

Planning Committee

ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 13 March 2013

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 13th March 2013

<p>1/01</p>	<p><u>On Page 1, under section Recommendation A, add the following figures to the Head of Terms:</u></p> <p>INFORM the applicant that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of the Legal Agreement to include the following Heads of Terms: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. A contribution towards tree planting and landscape enhancement £3,180 II. A contribution towards cycle lane and cycle parking improvements £20, 000 III. The submission of a Car Park Management Plan IV. A contribution towards highways improvements in the area – Still awaiting confirmation on final figure V. A contribution towards public realm improvements including the provision of public art £30,000 VI. A Contribution towards improving the linkage between the store and nearby bus stops £5, 000 VII. A contribution towards the implementation of Harrow Arts Centre way finding signage within the site– Still awaiting confirmation on final figure VIII. The submission of a Green Travel Plan [to include a financial remedial transport contribution towards Green Travel Plan targets in the event of non delivery] Legal Fees: Payment of Harrow Council’s reasonable costs in the preparation of the S106 Legal Agreement IX. Planning Administration Fee: Payment of administration fee for the monitoring of and compliance with the agreement. <p><u>On Page 11, under Second Consultation (following revisions to application) add:</u></p> <p><u>Summary of Responses</u></p> <p><u>Hatch End Association:</u></p> <p>On the whole we are not opposed to this revised application. We welcome the proposed extra cladding on the north aspect of the deck; the promise of careful landscaping with the addition of trees on the railway boundary beside the deck.; and the intention to allow parking for the overflow from the Arts Centre car park with a legal agreement.</p> <p>Landscaping: We assume the landscaping plan will be a condition of the planning consent. Some objectors to the application want to see a thick boundary of</p>
--------------------	---

evergreens. While we would accept this on the railway boundary, on the Uxbridge Road, it would obliterate glimpses of the imposing south west face of the Grade II Listed, Elliott Hall and also of the supermarket itself leading to more advertising on the boundary railings, which we would not want to encourage. We suggest that the fir trees on the north east boundary are retained as they were originally planted to restrict the views of the supermarket's illuminated signage for the residents of Milne Feild opposite.

Lighting and Signage. We would like to see the proposals for types of lighting, particularly on the deck as one of the conditions for approval and also a plan for illuminated signage on site.

Parking As mentioned above we welcome the proposal to allow overflow parking from the Arts Centre complex confirmed by a legal agreement, if timed parking is ever introduced it should be for three hours rather than the usual two, to cover length of classes or shows at the Arts Centre.

Pedestrian Access: We welcome the proposed pedestrian crossing between the site and the entrance to the Arts Centre. We are pleased to note on the revised plans that the crossing between the car park and the central fire door of the supermarket remains. The crossing is well used especially by pedestrians, not only from the car park, but those walking in from the Uxbridge Road.

One of our members has proposed a pedestrian access /bridge between the Uxbridge Road and the deck which would be useful for pedestrians from the local centre area and the station.

We believe that there should be a safe pedestrian access for shoppers returning to their cars on the deck with loaded trolleys in the event of one or other of the lifts not working or at very busy times, which will occur, when there will be queues at the lifts causing congestion.

Re-Cycling Bins Where will these bins be re-positioned for convenient access by users of the main car park and the deck?

On Page 11, under Second Consultation (following revisions to application) add:

2 additional letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residents. The comments are summarised as follows:

1. Following the additional information from the applicant, I still consider the skeletal design, even with timber cladding remains, utilitarian and hideous.
2. The proposed timber will weather and therefore may not be the most appropriate long term material.
3. The juxtaposition of the car park structure will completely obliterate over 40% of the front brick and featured elevation. It is therefore considered that the car park should be reconfigured so that it would run adjacent to the Uxbridge Road.
4. Additional trees are noted but further trees and bushes should be planted along the whole public facing length to soften the appearance.
5. An illuminated pedestrian bridge should be provided from the Uxbridge Road.
6. There are no details of lighting or details on how lighting levels will be mitigated for residents.
7. There are no details on car park controls to discourage commuters.
8. The additional electrical energy requirements for the car park should be drawn

from sustainable sources.

