing views from the rear windows and gardens of neighbouring properties.

As noted above, the building would not result in a loss of light to neighbouring properties, but the proposed block of flats would affect the view from these properties and their gardens. In particular, there would be an interruption to the views from the rear windows of adjoining properties, and Nos. 5 & 6 Courtfield Crescent in particular, as well as from the rear gardens of Nos. 1-5 Courtfield Crescent and Nos. 7-12 Courtfield Crescent. It is recognised that the impact of the visual intrusion would diminish with increased separation from the site and as landscaping proposed matured over time.

The impact with respect to the view from Nos. 5 & 6 Courtfield Crescent would be the most pronounced. The outlook from the rear windows of the ground floor of No. 6 Courtfield Crescent is already compromised by the fence. With respect to No. 5 Courtfield Crescent, the development would be obliquely visible from the rear windows as the block of flats would be 16m from the nearest window and set at an angle of 125 degrees. Notwithstanding this, the proposed block of flats would be clearly visible from the rear garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent, and to a lesser extent from those of Nos. 1-4 Courtfield Crescent. However, the nearest part of the building would be 15m from the garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent. Given this separation of the proposed block of flats from the garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent, and the maximum height of 9.7m, it is considered that the development would not be so intrusive as to justify refusal on this ground.

The proposal would have a similar impact with respect to the rear gardens of Nos. 7 & 8 Courtfield Crescent. The proposed block of flats would be at an angle of 140 degrees from the rear windows of these properties, and would be 4m from the rear garden of No. 7 at its closest point and 10m from the rear garden of No. 8 at its closest point, which comprises the two storey part of the proposed building. A representation has been received expressing concern that the block of flats would have an overbearing impact when viewed from the rear garden of No. 8 Courtfield Crescent, and that this would exacerbate the impact caused by the nearby Ewart House, resulting in a cumulative overbearing appearance.

It is recognised that there would be an element of visual intrusion that would detract from the outlook that is enjoyed from the rear garden of both No. 5 and No. 8 Courtfield Crescent. It is also recognised that from the rear garden of No. 8, clear views would remain to the north (towards the allotments) and to the east (towards Nos 9-15 Courtfield Crescent).

On balance, given the relative angles and distances from these gardens, it is considered that the proposal, whilst obvious, would not have such a significant impact upon the outlook from these gardens to justify refusal.

The proposed flats would also be visible from No. 20 Courtfield Crescent, which sits on the corner opposite the entrance to Becket Fold. However, the front of the proposed block would be approximately 30m from the nearest habitable windows at No. 20 Courtfield Crescent and would have less of an impact than the existing properties at Nos. 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent (at either side of the entrance to Becket Fold). Although the proposed development would, to a certain extent, close the gap at the entrance to Becket Fold, the design and set back of the block would not be so intrusive as to warrant refusal.

The proposed development would also be visible from some corner properties (Nos. 51-71) Elmgrove Crescent. However, there are no windows in Elmgrove Crescent which face the site and the impact on these properties is considered to be minimal.

With regard to the view from the balconies of Ewart House, it is considered that the proposed development would not be overbearing as the separation distance would be comparable to that between houses on opposite sides of a suburban street.

Intensity of Use

In addition to a consideration of the potential loss of light or overbearing appearance, the potential impact of the increased intensity of use of the site needs to be assessed.

The proposal would increase the number of residential units on the site from ten to 13, and the nature of these units would change from studio flats to one- and two-bedroom flats.

Representations have been received noting that the development would have a total of 22 double bedrooms – with the potential for occupation by 44 persons. It is recognised that in social housing occupation densities tend to be higher than in private housing. However, with regard to the intended age group, census data indicates that occupation densities would be lower than in general needs social housing. The applicants have stated that the intended occupiers could include couples who require separate bedrooms due to medical circumstances, individuals who may need occasional carers or some with dependent children. It is therefore considered unlikely that the development would house 44 persons.

