



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 6 JULY 2005**

**ADDENDUM**

This page is intentionally left blank

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**ADDENDUM**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 6<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2005**

**Section 2**

2/01 CAAC (2<sup>nd</sup> Proposal): The revisions are an improvement on the previous design, but the comments from the previous design, but the comments from the previous CAAC meeting of 23 May 2004 still apply. The design should be more subdued and in keeping with the wall. The gates should be squared at the top, rather than curved upwards to a point.

Amended drawing No pg/gS/50a received 24-MAY-05 (simplified design of gate).

2/02 **APPRAISAL**

Section 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> para 1<sup>st</sup> line to read  
"...will not result...."

2/03 Letter from Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings:

Opening up the gable window would seem to involve a significant amount of reinstatement work. If the area of the building's upper floor behind the window would be brought into use as part of the Manor's repair, we accept that this might provide justification for the proposal. If, however, the room behind the window would not be used, we feel it would be preferable for the window to remain concealed from the outside, so that it is retained unaltered as part of the history of the building's evolution.

It is intended that the attic room be used – indeed the opening up of the window would allow this to happen, as at present the room has no natural daylight and cannot be used. In addition the blocking up is relatively recent (early 20<sup>th</sup> Century) and not an historic feature.

- 2/04 1) In response to any inquiry regarding the overall level of electromagnetic/radio frequency emissions within the locality (namely with regard to existing telecommunications facilities on Raebarn House and Sherbourne House), the applicants have confirmed that radio frequency (RF) calculations have indicated that no areas accessible to the public surrounding the installation will exceed the general public exposure reference level in the KNIRP Guidelines.
- 2) No responses to public notification were received.
- 2/06 CAAC (2<sup>nd</sup> Proposal): Comments are same as before (from CAAC meeting of 18 April 2005). The revisions make no difference to these comments.
- 2/08 Plan Nos: Add A3/322
- 2/09 Plan Nos:  
Replace COM/P210 with COM/P210 Rev A
- Add Condition  
The window in the 1<sup>ST</sup> floor west flank wall of the approved development shall:
- a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8 metres above finished floor level,
- and shall thereafter be retained in that form.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 2/10 Letter of objection from Hatch End Association  
comments: access is not safe.
- 2/11 Plan Nos: Replace 104/003/02 Rev A  
with 104/003/02 Rev C
- 2/12 **APPRAISAL**
- 3) Para 1: "As this proposal was determined in 1971....."

- 2/16 New Plans received
- 1181/102A to replace 1181/02
  - 1181/104B to replace 1181/104a (dimensions of proposed rising arm barrier added)

Further comments received to add to applicant's statement:-

- The bollards are plain circular tubes 1100mm high paint Black. A picture is now included on drawing 1181/102/A.

**DEFER** at Officer's request in order to clarify access for fire appliances with respect to use of rising bollards.

- 2/17 Additional condition

"Notwithstanding the details on the approved drawings car parking space numbered 3 shall be constructed to minimum dimensions of 3.2m wide and 4.8m deep.

REASON: To ensure that the development will be accessible to people with disabilities.

Additional Objection received raising similar issue that have been previously raised.

- 2/18 Plan Nos:  
62.16.02 Rev D received 29<sup>th</sup> June 2005; AMH62/15.11F, Site plan

### **APPRAISAL**

#### (1) Second Paragraph

"A distance of 5.5m would be maintained between the outer flank elevation and the common boundary with Leigh Court. This exceeds the 3m distance set down in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidelines and is acceptable having regard to the circumstances of the site.

#### Third Paragraph (first sentence)

A distance of some 20-21m would be maintained between the flank elevation and the rear elevation and the rear elevation of Leigh Court.

**APPRAISAL****1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

Paragraph 2, line 3: substitute "2.8m" for "3.5m"

Paragraph 2, line 10: substitute "2.8m" for "3.4m"

**Main Items**

9a In response to part (i) of the petition, a response was sent to the head petitioner and circulated to members of the Development Control Committee.

The response points out that 914 letters of notification were sent regarding the outline application for the redevelopment of the whole estate. Site notices and a press advert were also undertaken. The application for the first phase was the subject of a similar number of letters (921) and site and press notices. The second phase was the subject of 818 letters. The Community Centre and much smaller third phase were the subject of 97 letters and 122 letters respectively.

The Council has agreed various minor changes to the proposed development without requiring formal re-applications in circumstances where those changes would have no greater impact and would not raise any additional issues when compared to the original approvals. Typically these may relate to minor variations in the size/position of windows, doors or balconies. The most recently proposed alterations to a previous approval have resulted in a planning application, as officers were of the opinion that the proposed changes could not be regarded as 'minor amendments'.