



PLANNING COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 9 SEPTEMBER 2009

ADDENDUM

This page is intentionally left blank



HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 9th September 2009

1/01	<p>Additional representation following submission by Preston Bennett Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No reference to volume comparisons – if it did this would highlight the very significant increase in scale and bulk (200% increase in volume) ▪ Impact of RNOH proposal considered largely mitigated by surrounding topography and woodland area – this consideration should also apply to Preston Bennett scheme ▪ Height of RNOH scheme 4m higher than existing building – Preston Bennett scheme of the similar height ▪ Footprint increase in RNOH proposal by 515m² which in officers report concludes that there would be a ‘net reduction in the building footprint’ Officers report then states that the surplus footprint will be re-provide elsewhere? ▪ Design and materials of Preston Bennett scheme superior to the RNOH proposal ▪ RNOH aspires to achieve 20% renewable energy saving but fails to explain how this will be achieved – Preston Bennett scheme is superior in that it would achieve Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 ▪ Tree loss – RNOH proposal would result in the loss of 10 TPO trees. Preston Bennett scheme no loss of TPO’s ▪ Scheme would have far greater impact on the area of special character than the Preston Bennett proposal <p>The table below includes the floor areas and volumes of the proposed building and existing buildings to be demolished as part of this application. The existing building includes both Graham Hill Unit and the incinerator building.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Existing</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Proposed</th> <th style="text-align: center;">% Over Existing</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Footprint (m²)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,172 m²</td> <td style="text-align: center;">657 m²</td> <td style="text-align: center;">- 43 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Volume (m³)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">6,485 m³</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7120 m³</td> <td style="text-align: center;">+ 9.79 %</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>PLAN NO’s</p> <p>REPLACE drawing numbers B3271 D003 Rev A, B3271 D004, B3271 D005 Rev A with B3271 D003 Rev B, B3271 D004 Rev A, B3271 D005 Rev B submitted 24th August 2009</p>		Existing	Proposed	% Over Existing	Footprint (m ²)	1,172 m ²	657 m ²	- 43 %	Volume (m ³)	6,485 m ³	7120 m ³	+ 9.79 %
	Existing	Proposed	% Over Existing										
Footprint (m ²)	1,172 m ²	657 m ²	- 43 %										
Volume (m ³)	6,485 m ³	7120 m ³	+ 9.79 %										

DELETE B3271 P000 Rev A submitted 9 July 2009 – plan number was incorrectly listed twice,

DELETE 3D visual sheets 1 and 2 - superseded by 3D Images submitted on the 3rd August

RECOMMENDATION

As a consequence of the applicant and the GLA's position on this proposal it is considered that the proposal could represent a material departure from the development plan requiring further notification through press and site notices

Whilst such notifications are considered unlikely to raise new issues (not already identified by respondents) it is considered appropriate and necessary to undertake such consultation prior to referral of the application to GLA and GOL under Circular 02/2009 inter alia sections 9 and 10 of the Town and Country Planning Consultation Direction 2009.

Accordingly, in the event that the committee is minded to support the application, it is proposed that further notification be completed (and authority delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning) to refer the application to GOL/GLA for final consideration subject to such consultation raising no new material planning issues.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION

Subject to no new material issues being raised through consultation to delegate referral of the application to GOL/GLA in accordance with above mentioned direction with recommendation for GRANT, subject to the conditions outlined in the report (as updated in this addendum)

REVISED CONDITIONS

The applicants have requested as follows:

Although it is the Applicants full intention to carry out the development following a grant of planning permission and the securing of the necessary funding, in these uncertain times it is prudent for us to ask your Council to use its discretion provided under Sections 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to grant planning permission for longer than the default period of three years. In light of this, we respectfully request that Condition 1 is reworded to extend the lifetime of the permission from the default of three years to five years.

Condition 1 **REPLACE** 'three years' with 'five years'

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

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

Condition 7 **REPLACE** approved plan number 'B3271 P002 Rev A' with 'B3271 P002

Rev B'.