The proposed age restriction (60 years) has also prompted concern amongst respondents, who suggest that because the restriction would only apply to the main tenant and not to other occupiers, some residents could be younger – or even capable of starting a family – which would result in greater levels of activity at the site that could be expected if all the residents were over the age of sixty.

While it is recognised that the age restriction can only be applied to the main tenant, patterns of use in both Ewart House and historical data from other sites, both for private and affordable housing does not suggest that concerns around tenant mix leading to higher densities or to significant dilution of the key population group are likely to become manifest.

Notwithstanding this, it is recognised that the occupation density at the development would be higher than the previous situation. As noted above, the residential density is within the range provided by policy 3A.3 of the London Plan, and that the housing types would comply with the aims of London Plan policies 3A.6, 3A.13 and 3A.17 regarding the units' sizes and number of bedrooms.

The proposal would result in increased comings and goings and residential activity at the site (although this may be less likely at unsocial hours given the occupants of the proposed development). However, the parking constraints at the site, which are discussed later in the appraisal, indicate that such additional movements would be more likely to be on foot or by non car modes and the increase in residential activity would not therefore be likely to be so significant that is caused significant additional disturbance to surrounding residents or prompted other amenity impacts that would warrant refusal on these grounds.

Impact of traffic movements

Representations have been received concerning the potential impact of the development with respect to transport and vehicular movements at the site, including during the construction phase. These aspects are discussed in the Transport Implications section of the appraisal below.

Amenity space

It is considered that the amount of amenity space that would be provided would be sufficient to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and to act as an amenity space in and of itself for the occupiers of the development, and would accord with the requirements of saved policy D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan. The proposal is expected to operate in association with Ewart house, and the amenities provide in the ground floor of that property. The amount of amenity space provision for residents, having regard to their expected needs and requirements for open space, is considered to be acceptable.

There has been a suggestion from a neighbour that the land forming the application site should be used as an amenity area for Richards Close and that the balconies on Ewart House would have a poor view of a three-storey building. The use of the site as an amenity area would comply with the requirements of the Unilateral Undertaking. Such a proposal is not, however, before the Council for consideration at this time. The Committee must consider the merits of the scheme before them.

4) Housing Quality, Affordable Housing, Elderly person's housing

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (2010) requires new residential development to be of a good quality. When considering what is an appropriate standard of accommodation and quality of design, the Council is mindful of the Housing Quality Indicators (HQI) with reference to the Interim London Housing Design Guide (2010), which have been incorporated into the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which supports national, regional and local planning policy in this regard.

Two of the one-bedroom flats would have gross internal areas of 48m², and two would have areas of 54m². Two of the two-bedroom flats would have a gross internal area of 68m², four would have an area of 70m², and one would have an area of 72m².

These comply with the requirements of the Interim London Housing Design Guide.

Policy 3A.5 of the London Plan, which is supported by saved policies D4 and C16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Accessible Homes (2010), requires that all new residential development should comply with the requirements of Lifetime Homes standards, and that 10% of new development should comply with Wheelchair Homes standards.

All of the flats would fully comply with the requirements of Lifetime Homes, and two ground floor one-bedroom flats would further comply with the Wheelchair Homes standards, as required by London Plan policy 3A.5.

The proposed flats would fall within the definition of Affordable Housing in London Plan policy 3A.8 and would provide social housing for persons over the age of 60, and would assist in meeting affordable housing targets as required by London Plan policy 3A.9. Given that all of the flats would be affordable housing, the minimum requirements of London Plan policy 3A.11 are exceeded.

Harrow's Housing Strategy 2007-2012 has identified that there is an on-going demand for all types of social housing. The Council's Older Person's Housing Review 2005 indicates that there is a particular shortfall in provision of social housing for older people.

London Plan policy 3A.13 requires boroughs to favourably consider special needs and specialist housing, and London Plan policy 3A.17 requires boroughs to address the needs of London's diverse population in the provision of housing. These policies are supported by saved UDP policies H7, which requires developments to provide a suitable mix of dwelling types, H13, which supports the provision of sheltered accommodation and H17, which encourages the provision of suitable accommodation for those with particular housing needs.

