

Planning Committee

ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 16 July 2014

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 16th July 2014

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 1/01 | <p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u> Please note the property is now known as Waxwell Farm House, and was formally known as ‘the Grail’.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 2:</u> On pages 7 (6th paragraph) & 12 (1st paragraph) of the report, there are incorrect references to the site being accessible off "Willow Dene". Willow Dene is a separate cul de sac off the Uxbridge Road. The northern car park for the new building is accessed off a separate slip road off Uxbridge Road, which also provides access to the Elmcote flats.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 3:</u> Page 11 of the report, section 3 (residential amenity), within the 2nd paragraph: refers to the nearest properties being in Willow Dene. However, these properties are incorrectly referenced and should be referenced as Elmcote Flats off the slip road from Uxbridge Road (adjacent to the driveway to the northern carpark)</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 4:</u> On page 14 of the report, (Access & Servicing): Should state that servicing and refuse collection will remain on Waxwell Lane. Access for new retreat centre will be from the Uxbridge Road entrance only into the existing northern car park.</p> <p><u>Addendum Item 5:</u> AMEND the wording of Conditions 3 (Cycle Storage), 8 (Travel Plan), 9 (External Lighting), 10 (Brown Roof Details) to remove the term “pre-commencement” to “not commence beyond DPC Level...”. The conditions shall now read as follows;</p> <p>3) The development hereby permitted, shall not commence beyond damp proof course level , until full details (including elevations and material specifications) of a secure cycle storage area to accommodate a minimum of two bicycles have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The cycle storage shall be completed prior to the first use of the development. REASON: In the interests of promoting sustainable transport in accordance with policy DM42 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).</p> <p>8) The development hereby permitted, shall not commence beyond damp proof course level, until details for a framework travel plan, including a detailed scheme</p> |
|-------------|--|

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>for vehicle pick up and drop off times for the Religious Training/Conference centre has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details from the commencement of the use on site and retained thereafter. REASON: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents and to ensure that highway safety is not prejudiced in accordance with policies DM1 & DM42 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).</p> <p>9) The development hereby permitted, shall not commence beyond damp proof course level, until details for external lighting to the site have be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained. REASON: To ensure that lighting within the site does not cause unacceptable nuisance to residents of the development, thereby according with policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013.</p> <p>10) The development hereby permitted, shall not commence beyond damp proof course level, until details have been submitted to approved by the Council demonstrating the provision of a brown roof to the two storey religious education/training centre hereby permitted. The detail submitted shall also demonstrate the long term maintenance of the brown roof. The provision of the brown roof and its maintenance shall be implemented prior to first occupation/use of the building and retained and maintained as approved thereafter. REASON: To ensure no decrease in the value of the Site of Nature Importance asset within the borough, thereby according with policies DM20 and DM21 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).</p> |
| 1/02 | <p>1. Objection letter received on 02.07.2014 from resident residing at Flat 5, 8-10 College Road siting the following objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would block the views • Building will be considerably higher than all surrounding buildings – will spoil the surrounding character and would be very modern. • Applicant is proceeding with commercial benefit. • Will diminish value of property. <p>Points 1 and 2 have been addressed in the appraisal section of the Committee report. With regards the commercial benefit of the proposal and matter relating to property value, these matters are not material planning considerations.</p> <p>2. Consultation response received from the Designing Out Crime Group. No objection to the proposal subject to including the security recommendations into their development in order to minimise the risk of crime.</p> <p>3. ADD new Condition below (No.19) and move plan list condition to No.20.</p> <p>Prior to the first occupation of the residential units within 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</p> |