7 The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number B3271 P002 Rev B 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 used 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.

Condition 10 **Amend** as follows:-

10 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority, a scheme of hard and soft landscape works including a landscape management and maintenance schedule for the site. Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans, and schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers / densities.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and to enhance the appearance of the development.

Condition 13 as printed except for the **DELETION of** 'The protection fencing should comprise of 1.8 metres high welded mesh: "Heras" fencing and should be staked and in place before demolition & construction works commence, and should remain in place for the entire duration of the construction works' to read as follows:

13 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.

ADDITIONAL CONDITION

The development hereby permitted shall only be used for the accommodation and support of parent/carers/family members of patients undergoing treatment at the RNOH Stanmore campus and for not other purpose.

REASON: The application involves development within the Green Belt for which the applicants have claimed and the Local Planning Authority has accepted there are very special circumstances. These very special circumstances relate to the use of the accommodation which must be controlled if the development is to satisfy the requirement of PPG2 and the relevant policies of the development plan.

DELETE THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS- 9, 14, 15, 19 & 21

9 Prior to commencement of development, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the development achieves a 'very good' BREEAM rating unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning

Authority .The development shall proceed in accordance with the details as approved and be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To assess the overall sustainability rating of the proposed development to ensure that the scheme adequately addresses sustainability requirements in accordance with policies 4A.1, 4A.2 and 4A.3 of the London Plan.

14 Prior to the commencement of development a detailed Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan/Schedule is required for the communal landscaped areas, to include the initial year and the subsequent long term management for years 2 to 5.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the development and the wider Green Belt site.

15 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used until all the works detailed in the application have been completed in accordance with the permission granted otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To safeguard the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

19 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of a scheme for generating 20% of the predicted energy requirement of the development from on-site renewable resources has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before the development is first occupied and shall thereafter be retained so that it provides the required level of generation.

REASON: To ensure the development meets the basic requirements of London Plan policies 4A.1 and 4A.7.

21 Prior to the commencement of development on the site, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority demonstrating suitable disabled access throughout the site, including access from the wheel chair car parking spaces within the site. Development shall proceed in accordance with the details as approved, and specific measures shall be retained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure the provision of adequate access for all persons within the development in accordance with HUDP policy C16 and Supplementary Planning Document Access for All.

1/02

ADD

Updated Housing Information

The proposed housing mix remains the same as previously [25% private sale and 75% affordable].

- The 25% of private sales units consist of 6no. x one-bedroom and 6no. x two-bedroom flats - Total of 12; and
- The 75% affordable units are a mixture of 22 flats and 12 houses - Total of 34.

The 75% affordable is further broken down to 35% shared ownership and 65% social rented.

The 35% shared ownership units consist of 6no. x one-bedroom and 6no. x two-

	<p>accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be retained. REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.</p> <p>- ADD condition: Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, measures to minimise the risk of crime in a visually acceptable manner and meet the specific security needs of the application site / development shall be installed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Any such measures should follow the design principles set out in the relevant Design Guides on the Secured by Design website: http://www.securedbydesign.com/guides/index.aspx and shall include the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. all main entrance door sets to individual dwellings and communal entrance door sets shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in BS PAS 24-1:1999 'Security standard for domestic door sets'; 2. all window sets on the ground floor of the development and those adjacent to flat roofs or large rainwater pipes (downpipes) shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in BS.7950 'Security standard for domestic window sets'. <p>Following implementation the works shall thereafter be retained. REASON: In the interests of creating safer and more sustainable communities and to safeguard amenity by reducing the risk of crime and the fear of crime, in accordance with Policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan, and Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.</p>
2/07	<p>ADD the following:</p> <p>Pg. 87 – Applicant is Mr Anwar Hasham remove agent</p> <p>Pg. 87 - Remove “Plan Nos: 1269 OS2 F; 1269 OS3; 1269 11 REV K; 1269 12 REV F; Design and Access Statement” from underneath RECOMMENDATION</p> <p>Pg 88 – Under INFORMATION change to:-</p> <p>“This application is reported to the Planning Committee <u>at</u> the request of <u>a</u> nominated member”</p>
2/08	<p>ADD Revised description:</p> <p>REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE SINGLE STOREY DETACHED BUILDING CONTAINING WORKSHOP AND STORAGE FACILITIES (SUI GENERIS)</p> <p>Additional explanatory note: Notwithstanding the appraisal undertaken in the report in terms of the impact of the proposed development on residential amenity, the amended description, which describes the proposed use as Sui Generis as opposed to B1, is considered not to materially alter the assessment or recommendation of this application. The proposed use on site would remain as per the current lawful use, and the assessment of the impact of this use is in line with that made by the Inspector as part of the 17th March 2008 appeal decision.</p> <p>Amendment to condition 6:</p> <p>The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a storage or amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning</p>