The housing type proposed would allow for independent living by older people, for which there is a demonstrable need in the borough, and this proposal would make a significant contribution to the supply of such accommodation.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would provide good quality accommodation that would make a positive contribution to the provision of specialist housing in the borough, as required by London Plan policies 3A.5, 3A.6, 3A.11, 3A.13 and 3A.17 and saved policies D4, D5, H13, H17 and C16 of the UDP.

5) Transport Implications

The proposed intensity of this development would increase the amount of 'elderly persons' dwelling units on this site from 10 to 13 resulting in a net increase of 3 units. The allocated parking provision (including disabled provision) of just less than half a space per dwelling is considered acceptable and is within UDP and London Plan maximum parking standards as set out in London Plan policy 3C.23 and saved UDP policy T13. The low level of parking provision is reinforced by the low car ownership associated with this type of development and hence, given the stringent on-street parking controls in the surrounding area, no measurable displacement of parking affiliated to the site is anticipated.

The internal road layout is acceptable and in accord with 'Manual for Streets' (MfS) principles. Refuse provisions are to acceptable standards in terms of vehicular access.

The net gain in traffic activity from the increase of 10 to 13 units is estimated to be in the region of 2 to 3 vehicles at both the morning and afternoon peak traffic periods.

This would represent a small percentage increase in current overall vehicular activity in the locality during peak hours and is therefore considered insignificant in road capacity and safety terms. Current Department for Transport guidance in the form of MfS considers that developments of the scale proposed are relatively insignificant on highway infrastructures.

Hence, in road safety and road capacity terms, the low level of generated traffic for the proposal, together with satisfactory access provisions and visibility sight lines onto Courtfield Crescent (in line with accepted DfT standards), the impact of the proposal is considered to be minimal and would not be at a level that would be considered prejudicial to vehicular or pedestrian movement or road safety.

There is no objection to this proposal on highways grounds and the proposal would comply with London Plan policies 3C.1, 3C.2, 3C.23 and saved policies T6 and T13 of the Harrow UDP.

Representations have been received regarding insufficient parking being made available at the site that could lead to parking pressure in nearby streets or even illegal or injudicious parking. However, as noted above, the anticipated level of car ownership associated with the proposal would be significantly lower than for general privately owned housing and the level of parking provision is considered appropriate for the development. Given the robust parking controls in the area, and the lack of available on-street parking provision in Courtfield Crescent and nearby streets, it is considered that the proposal would not result in overspill parking.

The Council's adopted policy on maximum parking standards supports the view that a key determinant of levels of car ownership and use is the availability of parking. Although the 2011 revision of PPG 13 seeks to remove maximum parking standards, the adopted parking restraint policies of the London Plan and the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are still relevant. Given that parking would be restricted at the site and in the wider area through physical constraints, it is anticipated that car ownership and use levels would be in line with the availability of parking. It is also considered that visitors, being aware of the parking restrictions, would seek alternative arrangements. Similar arrangements would also apply to the occupiers of Nos. 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent.

The parking area within the site would be barrier controlled, and therefore the availability of parking could be restricted to occupiers and permitted visitors to the development.

The potential for making the development 'resident permit restricted', in which occupiers would not be eligible for parking permits to allow for parking in residents' parking bays in the area, was considered. However, the nearest resident's parking bays are some distance from the site (In Richard's Close, which is accessible on foot), and the controlled parking zone does not experience levels of parking stress that would make such a requirement necessary or justified.

Representations have been received regarding the suitability of the layout for servicing by emergency vehicles. However, as noted above, the road layout complies with current Department for Transport standards and it is considered that the proposal could be adequately serviced by emergency and refuse collection vehicles.

The location of the parking area would be close to the rear garden of No. 5 Courtfield Crescent, with the closest part being 3m from the shared boundary. This could result in increased noise and disturbance from vehicle activity. However, there is an existing car parking area which is currently closer to the rear garden than the proposed parking spaces would be.

Given that there would only be six parking spaces, the levels of vehicular activity would be minimal and together with additional landscaping, the impact of the parking on nearby properties is not considered likely to be materially different to the existing circumstance.