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>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 PAS 24: 2012; 2. all window sets on the ground floor relating to the residential element and the ground floor rear commercial unit (fronting Havelock Place) of the development and those adjacent to flat roofs or large rainwater pipes (downpipes) shall be made secure to standards, independently certified. <p>Following implementation the works shall thereafter be retained.</p> <p>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 policies 7.3.B and 7.13.B of The London Plan 2011, policy AAP4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan 2013, and Section 17 of the Crime & Disorder Act 1998.</p> |
| 1/03 | <p><u>AMEND RECOMMENDATION B</u></p> <p>The date of recommendation B should be 16 January 2015 instead of 2014.</p> |
| 2/02 | <p><u>Addendum Item 1:</u></p> <p>INSERT under Relevant History section of the Officer Report the following history for plot to the rear of the site;</p> <p>P/1552/04 Two-storey detached house with integral garage and access from Poplar Close (Revised) Refused: 28/07/2004</p> <p>P/2753/04 Single and two storey detached house with integral garage and access from Poplar Close. Refused: 16/12/2004</p> <p>P/2008/05 Retention of portacabin for store/bin office Refused: 17/11/2005</p> <p>P/2720/05 Single and two storey detached dwelling house with internal garage and access from poplar close Refused: 19/12/2005</p> <p>P/2571/07 SINGLE STOREY DETACHED HOUSE WITH BASEMENT AND OFF-STREET PARKING AND ACCESS FROM POPLAR CLOSE REFUSED: 02 October 2007</p> <p>REASONS: <i>1) The proposed dwelling, by reason of its scale, bulk, design and siting, would be unduly obtrusive, incongruous and overbearing with inadequate space about the buildings and out of character with the street scene to the detriment of the amenities of nearby residents. The development would detract from the established pattern of development in the street scene and the character of the locality contrary to policies</i></p> |

SD1, D4, D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) "Extensions: A Householder's Guide" and Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003) "Designing New Development".

2) The proposed house by reason of siting layout, design, non-compliance with Lifetime Homes Standards, lack of outlook and aspect for proposed bedrooms at basement level and inadequate and unsatisfactory amenity space would provide cramped and substandard accommodation and the development would be overlooked from nearby properties on north and south sides resulting in a loss of privacy to the detriment of the amenities of the future occupiers of the site contrary to policies SD1, SH1, D4 and D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003), "Designing New Development", Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003), "Extensions: A Householders Guide", Supplementary Planning Document (2006) "Access for All" and Supplementary Planning Document (2006) "Accessible Homes".

APPEAL APP/M5450/A/07/2059924 DISMISSED (4 March 2008)M

– **See Appendix A**

Addendum Item 2:

Under section Summary of Comments within the Officers Report, insert the following points raised by the planning agent in response to the comments raised throughout the public consultation process.

Email responses received 30th May 20, 4th June 2014

Summarised as follows:-

- Poplar Close is an adopted road in which cars park already – all local residents. There are no parking restrictions, and therefore everyone has the same rights to park in the road.
- The drawings show the rear garden entirely as a garden, without any form of access from Poplar Close.
- The proposed parking provision is one space per flat, which accords completely with the Council's planning policy and guidelines.
- Refuse storage is shown to the front of the site, as at present, and there is no refuse storage shown at the rear.
- There is no reason why the contractor's vehicles should block Poplar Close
- The site plan as existing in which the entire 'separated rear plot' is now shown as 'communal back garden', which is completely clear.
- Parking – Is detailed on drawings
- The amount proposed is well in excess of the Council's minimum standard for flats
- New cycle shelter is to be located in the back garden.
- All points regarding the location of pipework, vents and flues are completely irrelevant to this application, and there no material problem caused to neighbouring properties.
- The proposed space standards correctly follow Harrow Council's guidance in its Residential Design Guide SPD *Design and Layout Guidance for Residential Conversions* [Section 5.11], in which it states that the Council recognises 'that the constraints associated with existing layouts means that some flexibility and pragmatism will be required at the margins of each space standard'.
- All of the proposed space standards are adequate for their purpose in relation to

the Council's guidelines.