	<p>authority. REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.</p>																																																
2/10	<p>DELETE Condition 1 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>REPLACE with : 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission. REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.</p>																																																
2/12	<p>ADD Revised description:</p> <p>CONVERSION OF RESIDENTIAL PREMISES INTO 7 FLATS; EXCAVATION OF PART OF REAR GARDEN TO FORM LIGHTWELL; EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS; LANDSCAPING AND PARKING TO FRONT GARDEN AND PROVISION OF TWO PARKING SPACES</p> <p>Pg 140: Under proposal details ADD the following:-</p> <p>Room sizes of the proposed flats in square metres</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Bedroom 1</th> <th>Bedroom 2</th> <th>Living</th> <th>Kitchen</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flat 1 (basement)</td> <td>8.41</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>24.17</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 2 (ground flr)</td> <td>13</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>13.4</td> <td>7.8</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 3 (ground flr)</td> <td>14.28</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>21.94</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 4 (1st flr)</td> <td>13.12</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>17</td> <td>8.16</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 5 (1st flr)</td> <td>13.32</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>22.64</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 6 (2nd flr)</td> <td>14.64</td> <td>13.25</td> <td>30.64</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Flat 7 (3rd flr)</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>18.4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Pg 142: CHANGE number of consultation responses to 5</p> <p>Summary of responses:</p> <p>Subsidence at no. 30 Roxborough Park, concerned that basement flat would cause further subsidence How to protect neighbouring property against any damage caused by the transformation Are there going to be any trees removed during landscaping? Concerned about possible increase in sewage output, the current system has reached its capacity Front garden should not be used as a car park Are additional parking spaces required for proposal? Noise during construction Windows should be kept the same size as the existing School works will be completed by summer next year and this will lead to usage of roads</p>		Bedroom 1	Bedroom 2	Living	Kitchen		Flat 1 (basement)	8.41	n/a	24.17			Flat 2 (ground flr)	13	n/a	13.4	7.8		Flat 3 (ground flr)	14.28	n/a	21.94			Flat 4 (1 st flr)	13.12	n/a	17	8.16		Flat 5 (1 st flr)	13.32	n/a	22.64			Flat 6 (2 nd flr)	14.64	13.25	30.64			Flat 7 (3 rd flr)	22.5	n/a	18.4		
	Bedroom 1	Bedroom 2	Living	Kitchen																																													
Flat 1 (basement)	8.41	n/a	24.17																																														
Flat 2 (ground flr)	13	n/a	13.4	7.8																																													
Flat 3 (ground flr)	14.28	n/a	21.94																																														
Flat 4 (1 st flr)	13.12	n/a	17	8.16																																													
Flat 5 (1 st flr)	13.32	n/a	22.64																																														
Flat 6 (2 nd flr)	14.64	13.25	30.64																																														
Flat 7 (3 rd flr)	22.5	n/a	18.4																																														