Representations have been received regarding the potential impact of construction activity on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, including vehicle movements to service the development process.

Although the activity associated with construction activity is not normally a planning consideration, in this case, the restrictions of the site are such that on-site activity, and associated service vehicle movements could result in disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

The applicants have submitted a construction method statement as an appendix to the Planning Statement. This sets out arrangements for contractors, deliveries and materials storage etc. The details contained in the method statement are considered suitable to minimise disruption and disturbance during the construction phase. These provisions could be secured through a planning Condition.

6) Sustainable Development

London Plan policy 4A.7 requires boroughs to adopt a presumption that developments will achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 20% from on-site renewable energy generation. This policy supports general policies 2A.1, 4A.1, 4A.2 and 4A.3 regarding sustainable development and mitigating climate change.

The applicants have submitted a Renewable Energy Feasibility Report and a Sustainability Statement, as required by London Plan policy 4A.4.

The proposal also includes the provision of photovoltaic and solar water panels on the roof which would generate energy on site.

These indicate that the proposal would meet Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and would achieve a 25% reduction in CO₂ emissions above current Building Regulations standards.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would comply with the requirements of London Plan policies 2A.1, 4A.3, 4A.4 and 4A.7, which relate to sustainable development and mitigating the environmental impact of new development, and saved policy D4 of the Harrow UDP and adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Sustainable Building Design.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted drawings, a condition requiring details of the solar hot water and photovoltaic panels to be submitted and approved is suggested to ensure that the proposal is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the area.

In addition to the on-site generation and energy-efficiency measures outlined in the Renewable Energy Feasibility Report and Sustainability Statement, the proposal would include a green roof on the front part of the two-storey element of the building. This is supported by London Plan policy 3A.11 and would also make a contribution to biodiversity enhancements at the site.

However, the adopted Biodiversity Action Plan and saved policies EP26, EP27 and EP28 of the UDP require the Council to maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity where feasible. Therefore, notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, conditions relating to the maintenance of the Green Roof and the provision of biodiversity enhancements to safeguard suitable 'at risk' species identified in the London Biodiversity Action Plan, including swift boxes, have been recommended.

7) S.17 Crime and Disorder Act

The proposal would comply with the principles and practices of secured by design and safer places. Furthermore, subject to appropriate lighting the proposal would allow for greater natural surveillance of the footpath between Courtfield Crescent and Richards Close which could reduce opportunities for crime and reduce the fear of crime of people using the footpath.

8) Consultation Responses

- Proposal represents back garden development, contrary to planning policy – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development section of the appraisal*
- Original restrictions on what had been garden land limiting it to single-storey have lapsed and allowed this to become a three-storey building. Proposal should be limited to single storey – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development section of the appraisal*
- Local opposition: Proposal does not take into consideration the views of the local community – *the proposal was the subject of consultation as detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement. The comments received in response to the application have been noted and addressed*
- Lack of consultation on phase one has created mistrust with the Council and the applicant – *the processing of the application for phase one is the subject of an independent report. All necessary consultations relating to this application have been undertaken*
- No proper community engagement before the proposals were submitted. There was no resident input in the design stage. An alternative scheme suggested by a resident was not considered – *the proposal was the subject of consultation as detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement, in addition to consultation and an exhibition carried out on Behalf of Harrow Churches Housing Association. The views of residents were noted, and amendments to the scheme, including raising the age limit for the principle occupier and increasing the number of parking spaces were made to the scheme following the consultation meeting and prior to submission. However the applicant retains the right to submit the application of their choice*