- None of the comments regarding Flat 5 is of any relevance, in the way in which compliance with the standards would be achieved, the external appearance and the context in relation to adjoining properties.
- The nature of the conversion complies with Harrow Council's guidelines, and great efforts have been made, particularly through extensive pre-application advice with the Planning Officers, to ensure that the appearance of the building is satisfactory. Having two front doors is irrelevant in Town Planning terms.
- The present or future structure of the building is not a Town Planning matter and is covered by the Building Regulations.
- All matters relating to access have been covered in the application relative to the nature of existing and proposed conditions.
- Number of residents in the application site would exceed the total number of residents in Poplar Close is an irrelevance.
- Similarly, whether there are more or less bathrooms to be created in the application site than in the whole of Poplar Close is equally irrelevant.
- The point regarding the number of cars generated is covered in Item 1a above.
- At present, there is no boundary fence wall to the rear plot fronting Poplar Close. A secure boundary fence would need to be reinstated.
- Other matters relating to boundary treatment, let alone satellite dishes [which have indeed not been included in the application] are for the Council to respond to as necessary.
- There is no Town Planning requirement for washing lines, vegetable-growing areas or locations for barbeques to be indicated on this application.
- The means of access remains as previously, and is safe and convenient. It is being improved by blocking the unsafe access onto Uxbridge Road.
- There are no references to parking at the rear.
- The second vehicular exit on the Uxbridge Road frontage has not been used for a long time and is less safe than the vehicular exit on to Poplar Close. Therefore, it is proposed to close it.
- The point regarding the width of Poplar Close and access for larger vehicles has no point in the context that it is an existing adopted road, servicing all of the properties in Poplar Close. As the access from Poplar Close into Cloister Wood already exists, for the same number of flats, the situation will certainly not be worsened.
- The proposed gated access off Poplar Close has already been considered by the Council during the pre-application advice, which was sought by the Applicants prior to submitting this application, and no objection was raised.
- Council's standards, as supported by the London Plan, have been altered for many years for new flatted developments [including for conversions] and that the proposed parking provision is more than adequate when judged by those standards. The statement that the proposal could generate three cars per flat is entirely speculative and simply not supported by the Council's policy and without foundation.
- The building as existing does not contain an original garage, nor is this indicated on the application drawings.
- It is noted that the residents are courteous in not blocking entrances to properties. The presence of a fire hydrant is not known.
- It cannot be disputed that residents of Poplar Close have rights of way onto the Uxbridge Road, to and from their properties, and, presumably, this ought to refer to the use of the public highway of Poplar Close. If the residents of Poplar Close are in fact using the front parking area of Cloister Wood through the vehicle entrance off Poplar Close as a short cut and on to Uxbridge Road via the closed gates at

that vehicle entrance, then this is trespass and could result in legal action against them by the building owner.

- Poplar Close and Uxbridge Road are not rural locations, but suburban. Whether parking restrictions and lines on the roadway might be introduced would be entirely a matter for Harrow Council, and not relevant to this planning application.
- The matter of precedent for further applications in surrounding roads is irrelevant to this application, as each application is judged on its own merits by the Council.
- The existing maintenance of the building is not a material matter relating to this planning application.
- Any aspects relating to energy for the proposals will be covered by Conditions attached to the planning permission, or by the Building Regulations.
- Matter relating to gas cookers and boilers will no doubt be considered in an appropriate way by the planning application process.
- The physical characteristics of internal bathrooms will be controlled by the Building Regulations, and not by Mr Lincoln's subjective opinions.
- Fire precautions are not material to the planning application. However, for Mr Lincoln's information, the Applicants have sought pre-application advice from senior members of the Council's Building Control Department to ensure that adequate measures would be included in the proposals.
- There is adequate storage provided for each flat, to comply with the Council's guidelines.
- The issue of noise transmission is dealt with by adequate stacking, compliance with the Council's guidelines and sound-insulation measures that will be dealt with by the Building Regulations.
- The type of glazing to be used will be governed by the Building Regulations.
- An arboricultural consultant was consulted, in advance of submitting the application, and was considered as acceptable during pre-application advice from the Council.
- As the proposals do not infringe the Council's minimum overlooking distances required to prevent overlooking.
- The current status of Poplar Close is that it is a public highway without parking restrictions. Residents of Poplar Close and their visitors no doubt make as much use of the unrestricted public highway as residents [and their visitors] of Cloister Wood already do, and would continue to do.
- The formation of foundations is not a Town Planning matter, and will be dealt with under a Building Regulations application.
- As demonstrated by the arboricultural impact assessment statement submitted with the planning application, the proposals have no adverse effect whatsoever on the existing retained trees.
- Cycle storage is encouraged for sustainability.
- Maintenance of the road surface of Poplar Close is not a Town Planning matter.
- Whether or not the residents, and their visitors, of Poplar Close are courteously observant of each other's spaces, is not a Town Planning matter on an unrestricted public highway.
- Emergency vehicular access already exists and will not be compromised by the proposals, as will no doubt be confirmed by the Council's Highways Officer.
- Whether or not vehicles enter Poplar Close as a cut-through to Blythwood Road, as Mr Rose speculates, is not relevant to this application.
- The front gardens in Poplar Close are not relevant to this planning application.
- A previous use of Cloister Wood as a single family residence is irrelevant to this application, given that it already has lawful use as six flats.
- Any increase in demand on infrastructure, sometimes due to increases in numbers