9. The Heritage Assessment is based on the original different car park design.
10. When Harrow introduces parking charges to the Uxbridge Road, the car park will be the first pot of call for those trying to avoid the charge and Morrison will not get the additional spaces, they say they require.
11. The Council should be supporting the High Street and Smaller shops.

On Page 11, under Second Consultation (following revisions to application) add:

The applicants have submitted a copy of their consultation response, carried out by Sharpe Communications on behalf of Morrisons Supermarkets PLC. Following the distribution of the Morrison information leaflet within the local community, 78 completed reply cards were received. Out of the 78 reply cards received 60.26% support the scheme, 8.97% were undecided about the scheme and 30.77% were opposed to the scheme. The consultation response carried out by Sharpe Communications is summarised as follows:

1. Any improvements to the Morrisons Store are very welcome.
2. When the store was originally proposed, it was considered that traffic would make the Uxbridge Road more congested. However, the roundabout seemed to help alleviate any increase in traffic and I suspect the same result will be repeated.
3. The additional parking will be needed and the locating the car park deck next to the railway line is a good use of space.
4. The site is below the road/bridge level and it is difficult to see how it will affect anyone.
5. Checks should be made to ensure that the car park is not used for free parking for commuters.
6. The additional car park capacity will be beneficial for customers of the store.
7. The upper deck of the car park should be easy to reach for elderly customers of the store.
8. More disabled parking spaces, close to the store are welcomed.
9. There is already considerable traffic congestion around the Avenue roundabout and additional car parking spaces will add considerably to this.
10. 45 car parking spaces will make no difference, if it were 145 I would be in favour.
11. The only time parking is a problem is during the Christmas period and I do, not feel it is needed.
12. Morrisons should be encouraging alternative modes of transport rather than cars
13. The proposed car park extension will be an eyesore and will not be in keeping with the environment.
14. The store is large enough for the local community and a new Morrison store has just been built in Harrow Town Centre.

On Page 27, under Section 8 – Consultation Responses add:

1. Following the additional information from the applicant, I still consider the skeletal design, even with timber cladding remains, utilitarian and hideous.
 - The timber cladding is considered to be a significant improvement from the initial proposal and will soften the appearance of the structure.
2. The proposed timber will weather and therefore may not be the most appropriate long term material.

- A condition is attached requiring samples of materials to be provided to ensure that the proposed timber will have longevity.
- 3. The juxtaposition of the car park structure will completely obliterate over 40% of the front brick and featured elevation. It is therefore considered that the car park should be reconfigured so that it would run adjacent to the Uxbridge Road.
- It is considered that the proposed location is the most appropriate as it would be sited predominately away from the public frontages along the Uxbridge Road.
- 4. Additional trees are noted but further trees and bushes should be planted along the whole public facing length to soften the appearance.
- A landscape scheme to provide full details of trees is required by condition. Furthermore, additional trees are required to be planted through a section 106 agreement to mitigate the trees lost as a result of the development.
- 5. An illuminated pedestrian bridge should be provided from the Uxbridge Road.
- It is proposed to retain the line of the trees along the north western part of the Uxbridge Road as it is considered that this would soften the appearance of the structure from this prominent public vantage point.
- 6. There are no details of lighting or details on how lighting levels will be mitigated for residents.
- Details of lighting are required through a planning condition.
- 7. There are no details on car park controls to discourage commuters.
- A car park management plan is sought through a section 106 agreement which will be required to address the management of the site.
- 8. The additional electrical energy requirements for the car park should be drawn from sustainable sources.
- An informative is attached advising the applicant that the car park lighting should be energy efficient lighting. Details of this will be required to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for further consideration under condition 11.
- 9. The Heritage Assessment is based on the original different car park design.
- The height, depth and width of the structure have not been altered since the initial submission and therefore it is considered that the revised alteration to materials and landscaping would not result in any adverse impacts on surrounding heritage assets.
- 10. When Harrow introduces parking charges to the Uxbridge Road, the car park will be the first port of call for those trying to avoid the charge and Morrison will not get the additional spaces, they say they require.
- This will be addressed through the car park management plan that is required through a section 106 agreement.
- 11. The Council should be supporting the High Street and smaller shops.
- The subject planning application has been assessed on its own individual merits.
- 12. Re-Cycling Bins Where will these bins be re-positioned for convenient access by users of the main car park and the deck?
- It is noted that the existing recycling bins, located to the south western boundary of the site, would be lost as a result of the extension to the store. Accordingly, it is recommended that a condition be added to require further details on the re-location of the recycling bins to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development.