Pg. 145 under section 4 consultation responses **ADD:-**

- Subsidence, damage to neighbouring property during transformation and sewage output are not matters within the remit of the Local Planning Authority
- Trees removed
- Front garden should not be used as a car park – there is currently a hardstanding area in the front garden used for parking (refer to pg. 144 of report). The proposal seeks to use existing hardstanding therefore there would be no further impact in the streetscene in this regard. Furthermore, suggested conditions 3 and 4 would seek a landscaping plan and implementation of such a plan which would help to improve the appearance of the streetscene and preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area
- Additional parking spaces are not required for the proposal, please refer to ‘Parking’ section of the report at page 144
- Two small trees would be removed, one within the front garden and one within the rear garden
- Usage of the road would not increase as a result of this proposal and would arguably decrease (see pg 144)

3/01 Following the publication of the Committee report, further representations have been received from the applicant. The statement, in the form of an 8-page rebuttal, raises the following issues:

Survey and building dimensions

Correction to the volumetric and floor area calculations. Based upon an RICS compliant survey, the application involves the following:

	Existing	Proposed	% Over Existing
Footprint (m2)	604	510	-15.5% (correction)
Volume (m3)	2,916	5,548	+90%

The applicants have requested that the above table replaces the incorrectly referenced table found on page 215 of the agenda. Given the basis of the survey, officers would not propose to contest the dimensions set out in the applicant’s statement. The revised table above confirms the 90% increase in volume previously reported and reduces the attributed floorspace reduction from the 18.4% quoted in the report to 15.5%. It is acknowledged that both measurements depart from the measurements taken by the officer and reproduced in the table at the top of page 215.

Clarification on building height.

The applicants submit that although the report is correct in its indication of total height of 10.3m at the front (east) elevation, because this relates to the lift overrun, the actual perceived measurement should be taken to be 9.5m – 2 metres higher than the ridge of the two storey coach house on the site. The submission also, whilst acknowledging that the west elevation would be higher, argues that this viewpoint would be screened by fencing and vegetation.

Representation from Stanmore Society

The submission notes the response received (and reported on page 212) and considers that this should be given considerable weight.

Policy Considerations

The applicants submission suggests that the assessment of the proposal against national, regional and local policy relating to development in the greenbelt is incorrect, and misrepresents the case for very special circumstances advanced in the planning application. In particular, the applicant's submission suggests that the proposal demonstrates that the development would not have an adverse effect on the five purposes of green belt. This includes the regeneration and recycling of derelict land through the removal of hard standings and derelict buildings, the refurbishment of Vine Cottage, new landscaping and management of the site in a way that would safeguard nature conservation interests.

Accordingly, the applicant disagrees with the officer's report (page 213/4) that the development does not contribute to any green belt objectives. The applicants consider that the officer's approach is inconsistent with the application at 1/01 for another development on this site.

The applicant further contends that the development would accord with the fifth criteria for construction of new buildings in the green belt – namely redevelopment within an existing Major Developed Site (MDS).

Major Developed Site

Having regard to the criteria for MDS, the applicants revised submission contends that in respect of the 5 criteria for acceptable development within the site the following considerations are relevant;

Criteria a – the floorspace and volume calculations provide evidence of footprint consolidation which can achieve a positive outcome in terms of enhanced openness of the site as a whole. The statement considers that the proposed dwelling positively integrates with the changing levels on the site to minimise its impact.

Criteria b – the applicants consider that the development does contribute to the objectives for the green belt (see above under policy considerations).

Criteria c – the assessment of height in the officer's report is claimed to be inaccurate. The applicants Design and Access Statement indicates that the maximum height of dwellings on the site is 147.89m. The proposed dwelling is exactly the same height as Vine Cottage (to be retained) thereby having no greater impact upon the openness of the green belt. Outline pp for the hospital site sets the maximum height parameter for the Eastern Development Zone at 151.24m. The proposed dwelling is 3.35m below this.

The ridge height of the coach house on the site is 7.5m and the proposed height of the dwelling at the front of the site is 9.5m (only a 2m increase). A consistent approach with RNOH should be applied and the officer's report is therefore inaccurate and must be corrected.

