



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY 17 MAY 2005

ADDENDUM

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

ADDENDUM

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 17TH MAY 2005

Section 1

INDEX Delete 'Harrow on the Hill' replace with 'Canons'.

1/01 Application **WITHDRAWN** by applicant.

RECOMMENDATION

Delete Reason for Refusal 4 – the Environment Agency has withdrawn its objection subject to the inclusion of a suggested condition in any planning permission.

1 additional notification reply received.

Summary of responses: As Committee report.

1/02 After the agent obtained a copy of the Committee Agenda Report for the above development, a letter raising a number of matters was received by Council, which can be summarized as follows:

- Parking provision can be reduced to the 80 no. noted in the report;
- Reference is made to an earlier application for residential use: P/1057/03/CFU:
In making comparisons it should be made clear that this earlier application has the support of planning officers and was recommended for approval. The proposed scheme, when directly compared, is lower than this earlier submission and the positive nature of the prior scheme could generally be applied to this new proposal.
- The latest report does not make clear when referring to the increase in unit numbers the increase in site area. The earlier submission did not include the site area of 57 Gayton Road, an additional 400m².

INFORMATION:

183 Habitable rooms, for 67 flats,
Density: 152 Dwellings per hectare.
416 Habitable rooms per hectare.

Section 2

2/02 Plan Nos:
Delete: 050303/01 Rev B and 05030/02 Rev B
Substitute: 050303/01 Rev C and 050303/02 Rev C

2/03 **APPRAISAL** section 3, **Parking and Access**, add

“The visibility splay of 90m as required by Design Bulletin 32 is met. The Winton Gardens / Whitcurch Lane junction also conforms to these requirements”.

“Given that the traffic generation from the development is not expected to significantly impinge on the capacity of the immediate highway network, safety in this location would not be compromised”.

2/05 Drawing 04E replaces drawing 04D

c) Proposal Details

Amend 4th bullet to read: The proposal includes 2 parking spaces on the existing frontage. These would be separated by a 1.2m wide walkway and would be accessed from Shaftesbury Avenue by a 6m wide crossover. The remainder of the frontage would be given over to soft landscaping.

2/06 1 additional objection received that can be summarised as follows:

- still opposed to the proposal despite being reduced from 10 to 8 flats; 8 flats is an over intensive use of the property; traffic and car parking is already a problem in the area and would be exacerbated by the development, in part due to nearby schools; inadequate on site parking spaces proposed; residents & visitors would be likely to park in adjacent St Saviors Court car park; area already overpopulated; lack of bin storage facilities; lack of rear garden amenity space; 8 flats could accommodate as many people as the prior refused 10 flats; character of area has been severely eroded already; high density

development of flats is not needed in the area; hundreds of flats within minutes of the site; general appearance of the flats is not in keeping with the local area; flats would alienate families who live in the road; disruption during building; devaluation of property value.

Apart from many of the points raised having already been addressed in the main Committee Agenda report, the following additional comments are made with respect of selected issues:

- residents & visitors would be likely to park in adjacent St Saviors Court car park;

The management of the parking of vehicles on private land is not a relevant planning consideration.

- lack of bin storage facilities;

The development plans detail two areas allocated for on site bin storage which are considered adequate for the scale of the development proposed.

- disruption during building;

An informative is proposed to draw the developer's attention to the requirements of the Considerate Contractor's Code of Practice.

- devaluation of property value.

This is not a relevant planning consideration.

2/07

Plan Nos:

Delete: 1130/1E and 3

Substitute: 1130/1F and 3A

Amend Condition 4:

The use hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for the landscaping etc.....

2/09

Amend Condition 4 to read as follows:

4. The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in conjunction with planning permission P/2629/03/CFU as shown on drawings 003A and 004C agreed as amendments by letter dated 22nd April 2005, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: As stated.

- 2/10 Add
Notification Replies: 2
Response: unsightly, not appropriate in a residential area, adverse impacts on health, recent publicity in relation to mast/antennae near schools.
- Add to Consultation Responses:
See report above.
- 2/11 Add as Neighbour Response: 1 response received
- Proximity to antennae, too many masts already on building, open doors and windows in summer and radiation will affect them.
- Add to Consultation Responses:
See report above.
- Add plan no: XXXXX_0X_261_M01_01
- 2/12 DEFER at Officers' request to give further consideration to the impact of proposals on St. Georges Centre
- Plan Nos:
Delete: 1133/2A
Substitute: 1133/2B
- RECOMMENDATION** as follows:-
- Resolve to GRANT planning permission..... subject to the following conditions and no new material objections being raised by the expiry date of the notifications period:
- Condition 5: Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the area.
- Add new Condition 6:
Notwithstanding the highway safety layout shown on the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall not commence until revised details of the highway layout have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To ensure the provision for satisfactory highway layout.
- | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|------|---------|-----------|
| f) | Notifications | Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| | | 118 | 1 | 24-MAY-05 |
- Summary of Response:** inappropriate scheme, threat to security due to obstruction of CCTV cameras, creation of loitering areas, potential to climb onto planter from St. Annes car

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 17 MAY 2005

AGENDA ITEM 12

**ADVANCE WARNING GIVEN OF REQUESTS TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS ON
PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative
Item 2/03 Land rear of 123 to 137, Part of Garden 133 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware	Mrs Collins	Gillett Macleod Partnership for London & District Housing Ltd
Item 2/03 Land rear of 123 to 137, Part of Garden 133 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware	Mrs Sylvia Kay	Gillett Macleod Partnership for London & District Housing Ltd

This page is intentionally left blank