- A meeting organised by the Council was only one week before the plans were submitted – *at the time the meeting was arranged the Council was not aware of the date of submission of the application. This was clarified following the meeting. However, the applicants have advised the Council that the submission was delayed to allow the meeting to take place to give residents the opportunity to view and comment on the proposals prior to formal submission.*
- Residents not involved in pre-application process – *the local planning authority has undertaken all necessary consultation with the application. The pre-application process is designed to allow the applicant the benefit of advice based on officer's opinions in relation to adopted policies and guidance. Any planning application that arises is assessed on its merits, according to policy and guidance and other material considerations, including comments received as a result of consultation*
- Taking into account the 76 dwellings in Phase 1, Harrow Churches will have an overdominating presence in Courtfield Crescent – *it is acknowledged that the resulting development of both phases would represent an increase in the number of flats in the area than was previously the case. However, the overall residential density would be in line with London Plan policies. The question of ownership of land is not a material planning consideration.*
- Phase one of the development (Richards Close) has created an overdevelopment in the area: Phase two will add to this overdevelopment in a suburban space – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development section of the appraisal*
- Both phases should have been submitted together – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development section of the appraisal*
- Demolition of garage at No. 7 was done to enlarge the proposal site – *a landowner is free to demolish such outbuildings without planning permission and to accumulate land for sites as he or she wishes*
- Overdevelopment of the site, raising the number of occupants from 10 to a maximum of 44 – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development and Character and Appearance of the Area sections of the appraisal*
- Proposed building would be too high and out of scale with two-storey houses in Courtfield Crescent – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Out of character as three-storey building with solar panels on roof would not complement two-storey dwellinghouses and materials palette does not complement nearby dwellinghouses – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Materials out of character with housing in Courtfield Crescent – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal. Details of the external materials would need to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to the construction of any part of the building above damp proof course*

- Proposal would be visually intrusive – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers sections of the appraisal*
- Bin storage area would have 9m long metal grilles at high level which would be out of keeping with frontages in the area. Bin store should be relocated. – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Use of flat roofs with parapet is out of character with Courtfield Crescent – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Forty-five degree code has been applied simplistically to maximise site coverage and results in the corners of the building being too close to the boundaries of the site – *this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development and Character and Appearance of the Area sections of the appraisal*
- Flat roof design has been used to maximise floorspace – *the flat roof design of the building has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal.*
- Design of building is out of character with Courtfield Crescent or Duffield Close. Ewart House should not set a precedent – *this application has been assessed on its merits and with respect to other development in the locality, as described in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Layout and siting inappropriate in itself and in relation to adjacent buildings, spaces and views – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area section of the appraisal*
- Land should be used for green space to provide better amenity space for Ewart House –*this matter has been addressed in the Background and principle of development section of the appraisal*
- Three-storey building would ruin skyline and would result in perceived overlooking and overcrowding – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal*
- Proposed block of flats, by virtue of its bulk, massing and position, would be overbearing from rear gardens, especially when viewed in conjunction with Ewart House – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal*
- Proposal will exacerbate feeling of over-building and overdominance following Richard's Close – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal*
- Loss of privacy from overlooking of back gardens – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal*
- Noise and disturbance as parking area would be adjacent to gardens – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal*

- Disturbance and disruption from increased people on the site, vehicle and pedestrian movements and service vehicle activity – *this matter has been addressed in the Character and Appearance of the Area, Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers and Transport Implications sections of the appraisal*
- Age restrictions will apply to main tenant only and could result in younger people or even children living there – *this matter has been addressed in the Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers section of the appraisal. The age restriction can only be applied to the main tenant by law*
- Potential for age restriction and tenure type to be removed, leading to general market housing – *the age restriction will be secured through a legal agreement. Any proposal to change tenure type would therefore need to be considered by the Council as a variation of that Legal Agreement and would be the subject to consultation*
- Proposal description on application form is wrong as the whole development would not be for independent older people as main tenant only has to satisfy age restriction – *the description on the application is considered to be appropriate*
- Insufficient parking which could lead to illegal parking on double yellow lines or blocking driveways and potentially block emergency service vehicles, especially as 6 & 7 Courtfield Crescent have no parking spaces – *this has been addressed in the Transport Implications section of the appraisal*
- Inevitable overspill parking on Courtfield Crescent – *as noted in the Transport Implications section of the appraisal, this street has double yellow lines where on street parking is not permitted or practical. Given the nature of the proposal, it is not considered that overspill parking on Courtfield Crescent would be inevitable*
- Previous decisions refused a change of use of first floor of 6 Courtfield Crescent to office use due to inadequate parking provision – *these applications (Reference number WEST/497/94/FUL and WEST/164/95/FUL), which were for a change of use of the upper floor to an office were dismissed at appeal on 20-Sep-1995 and by the Council on 20-Dec-1995 respectively. Guidance with regard to parking provision has changed significantly since then. Furthermore, the use as offices is materially different from residential use and these decisions are not directly relevant to this current application*
- Loss of garage at No. 7 Courtfield Crescent, and removal of their ability to park at Becket Fold would result in parking pressure – *the garage has already been demolished, and No. 7 Courtfield Crescent has no dedicated parking provision. This matter has been addressed in the Transport Implications section of the appraisal and it is considered that this would have no significant impact on highway safety*
- Problems with access to the site by construction vehicles, especially if they are queuing to enter the site – *this matter has been addressed in the Transport Implications section of the appraisal, and a suitable condition has been suggested.*