Criteria d – footprint. The applicant's rebuttal points to the revised data provided in the table above as the correct representation of the volume and footprint relating to the development. Including Vine Cottage the development amounts to 10.5% site coverage. The applicants claim that this demonstrates a positive enhancement to the openness of the green belt.

Established residential use.

The applicant's statement clarifies that the reference to this former use in the planning application documentation is to demonstrate the compatibility of the residential use with former use on the site. The proposal is not for a replacement dwelling and the applicant's case is not based upon this argument.

Major Development Site 2

The applicant's submission refutes the conclusion on page 215 of the officer report that the site cannot be considered within the context of a MDS because it is functionally distinct. The statement contends that the officer's conclusion that because the site falls outside the outline planning application boundary for the new hospital application, it cannot be within the MDS, is incorrect. Just because the ownership of the site has changed or all or part of the site becomes vacant, the site does not automatically lose its MDS designation without formal ratification by the Council.

Design of the development

The applicant's statement re-states their belief that the development demonstrates exceptional architectural and design quality. The statement refers to comments made by officers of the planning department ahead of the preparation of the committee report, which describe the design as of "a very high standard" and of "sufficient high quality so as to mitigate the loss of locally listed buildings." The applicant's statement considers that these comments should be cited in the officer's report and given weight. The applicants consider the development has the potential to be "iconic and a landmark architectural beacon in Harrow." The statement confirms that in the applicants opinion, design is the principal "very special circumstance in support of the development and justifies on its own, as well as in combination with other considerations, a departure from green belt policy..."

The report considers that the assessment of design and impact upon the green belt is inconsistent between their application and the other proposal for a new hospital building on the agenda. Specifically, they cite the officers conclusion in the other case regarding the way in which the topography and surrounding woodland mitigate the impact of development on the openness of the greenbelt (agenda report page 8).

The applicants submit that the site visit demonstrates that features such as the recessed top floor and changing levels mean that the roof level will be either wholly obscured or only partially visible.

Sustainability

The applicants contend that sustainability report submitted and the schemes sustainability credentials has been wholly omitted from the report. The development would achieve code level 4. The applicants consider that this achievement has been down played in the report. Achievement of the code 4 rating would mean that the building was one of the first and would act as an exemplar project. Together with the exceptional design, this element is considered to amount to very special circumstances.

Scheduled Ancient monument

The proposal would secure long-term management of the SAM.

Landscape restoration

The applicants cite this as a positive benefit of the scheme. They consider officer's conclusions in respect of the other development in this regard is inconsistent. No objections have been raised to the applicant's proposals by the tree officer and support has been given by English Heritage for the landscape restoration plan. The applicants

consider that the officer must conclude that the impact of the 3 storey development on the area of special character must be consistent between both applications.

Locally listed buildings

The applicants draw attention to the “no objection” received from English Heritage to the loss of the locally listed buildings. They consider this overcomes the previous reason for refusal (see page 210).

Scheduled Ancient monument

Consider that the application has overcome (see above) the third previous reason for refusal at (page 211)

Trees

Consider that the requirement for a tree protection method statement is unnecessary as one has been submitted (see page 221).

Highways and access – refer to “no objection” to the reinstated access from highways officer and LB Barnet

Comment

Given the length of the applicant’s late submission and the complexity of the matter, copies of the full submission were exceptionally forwarded to members on 8th September for information. The reported component above therefore represent a summary of the applicants case (termed a rebuttal) and seek to summarise the key points.

The applicants submission nevertheless seeks to correct inaccuracies associated with manual (as opposed to survey) data. It also alleges a different approach to interpretation of national planning policy on development within the green belt between two separate items on the agenda and the differences in interpretation between the local planning authority and the applicant’s consultants. Further, the proposal advances a contrary conclusion to that reached by officers on whether the “very special circumstances” cited in this case, justify “inappropriate development” within the green belt.