On Page 30, under Conditions add:

12. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for the relocation of refuse/recycling bins has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The scheme as approved shall be implemented within 1

	<p>month of the completion of the development hereby approved, and thereafter retained. REASON: To ensure adequate standards of refuse/recycling collection and to promote the recycling of waste in accordance with saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and policies 5.16 and 5.17 of The London plan (2011).</p> <p><u>On Page 31, under Informative 1 – section The London Plan (2011) add:</u></p> <p>5.16 – Waste Self Sufficiency 5.17 – Waste Capacity.</p> <p><u>On Page 33, under Informatives add:</u></p> <p>6. The applicants is advised that the details of the car park deck and surface level car park lighting as required by condition 11 should be energy efficient lighting. The applicant should ensure that the level of illumination does not result in light pollution or become a nuisance for surrounding neighbouring residents. The Council can now assess whether lighting is a Statutory Nuisance under the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005. This act extends the Statutory Nuisance provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, to cover artificial light emitted from premises.</p>
<p>2/01</p>	<p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u> On page 35 of the agenda, there is a prefix ‘MR’ in front of the Applicant name.</p> <p>Amend the name of the Applicant from ‘MR CHASE PROPERTIES UK LTD’ to CHASE PROPERTIES UK LTD. The Applicant has provided written email confirmation to that effect.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 2:</u> On page 37 of the agenda, under the heading ‘Consultations’, add:</p> <p><u>Highways Authority:</u> There is no objection to the proposal as the principle of the change of use from A1 to an A2 use does not raise any specific concerns. As this proposed A2 use complements the existing shopping facilities in this parade and given the activities associated with the closeness of the A1 to A2 user profile, some of the new business generated is likely to be incidental to the already existing shopping activities, hence creating little variance in current demands and activities, hence naturally reducing additional patronage by the private motor car to the area. This is coupled with the relatively small scale of the proposal with some on-street parking availability and good bus/train service links at this location.</p> <p>Given the small Gross Floor Area, only one secure cycle space should be provided in line with The London Plan 2011 standards, if physically possible.</p> <p><u>Local Planning Authority Comment:</u> The site is restricted and there would not be room to provide secure cycle space storage on site. It is noted that there is public cycle storage capacity locally in the district centre.</p>
<p>2/02</p>	<p><u>On Page 54, under the section CONSULTATIONS, under Sport England add:</u></p> <p>Following the second consultation on the application, Sport England made additional comments on the application as follows:</p> <p>It is understood that the site forms part of, or constitutes a playing field as defined in</p>

The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (Statutory Instrument 2010 No. 2184), in that it is on land that has been used as a playing field within the last five years, and the field encompasses at least one playing pitch of 0.2 ha or more, or that it is on land that is allocated for the use as a playing field in a development plan or in proposals for such a plan or its alteration or replacement.

Sport England has therefore considered the application in the light of its playing fields policy. The aim of this policy is to ensure that there is an adequate supply of quality pitches to satisfy the current and estimated future demand for pitch sports within the area. The policy seeks to protect all parts of the playing field from development and not just those which, for the time being, are laid out as pitches. The policy states that:

This application proposes the construction of new school buildings and associated development at Pinner Park Infant and Junior Schools. Part of the development includes a new car park to be located to the south west of the main school buildings and partly on the school's playing field.