- Construction method statement does not address issues of how much plant will be required, sizes of vehicles, mud deposits on the carriageway – *the applicants have submitted a construction method statement that covers vehicle movements and the amount of plant that would be on site at any one time. The Method Statement states that the delivery vehicles would be restricted to 7.5 tonne flat bed, box or curtain sided goods vehicles, and that deliveries will be coordinated by the site manager to avoid congestion in the surrounding roads. In addition, the Contractors fully endorse the Considerate Contractor Scheme, which would address issues such as mud on the road. It is considered that the details submitted, along with the commitment to the considerate Contractor Scheme, are sufficient to address concerns regarding the impact of the construction works*
- Problems with access by emergency vehicles and to owners of properties in Courtfield Crescent – *as noted in the Transport Implications section of the proposal, the road layout complies with current Department for Transport guidance*
- Representations have also included comments on the handling of the Phase 1 development – *The comments on the handling of Phase 1 of the development are noted. However, this matter is being investigated separately and it is not considered appropriate to review these issues within this report.*
- The representations in support of the proposal are noted, and the issues raised have been addressed in the Background and principle of development and Housing Quality, Affordable Housing and Elderly Person's Housing sections of the appraisal

CONCLUSION

The proposal would provide new, high quality affordable housing tailored to the needs of older people, for which there is an identified need in the Borough. In principle, the development would therefore meet development Plan objectives through the re-use of previously developed land, in a location close to the metropolitan town centre.

The proposals have prompted considerable interest and comment. These include proposals for an alternative form of development from one respondent that cannot be considered as part of the current planning application. The proposals represent a controversial response, in architectural and design terms, to the area, but for the reasons outlined above are considered on balance to be acceptable and not to result in significant adverse impacts upon the amenities of those who already reside in surrounding properties. The associated impacts that the development would create can, officers consider, be adequately mitigated through the use of appropriate conditions and the S.106 agreement. Notwithstanding opposition to the proposals expressed at the pre application stages and in response to the application, the proposals are accordingly considered to be acceptable and approval, subject to the S106 and conditions is accordingly recommended.

CONDITIONS

1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of seven years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To ensure that the planning permission is subject to review in accordance with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 The development hereby permitted shall not proceed beyond damp proof course until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:

a: the building

b: the ground surfacing

c: the boundary treatment

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality, as required by saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

3 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

“956PL01 Rev P3; 956/PL02 Rev P3; 956/PL03 Rev P3; 956/PL100 Rev P3; 956/PL101 Rev P3; 956/PL102 Rev P3; 956/PL103 Rev P3; 956/PL104 Rev P1; 956/PL200 Rev P2; 956/PL201 Rev P3; 956/PL202 P3; 956/PL203; J42.11/01; J42.11/02; Design and Access Statement; Planning Statement; Arboricultural Implications Assessment; Renewable Energy Feasibility Report; Sustainability Statement; Daylight and Sunlight Assessment; Transport Statement

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

4 The development hereby permitted shall not proceed beyond damp proof course until details of any extraction flues, ventilation systems, and rainwater disposal systems (including downpipes) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The application shall be implemented in full accordance with such details and be maintained thereafter.