In respect of the statements of fact (height, volume, footprint etc.) provided by the applicant, officers would not propose to offer a contrary view to the survey data or methodology used by the applicant in this case. This data nevertheless confirms that the proposed dwelling, despite the net reduction in the area of the site development, would provide for development of a significantly greater volume than all of the current buildings on the site. Equally, whilst the maximum height of the development proposed (on the lowest part of the site) is no higher than the ridge line of Vine Cottage, some 60m from the new dwelling at the other end of the site (and the highest building), the applicants figures confirm that the proposed dwelling, when viewed from the [West] would be up to 6.9m (2 storeys equivalent) higher than the existing coach house building which is currently located on the site of the new dwelling. Given the view of officers of the GLA on this matter in relation to the other proposed development at RNOH, which has prompted a review of the application appraisal and a need for “very special circumstances” to be proven in that case, and the lack of clarity relating to reference point for building height in the context of Annex C4 of PPG2, this factor alone is considered to render the development non compliant with criteria c of Annex C4 of PPG2.

The applicant has argued that the development satisfies all four criteria for development within a MDS. Based upon the data provided and notwithstanding the submission on criteria b and d, the proposal is not considered to properly satisfy criteria a and c of

annex C4. Accordingly, officers consider, and the applicant, in their submission appears to accept, that consideration of this proposal should take place in the context of the need for “very special circumstances” to justify the development.

Page 212-213 of the officer report outlines the purpose and objectives of greenbelts. In that context, the development of greenbelt land for additional new homes is considered to be inappropriate development. Inappropriate development should be approved only in “very special circumstances.”

The applicant cites the following as the “very special circumstances” that should in this case justify the development.

- 1 The “exceptional” design of the new dwelling”
- 2 The construction of the new dwelling to meet code level 4 of the code for sustainable homes.
- 3 The safeguarding and improved management of the scheduled ancient monument.
- 4 The restoration of the landscape arising from the removal of derelict buildings and improved management of the trees in line with green belt objectives.

Officers have concluded that, for the reasons set out in the report, the very special circumstances highlighted, given the impact of the proposed dwelling on the locality, do not outweigh the presumption against this “inappropriate development” in the green belt that is proposed. The report does not explicitly respond to the improvements to the landscape cited as a consequence of the development and the re-use of the site and its associated management. The landscaping proposals are considered acceptable, but are considered to have no more than a benign effect, arising from proposals to enclose the site, on the wider appearance of the green belt.

Members have nevertheless visited the site to consider the site context, site condition and topography. Officers consider that the proposed dwelling would appear as a sizeable and significant new structure on the site, visible from outside of the site and therefore appreciated from views within the green belt. This new dwelling would, in the opinion of officers, have a considerable and significant impact that was greater than the impact associated with the existing, modest single and two storey buildings of “domestic” scale that comprise the application site. Given this greater impact, officers have concluded that the development would have a greater impact upon the openness of the green belt than the current buildings. Having visited the site, this is a matter for members to consider. The applicant’s claim that the building is of exceptional design needs to be considered in the context of the objectives for the greenbelt cited in the main report and members own assessment of the quality of the design and its response to the site conditions.

With regard to the other matters raised by the applicant in their submission, save where acknowledged above, these represent matters of detail that either singularly or in combination with each other do not represent very special circumstances. They are reported for member’s attention alongside the comments made in the principle report.

With regard to the comments in respect of the other item on this agenda, and officer’s consideration of that item, these are addressed at the relevant point in the addendum report above.

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation for refusal of the application remains as set out on page 208 of the main agenda, save for reference to one London Plan Policy, 3D.9 which had been

	omitted from the earlier recommendation in error.
--	---

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 9 SEPTEMBER 2009

AGENDA ITEM 9

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

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative (who has advised that they would wish to reply)
2/13 – 5 West Drive, Harrow, HA3 6TX	Mr Rodney Goodman	

This page is intentionally left blank