

Planning Committee

ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 11 July 2012

This page is intentionally left blank

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 11th July 2012

1/01	<p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u> On page 5, under NOTIFICATIONS add the following: 13 additional responses objecting to the development have been received. Comments not already summarised can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential area should be kept residential • Issues of flooding on the site • Development will result in fly-tipping • Noise issues • Loss of views of Kodak chimney • Doubt whether this development is needed considering Kodak permission <p><u>Addendum Item 2:</u> On page 8 of the agenda under the heading at the heading Amenity – replace “such low levels of vehicular movements, about 50% below the number of trips previously proposed ...” <u>with</u> “such low levels of vehicular movements, about 33% below the number of trips previously proposed ...”</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 3:</u> On page 11, under CONSULTATION RESPONSES, add the following:</p> <p><i>Residential area should be kept residential</i> Each planning application must be assessed on its individual merits and the location of development in a certain type of area cannot solely preclude development because of the existing or surrounding land uses. Clearly the surrounding area should form the context within which to consider whether the proposed land uses are appropriate in this area. As detailed in the appraisal section of the application, the area, though largely residential has a mixed land use character as demonstrated by the location of business uses along Headstone Drive, Headstone Gardens and adjacent to the site, within the land enclosed by View Close, Harrow View, Headstone Drive and Walton Road. Within this mixed use context and considering that B1 uses (part of the development does relate to B8 uses) are defined as being not harmful to residential amenity, it is considered that the principle of the proposed uses on the site need not necessarily be harmful.</p> <p><i>Issues of flooding on the site</i> These issues are addressed in the appraisal section of the report. It is, however, worth noting that the existing application site is entirely hardsurfaced. It is proposed to introduce areas of soft landscaping on the site as well as providing a green roof to the</p>
-------------	--

building. Subject to conditions which are recommended, it is considered that the development would reduce water run-off rates on the site and would therefore reduce the risk of flooding on or near the site in comparison with the existing situation.

Development will result in fly-tipping

Statements in relation to fly-tipping are unqualified and it is not understood how this issue may arise. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that conditions are attached which require the developer to accord with 'Secured by Design' standards which would have a positive impact on security in the area. It would also be in the interest of the developer, given that they would lease or sell the units to make these units commercially attractive to prospective users and it is therefore likely they would seek to ensure these issues would not arise. Given the existing situation on site and the conditions that would be attached to any planning permission, it is considered that the proposed development would reduce the likelihood of fly-tipping on the site.

Noise issues

This issue has been addressed in section 3 of the appraisal in the officer's report.

Loss of views

This issue has been addressed in section 10 of the appraisal in the officer's report.

Doubt whether this development is needed considering Kodak permission

This issue has been addressed in section 10 of the appraisal in the officer's report.

Addendum Item 4:

Under section 4, amend 50% reduction to 31% reduction.

Addendum Item 5:

Add informative 7 to under section INFORMATIVES:

INFORMATIVE:

The applicant has submitted a revised site plan indicating the exact ownership of the applicant's land. The correct site boundary is shown on drawing numbers 5056/2/01A and 5056/2/26C. The applicant is advised that the indicative site boundaries shown on other drawings are inaccurate.

Addendum Item 6:

The applicant has submitted, on Tuesday 10 July 2012, a brief for the members to view of the development proposal. This brief is appended here to this addendum as Appendix 1.

HEADSTONE DRIVE MEMBERS BRIEFING

Dear Councillor,

This Wednesday the 11th of July you will be asked to consider an application to build seven storage and office buildings in Marlborough ward.

The application holds a recommendation to approve subject to conditions. The Council Annual Monitoring Report produced as part of the LDF process confirms that there is demand for small and start up industrial units, above all and other types of industrial / commercial units.

Working with the community

The proposals before you have been altered in response to public views of an earlier version of the scheme.

- The building has been made significantly smaller, with less vehicular movements.
- The building has been moved away from neighbouring property boundaries.
- Residents have throughout expressed support for these proposals allowing for easier refuse collection. With this in mind this feature has been maintained throughout the revisions.
- The scheme complies with your officers judgement on car parking and has addressed resident concerns.



Contributions

- £5,000 towards public realm improvements.
- £10,000 towards local training and employment initiatives prior to commencement of development.
- Payment of Harrow Councils reasonable costs in the preparation of the legal agreement and the payment of a £1,000 administration fee for the monitoring of and compliance of the legal agreement.

The Site

The proposed site of the application lies on the corner of Headstone Drive and Harrow View and is occupied temporarily by a house clearance man.

The site is 11 minutes' walk away from Harrow and Wealdstone Station and is immediately served by the H9 bus service providing easy access into the London bus network.

YOUR OFFICERS HAVE SAID

Principle of Development

"The site lies just outside of the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area but is currently vacant and is providing a low return. In light of increased emphasis on economic development within the NPPF, it is considered that adopted national policy would add further weight to the previously accepted principle of use of the site for employment purposes."

