# Planning Committee ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 12 February 2014





# HARROW COUNCIL

#### ADDENDUM

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

#### DATE: 12 February 2014

2/01	Addendum Item 1:
	Notifications
	Replies: 1
	Summery of Deenenger
	Summary of Response:
	<ul> <li>The three storey building sited in front Adrian Court would directly block sunlight to the flats.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The terraces to the side of the property would result in a loss of privacy to Adrian</li> </ul>
	Court.
	<ul> <li>The proposal will result in parking issues for Adrian Court.</li> </ul>
	• The entrance to the development will be on the side nearest Adrian Court this likely
	to cause substantial noise form residents entering and leaving the block
	Addendum 2:
	Consultations
	Landscape Officer – No objection to the proposed development subject to retention of
	silver birch tree and conditions in respect of tree protection, landscaping, levels and
	boundary treatments
	Response – The silver birch tree is shown to be retained on the proposed site plan
	KEH 106. The conditions requested are annexed to the officer's report.
	Addendum Item 3:
	Consultation Response:
	<ul> <li>The three storey building sited in front Adrian Court would directly block sunlight to the flats.</li> </ul>
	The impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Adrian
	Court is addressed in the officer's report on page 22 paragraph 2. Here it is stated that
	there would be no harm to the light entering the rear and front facing windows of
	Adrian Court, due to the fact a 45 degree line taken from the centre of nearest
	habitable rooms is not subtended. The front facing windows of Adrian Court are
	orientated to the north east therefore the opportunities for receiving direct sunlight are
	limited.
	The terraces to the side of the property would result in a loss of privacy to Adrian

Court. There are side facing terraces however they will be screened by a 1.8m high wall which will prevent any direct overlooking or loss of privacy to Adrian Court.

• The proposal will result in parking issues for Adrian Court.

The Highways Authority considers the development provides adequate parking for the number of flats proposed. There is no evidence that there would be any overspill parking to Adrian Court which is a private property.

• The entrance to the development will be on the side nearest Adrian Court this likely to cause substantial noise form residents entering and leaving the block

The comings and goings associated with this small scale residential development would not give rise to any significant disturbance to the adjoining properties. Conversely it is not considered the comings and goings from Adrian Court would result in noise disturbance to the future occupiers of this development.

# Addendum 3 AMEND Condition 8 to Read:

No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- i. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials
- iii. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
- iv. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- v. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works
- vi. tree protection measures within (including the retained silver birch tree along the north eastern boundary as shown of drawing number KEH 106) and outside the application site boundaries.

REASON: To ensure that the construction of the development does not unduly impact on the amenities of the existing occupiers of the properties on the site, thereby according with saved policies DM1 and DM44 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013.

**2/02** Following the publication of the Agenda, an additional 4 representations have been received.

The Hatch End Association considers that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site by providing cramped living quarters. The Association considers the mass and height of the overall building would be out of character in Letchford Terrace and that four two-storey townhouses should be provided.

The Pinner Local History Society considers the proposed terrace to be too obtrusive in this setting and that the design should be revised. The Society considers that the development of the site could be an opportunity to enhance the characteristics of the site, which represents a distinct spaces within the historic old Hatch End area and that the proposal would not alleviate the linear street view. The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site. In addition, the Society considers that greater efforts should be made to retain the existing Locally Listed buildings. Two representations from neighbouring occupiers noting that the proposed houses are not in keeping with the area, the proposal would exacerbate parking stress in the area, the balconies would overlook two nearby schools and that the development would take away from the historic character of this area in the name of profit.
Officers' responses to these concerns are:
The density of the development is within the parameters of The London Plan, and six houses, which comply with the relevant space and layout standards, is a suitable level of provision.
Officers consider that the design of the terrace would complement the area, while providing a contrast from the existing terraces on either side.
The concerns regarding the loss of the Locally Listed Building, parking and overlooking of schools have been addressed in the agenda report.

## Marketing Information

In November 2012, the public house was offered to rent through Star Pubs and bars (as 'The Inn at Harrow') as a Regular Pub with some Food. The pub was offered as being renamed and refurbished. This marketing was sent to over 5,000 operators and advertised on the website for over six months.

The public house was later offered for rent, through Davis Coffer Lyons, with a new lease in the region of £60,000 a year. The lease has been offered with a nil premium, meaning that no initial deposit would be required. This offer was made in June 2013, after the site was acquired by the current owners.

The applicants have demonstrated that these marketing exercises were unsuccessful.

#### AGENDA ITEM 9

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

No requests to make representations on planning applications have been received.