It is understood that this small section of the playing field is unused due to poor drainage and regular flooding. No existing playing pitches would be prejudiced by the proposed development. The car park would also create improved access to the playing fields for community use.

This being the case, Sport England does not wish to raise an objection to this application, subject to the following condition being attached to the decision notice (if the Council are minded to approve the application):

Prior to the commencement of the use of the extensions hereby permitted, a Community Use Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-school users/non-members, management responsibilities and include a mechanism for review. The approved Scheme shall be implemented upon commencement of use of the development.

Reason: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport in accordance with policy 3.19 of The London Plan (2011).

Sport England does not object to amendments to conditions, provided they achieve the same outcome and we are involved in any amendments. If your Authority decided not to attach the above condition, Sport England would wish to maintain/lodge a statutory objection to this application. Should your Authority be minded to approve this application without the above condition, then in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, and the DCLG letter of 10 March 2011, the application should be referred to the National Unit for Land Acquisition and Disposal at the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the above condition be attached to the permission.

On Page 54, under the section CONSULTATIONS, under Environment Agency add:

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we **object** to the grant of planning permission and recommend refusal on this basis for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has not demonstrated that sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) will be used on site to provide storage for surface water generated on site, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103, which requires development to give priority to the use of SuDS. The current FRA states that attenuation tanks will be used on site. However, there are no calculations to demonstrate that the attenuation tanks will provide adequate storage to enable a reduction in runoff to greenfield rates. The requirement for applicants to target the achievement of greenfield runoff rates is identified in the Harrow Development Management Policies DPD (at examination) – Policy 17 (On Site Water Management and Surface Water Attenuation).

The drainage plan provided (reference: APL35-D-100) states that pumps will be used to discharge surface water from the attenuation tanks. Pumping of surface water is an unsustainable drainage method. Pumps require ongoing maintenance and can fail during a storm event. Our preference is for gravity discharge to the surface water drainage system. We require the applicant to demonstrate that they have discharged as much surface water runoff via gravity as possible. This can be achieved through the use of larger areas of shallow attenuation or alternative SuDS approaches.

2. The applicant has not demonstrated that the peak discharge rate for all events up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, including an appropriate allowance for climate change, will not exceed greenfield runoff rates.

On Page 62, under Development and Flood Risk:

The objection from the Environment Agency is noted. However, it is considered that the Flood Risk Assessment which has been submitted is robust and has been considered in detail by the local drainage authority. The Council's drainage engineer considers that the proposal would actually result in an improvement in flood risk terms as compared to the existing situation. The proposed extensions will cover a relatively small area and will be sufficiently attenuated through the use of storage tanks and pumps. The EA have suggested an infiltration system but this is not considered to work on the existing clay soil of the site. Furthermore, the discharge of the water to the east of the site as required by the EA, is considered not to be required or an appropriate solution in this case, given the distance from the extensions. Given that two pumps are proposed, one standby and one duty, the chance of total failure is remote and is not considered to pose a risk to staff or pupils of the school. As such, notwithstanding the objection from the Environment Agency, it is considered that the Flood Risk Assessment is acceptable and does not warrant refusal of the application.

On Page 67 under Conditions, add:

15. Prior to the commencement of the use of the extensions hereby permitted, a Community Use Scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Scheme shall include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-school users/non-members, management responsibilities and include a mechanism for review. The approved Scheme shall be implemented upon commencement of use of the development.

Reason: To secure well managed safe community access to the sports facility, to ensure sufficient benefit to the development of sport in accordance with policy 3.19 of The London Plan (2011).

On page 61 of the report under section 4 – Traffic and Parking amend:

50% increase in pupils to 33% increase in pupils

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)
1/01 Morrison Supermarkets PLC, 299 Uxbridge Road, Hatch End, Pinner	Paul Giles	Ed Kemsley
2/01 324 Rayners Lane, Harrow		
2/02 Pinner Park Infant and Nursery School & Pinner Park Junior School, Melbourne Avenue, Pinner, HA5 5SJ		