of residents, is nowadays dealt with for all new developments, appropriate to their size, by the Community Infrastructure Levy, as determined by the Council.

- All aspects concerning Health and Safety during construction will be dealt with under the Construction [Design and Management] Regulations 2007, and Environmental Health legislation, of which the Applicants are aware. This is not a Town Planning matter.
- The proposals do not impact on flooding and the point regarding insurance premiums is not a Town Planning matter and entirely speculative.
- Whilst The Moritz and Cloister Wood indeed back on to each other, there is already an existing first floor window well in excess of 30m from the flank wall of The Moritz, which is greatly in excess of the minimum overlooking distance between habitable room windows, let alone habitable room and non-habitable room windows/flank walls. There is also a tall hedge on the boundary.
- The proposals will not dominate or be out of character with the surroundings, and have been designed carefully so as to overcome such design issues. There is a variety of property sizes and styles in this area, and Cloister Wood existed before the bungalows in Poplar Close. If anything, it is the bungalows that are out of character with the area as it was before newer development took place.
- The rear extension does not overshadow the gardens of Limedene Close any more than the building does at present.

Addendum Item 3:

In the fifth full paragraph on Page 99 of the report, it is stated that the existing property is arranged as six one-bedroom flats. This shall be corrected to state that the existing property is two, two bedroom flats and four one bedroom flats.

Addendum Item 4:

A further objection to the scheme was received on the 7th July and is summarised as below.

- The submitted plans make no accommodation for on site car parking for the development, and it is intended to use Limedene Close slip road for car parking. This would result in a loss of car parking for existing residents and visitors.

Response to Objection Received.

This is incorrect. The proposed plans (S/UR/26) demonstrates that the existing access from Uxbridge Road would be closed off, with an access to the property being via Poplar Close. The proposed plan further details that six car parking spaces would be located within the front garden of the development.

2/03

FLOOD RISK AND DRAINAGE UPDATE (PAGE 129)

Since the initial committee report was produced, further details have been submitted by the applicant in relation to the detailed proposals for surface water storage and attenuation. The details have been referred to the Drainage Authority who are satisfied that the details will result in satisfactory run off rates in accordance with the local plan policy objectives. As such, it is recommended that condition 8 on the committee report is removed as the details provided now satisfy this requirement.

AMENDED CONDITIONS

On page 131 **AMEND** condition 3 as follows:

Save where varied by the other planning conditions comprising this planning permission, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Planning, Design and Access Statement Ref: 1504-5.4-002

DAS.docx; 1504-PP-02; 1504-PP-03; 1504-PP-06; 1504-PP_07; 1504-PP-08; 2014 Newton Farm, Nursery, Infant and Junior School Travel Plan; Document titled "Overview of Harrow Councils Primary School Expansion Programme – Harrow's Approach"; Document titled "School Expansion Programme 2014-14"; Transport Assessment by Mott MacDonald (dated April 2014); Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Newton Farm Nursery, Infant and Junior School by A.T. Coombes Associates (dated 27th June 2014); Statement of Community Involvement (May 2014); Untitled document – aerial site plan; Document titled Mott MacDonald, dated 26.02.2014; Construction Method, Phasing Plan and Logistics Statement; Sustainability Statement Ref: KSc/7111909/JP Rev 01 (dated 20 May 2014); 1504-PP-05 Rev A; 1504-PP-04 Rev A; 1504-PP-01 Rev B; LO1525/DR05 Rev T1; Letter from Thames Water, dated 23rd June 2014; LO1525/DR01 Rev T4; LO1525/DR02 Rev T2; LO1525/DR04 Rev T3; Document titled New development and impermeable car park area (drainage storage calculations); Letter from Hydro International, dated 11th July 2014
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