REASON: In order to ensure a high standard of development which provides an appropriate standard of visual amenity for the surrounding area, as required by saved Policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004.

5 The development hereby permitted shall not proceed beyond damp proof course until details of a strategy for the provision of communal facilities for television reception (e.g. Aerials, dishes and other such equipment) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details should include the specific size and location of all equipment. The approved details shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the building and shall be retained thereafter and no other television reception equipment shall be introduced onto the walls or roof of the approved building without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to prevent the proliferation of individual television reception items on the building to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area in accordance with saved Policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

6 Prior to the commencement of works to the roof of the approved building, details of the proposed solar hot water heating system and photovoltaics, (including sectional drawings) which demonstrate that any panels will not be unduly dominant from the neighbouring highway or residential properties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall also include details for the maintenance of the solar hot water heating system and photovoltaics. The development to be completed in full accordance with such details and thereafter retained.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity of the development and the area, as required by saved Policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2010.

7 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority, a scheme of hard and soft landscape works. Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans, and schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers / densities.

Hard landscape works shall include details of permeable paving, vehicle barriers, boundary treatments and external lighting.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and to enhance the appearance of the development, in compliance with saved policies D4 & D9 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

8 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings, or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any existing or new trees or shrubs which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season, with others of a similar size and species, unless the local authority agrees any variation in writing.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and to enhance the appearance of the development, in compliance with saved policies D4 & D9 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

9 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of the green roof have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The schedule shall include details of the arrangements for the implementation and maintenance of the green roof. The development shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

REASON: In the interest of the character and appearance of the development, as required by policy 4A.11 of the London Plan (2008) and saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

10 The development hereby permitted shall not proceed beyond damp proof course until a scheme for biodiversity enhancements at the site has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity enhancements shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained.

The scheme should include the provision of swift boxes.

REASON: To enhance the biodiversity at the site and in the area, as required by saved policies EP26, EP27 and EP28 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and the Harrow Biodiversity Action Plan (2008).

11 The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.

REASON: The existing trees represent an important amenity feature which the local planning authority considers should be protected, and as required by saved policy D10 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

12 No site works beyond the demolition of the existing buildings on the site and no construction of the building hereby permitted shall commence until details of the levels of the buildings, roads and footpaths in relation to the adjoining land and highway, and any other changes proposed in the levels of the site, have been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure that the works are carried out at suitable levels in relation to the highway and adjoining properties in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring residents, the appearance of the development, drainage, gradient of access and future highway improvement, as required by saved policies D4 and EP12 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

13 The construction of the building hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of works for the disposal of surface water have been submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To ensure that adequate drainage facilities are provided, in compliance with saved policies D4 & EP12 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

14 The construction of the building hereby permitted shall not be commenced until details of surface water attenuation / storage works submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details. And shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, in compliance with saved policies D4 & EP12 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

15 The refuse bins shall be stored at all times, other than on collection days, in the designated refuse storage area, as shown on the approved drawing.

REASON: to safeguard the appearance of the locality, as required by saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

16 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking areas shown on the approved plans have been constructed and surfaced with permeable materials, or drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and shall be used only for the parking of private motor vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted (by residents and their visitors) and for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety, as required by saved policies D4, T6 & T13 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

17 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:

a: the frontage

b: the boundary

of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres.

Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.

REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety, as required by saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

18 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with Appendix 6 (Method Statement) of the approved Planning Statement.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to ensure that the development process does not impeded the free flow of traffic or pedestrians on nearby public highways, as required by saved policies D4 and T6 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to national planning statements and guidance, the policies and proposals in the London Plan and the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and adopted Supplementary Planning Documents set out below, and to all relevant material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

Planning Policy Statement 1 – Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)

Planning Policy Statement 3 – Housing (2010)

Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport (2011)

Planning Policy Statement 22 – Planning for Renewable Energy (2004)

London Plan:

2A.1 – Sustainability Criteria

3A.1 – Increasing London's supply of housing

3A.2 – Borough housing targets

3A.3 – Maximising the potential of sites

3A.4 – Efficient use of stock

3A.5 – Housing choice

3A.6 – Quality of new housing provision

3A.8 – Definition of Affordable Housing

3A.9 – Affordable housing targets

3A.11 – Affordable housing thresholds

3A.13 – Special needs and specialist housing

3A.17 – Addressing the needs of London's diverse population

3C.1 – Integrating transport and development

- 3C.2 – Matching development to transport capacity
- 3C.23 – Parking Strategy
- 4A.1 – Tackling climate change
- 4A.2 – Mitigating climate change
- 4A.3 – Sustainable design and construction
- 4A.4 – Energy assessment
- 4A.7 – Renewable energy
- 4A.9 – adaptation to climate change
- 4A.11 – Living roofs and walls
- 4A.14 – Sustainable drainage
- 4B.1 – Design principles for a compact city
- 4B.8 – Respect local context and communities

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- S1 – The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use
- D4 – The Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 – Residential Amenity
- D9 – Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
- D10 – Trees and New Development
- H7 – Dwelling Mix
- H10 – Maintenance and Improvement to Existing Housing Stock
- H11 – Presumption Against the Loss of Residential Land and Buildings
- H13 – Sheltered Accommodation
- H17 – Access for Special Households with Particular Needs
- EP12 – Control of surface water run-off
- EP20 – Use of Previously Developed Land
- EP26 – Habitat Creation and Enhancement
- EP27 – Species Protection
- EP28 – Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
- T6 – The Transport Impact of Development Proposals
- T13 – Parking Standards
- C16 – Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (2010)

Supplementary Planning Document, Accessible Homes (2010)

Sustainable Planning Document, Sustainable Building Design (2009)

Interim London Housing Design Guide (2010)

Code of Practice for the Storage and Collection of Refuse and Materials for Recycling in Domestic Properties (2008)

Harrow Biodiversity Action Plan (2008)

London Biodiversity Action Plan (2000)

Manual for Streets (2007)

2 INFORMATIVE

CONSIDERATE CONTRACTORS' CODE OF CONDUCT

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 INFORMATIVE

THE PARTY WALL ETC. 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 INFORMATIVE

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS

To discharge the attached drainage conditions, the applicant's attention is drawn to the following required information:

- a) A copy of a letter from Thames Water with permission for indirect connections to the public sewers is required.
- b) The development is subject to a limitation on a discharge to **5 l/s**, consequently there will be a storage implication and the system should be checked for no flooding for a storm of critical duration and period of **1 in 100 years**. These **storage calculations** should include all details of inputs and outputs together with impermeable and permeable areas drained. Please note that the M5-60(mm) is **21** and the Ratio “r” should read **0.43** for this region. Similarly the Volumetric Run-off Coefficient should be substantiated by calculations (Reference to Chapter 13 The Wallingford Procedure) or a figure of **0.95** should be used for winter and summer. Please note that a value for UCWI of 150 is appropriate when calculating Percentage Runoff (PR) for storage purposes. Please include 20% allowance for climate change.
- c) Full details of drainage layout including details of the outlet and cross section of proposed storage are required.
- d) Full details of any flow restrictions (hydrobrake) that are proposed for this scheme need to be submitted together with the relevant graphs.

Should the applicant wish to discuss these matters, please contact Hanna Miturska on 020 8416 8366.

5 INFORMATIVE

Public Sewers

There are public sewers crossing the site. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval must be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Development Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

Plan Nos: 956/PL01 Rev P3; 956/PL02 Rev P3; 956/PL03 Rev P3; 956/PL100 Rev P3; 956/PL101 Rev P3; 956/PL102 Rev P3; 956/PL103 Rev P3; 956/PL104 Rev P1; 956/PL200 Rev P2; 956/PL201 Rev P3; 956/PL202 P3; 956/PL203; J42.11/01; J42.11/02; Design and Access Statement; Planning Statement; Arboricultural Implications Assessment; Renewable Energy Feasibility Report; Sustainability Statement; Daylight and Sunlight Assessment; Transport Statement; Community Involvement Report