Impact of Development on Character of the Area

"...the proposed development would respond satisfactorily to the residential and commercial context of the site and would remove an area of poorly maintained land. The proposed buildings on site would therefore complement the mixed character and appearance of the area and no objection is raised in this respect"

Impact of Development on Neighbouring Properties

"...that the proposed buildings on the site would not have undue overbearing or overshadowing impacts upon neighbouring properties."

"...that there would be no undue loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. The proposed B1 use would also, by definition, not be harmful to neighbouring residential properties."

Highways and Parking

"...the applicant has reduced the scale of the proposed development on the site, thereby reducing the level of traffic throughout the course of the working day by almost 50%."

"...traffic generated by this site would not have unreasonable impact on pedestrian or vehicular safety."

Parking provision is: "...considered to be appropriate given the 'land-locked' nature of this site and the absence of nearby parking spaces."

"...A turning facility within the site would allow for refuse vehicles to enter and exit the access way in forward gear, to the betterment of the public realm."

Sustainability

"The proposed development will aim for an 'excellent' BREAAAM standard though it is acknowledged that some aspect of the design may vary throughout the build phase reducing the sustainability to 'very good' levels. Nonetheless, the design of the building would meet London Plan policies ... a condition is attached to this application to ensure the development meets the stated targets and accord with the provisions of the development plan."



A cross section of the development

1/02	<p>Condition 2 is to be amended as follows;</p> <p>2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4270/110, 4270/108, 4270/107, 4270/106, 4270/105 Rev C, 4270/104, 4270/103 Rev B, 4270/102 Rev A, 4270/101, 4270/100 Rev A, 4270/99, 4270/98</p> <p>REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.</p> <p>Amended plans have been received showing cycle parking spaces for 50 cycles, although full details of the cycle parking facilities for all 50 cycles have not been submitted subsequently condition 14 is still considered necessary to be attached to the planning permission if granted.</p>
2/01	<p>ADD the following CONDITION:</p> <p>8. The use of the land hereby approved shall be for the parking of vehicles in connection with the provision of MOT testing services within the existing vehicle repair garage at 14-16 Masons Avenue, Wealdstone, HA3 5AP and for no other purpose.</p> <p>REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and businesses in accordance with policy 7.15 of The London Plan (2011) and saved policy EP25 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).</p>
5/01	<p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u> Amend recommendation to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PRIOR APPROVAL of details of siting and appearance IS required 2. Delegated Authority be given to the Divisional Director of Planning to determine prior approval following the end of the consultation period on 26 July 2012. <p><u>Addendum Item 2:</u> Page 97 two further consultation letters sent to Nower Hill High School and Pinner Park School on 5 July and a response is required by 26 July 2012.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 3:</u> Update response from Highways Authority: No objection</p> <p>Update response to consultation on page 97. Four letters of objection have been received. Summarised as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eyesore, overbearing, obtrusive, the mast would stand out against the appearance of the church and it would stand out against the skyline • Line of sight would be affected, highway safety • No similar mast in the surrounding area • Health hazard • The council acknowledged health fears in P/0066/12 • Perceived danger to health could threaten the viability of the church <p>On page 100, under Consultation Responses, add the following:-</p> <p><i>Eyesore, overbearing, obtrusive, the mast would stand out against the appearance of the church and it would stand out against the skyline</i></p> <p>These issues are addressed in section 3 of the appraisal in the officer's report</p>

Line of sight would be affected, highway safety

These issues are dealt with in section 4 of the appraisal in the officer's report. With regard to line of sight and highway safety of vehicles entering and exiting the Church car parks, there is a sufficient distance between the development and the vehicle access points to ensure that a safe line of sight would be maintained. This matter has been assessed by the Council's Highways Authority who has raised no objection.

No similar mast in the surrounding area

This is noted. Notwithstanding this, the Local Planning Authority is required to assess this particular proposal on its merits and for the reasons outlined in the report it is considered acceptable.

Health hazard, perceived danger to health could threat the viability of the church

Health issues are dealt with in section 1 of the appraisal in the officer's report. Unfortunately viability of the church is not material planning consideration.

The council acknowledged health fears in P/0066/12

This is acknowledged. However, since the determination of P/0066/12 on 27 February 2012 – which was assessed under PPG8, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been published by Central Government (published on 27 March 2012). This has superseded all previous National Planning Policy Guidance and Statements, including PPG8. The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of applications. The NPPF makes it very clear that local planning authorities cannot refuse applications for telecommunications development on health grounds, be they actual or perceived, provided the applicant has demonstrated compliance with the International Commission on non-ionising radiation protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. In this case the applicant has demonstrated compliance; therefore a reason for refusal on this basis cannot be justified.