AMEND condition 6 (Page 132) as follows:

The development hereby permitted, shall be undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Newton Farm Nursery, Infant and Junior School by A.T. Coombes Associates (dated 27th June 2014). This will include that replacement tree planting is provided and that the details are submitted for approval under condition 4 of this permission, arboricultural supervision is undertaken throughout the project and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. The tree protection measures shall be erected 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, and as required by policy DM 22 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

REMOVE Condition 8 (page 132)

On Page 135 under Plan Nos, AMEND plan Nos as follows:

Planning, Design and Access Statement Ref: 1504-5.4-002 DAS.docx; 1504-PP-02; 1504-PP-03; 1504-PP-06; 1504-PP_07; 1504-PP-08; 2014 Newton Farm, Nursery, Infant and Junior School Travel Plan; Document titled "Overview of Harrow Councils Primary School Expansion Programme – Harrow's Approach"; Document titled "School Expansion Programme 2014-14"; Transport Assessment by Mott MacDonald (dated April 2014); Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Newton Farm Nursery, Infant and Junior School by A.T. Coombes Associates (dated 27th June 2014); Statement of Community Involvement (May 2014); Untitled document – aerial site plan; Document titled Mott MacDonald, dated 26.02.2014; Construction Method, Phasing Plan and Logistics Statement; Sustainability Statement Ref: KSc/7111909/JP Rev 01 (dated 20 May 2014); 1504-PP-05 Rev A; 1504-PP-04 Rev A; 1504-PP-01 Rev B; LO1525/DR05 Rev T1; Letter from Thames Water, dated 23rd June 2014; LO1525/DR01 Rev T4; LO1525/DR02 Rev T2; LO1525/DR04 Rev T3; Document titled New development and impermeable car park area (drainage storage calculations); Letter from Hydro International, dated 11th July 2014

| | |
|------|---|
| 2/04 | <p>CONSULTATIONS UPDATE <u>Page 139</u></p> <p><u>Additional comments from the Drainage Authority:</u> Additional details are required in relation to some temporary overground surface water storage to mitigate the impact of flood risk and a condition is recommended in relation to this.</p> <p><u>CONDITIONS UPDATE</u></p> <p><u>ADD</u> the following condition (page 144): Prior to the installation of the mobile on site details of temporary works for the disposal of surface water and surface water storage and attenuation works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained for the duration of the development on site. REASON: To ensure that adequate drainage facilities are provided, reduce and mitigate the effects of flood risk in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Policy DM 10 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and to ensure that the necessary construction and design criteria for the development proposals follow approved conditions according to NPPF (2012).</p> |
| 2/05 | <p>CONSULTATIONS UPDATE <u>On page 152 under Consultations ADD:</u></p> <p><u>Environment Agency:</u> Although the site is partially located in flood zone 2, the location of the extensions will be in flood zone 1. We therefore have no objections to this application.</p> <p><u>Sport England:</u> The proposed development does not result in the loss of playing field. The application does propose the loss of a small area of open space infilling between the existing buildings. The open space is proposed to be re provided. This being the case, Sport England does not wish to raise an objection to this application as the development accords with Sport England playing field policy.</p> <p><u>Page 152, under summary of responses ADD:</u></p> <p>1 letter has been received from a neighbouring occupier and the comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A previous application under P/1722/11 was approved in July 2011 for the provision of six additional parking spaces adjacent to the east of Woodlands School and included conditions to prevent parking outside school hours and this should also apply in this case to protect neighbouring amenity. <p>Officers Response</p> <p>∇ The proposed 10 car parking spaces would be located approximately 14 m from the nearest residential dwellings (i.e. no's 2, 3 and 4 Newgale Gardens) to the east. However, the proposed parking spaces would be largely obscured from these dwellings by an existing 2.0 m high close boarded timber fence located on the boundary, as well as hedging and a mature tree. As such, it is anticipated that the proposed car parking spaces to the east and vehicles parking on them would not</p> |

be visually obtrusive when viewed from nearby residential properties.

- v The proposed car parking spaces would result in cars parking closer to the residential properties noted above which could potentially result in additional noise and disturbance to the residents of those properties. It is anticipated that use of the car parking spaces would take place during school hours only and therefore not during unsocial hours, such as late at night, bank holidays and on weekends. To ensure that these parking spaces are used during school hours only an additional condition is recommended in the interests of the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

AMENDED CONDITIONS

On page 167 **AMEND** condition 3 as follows:

Save where varied by the other planning conditions comprising this planning permission, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Woodlands and Camrose School Flood Risk Assessment Ref: SJC/771601; Woodlands School Travel Plan (dated May 2014); Design and Access Statement; Transport Assessment for the Expansion of Woodlands SEN School and Camrose Primary School (May 2014); Statement of Community Involvement (May 2014); Document titled Overview of Harrow Councils Primary School Expansion Programme; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Ref: 77601-REP-ENV-100-ECO; Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Camrose Primary School, by A.T Coombes Associates (dated 19th May 2014); Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Woodlands Primary School, by A.T Coombes Associates (dated 23rd May 2014); AE(0-) A01; AG(9-)A03; AE(0-) A02; AE(0-) A03; AE(0-) A04; AE(0-) A10; AE(0-) A11; AG(0-)A02; AG(0-) A03; AG(0-) A04; AG(0-) A05; AG(0-)A31; AG(0-) A32; AG(0-) A63; AG(9-) A01; Mechanical, Electrical and Public Health Design & Energy Strategy Proposal; AG(0-) 21; AG(0-) A01 Rev A; AG(0-) A06 Rev A; AG(0-) A61 Rev A; AG(0-) A62 Rev A; Document titled: Storage Tank Design by Clark Smith Partnership (Camrose School); Document titled: Storage Tank Design by Clark Smith Partnership (Woodlands School); S-100-11 Rev E1; APL64-S-100-22 Rev E1; S-100-10 Rev E2
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

On page 168 **AMEND** condition 9 as follows:

The Woodlands School Travel Plan (2014) shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details upon the first occupation of the development hereby approved. The mitigation measures identified in the Travel Plan shall be implemented for the duration of the development.

REASON: To promote sustainable transport and reduce the impact of the development on the surrounding road network in accordance with London Plan policies 6.1 and 6.3 and policy DM 42 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

ADD Condition 15 (page 168) as follows:

The ten car parking spaces hereby permitted shall not be used outside the following times:

- 0730 hours to 1800 hours Monday to Friday (excluding Bank Holidays) without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents, in accordance with policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

INFORMATIVES UPDATE

Page, 169 under informative 1 **ADD** the following policies:

The London Plan (2011):

5.12 Flood Risk Management

5.13 Sustainable Drainage

5.14 Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure

7.18 Protecting Local Open Space and Addressing Local Deficiency

Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013):

Policy DM 18 Protection of Open Space

On Page 171 under Plan Nos, **AMEND** plan Nos as follows:

Woodlands and Camrose School Flood Risk Assessment Ref: SJC/771601; Woodlands School Travel Plan (dated May 2014); Design and Access Statement; Transport Assessment for the Expansion of Woodlands SEN School and Camrose Primary School (May 2014); Statement of Community Involvement (May 2014); Document titled Overview of Harrow Councils Primary School Expansion Programme; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Ref: 77601-REP-ENV-100-ECO; Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Camrose Primary School, by A.T Coombes Associates (dated 19th May 2014); Arboricultural Impact Assessment at Woodlands Primary School, by A.T Coombes Associates (dated 23rd May 2014); AE(0-) A01; AG(9-)A03; AE(0-) A02; AE(0-) A03; AE(0-) A04; AE(0-) A10; AE(0-) A11; AG(0-)A02; AG(0-) A03; AG(0-) A04; AG(0-) A05; AG(0-)A31; AG(0-) A32; AG(0-) A63; AG(9-) A01; Mechanical, Electrical and Public Health Design & Energy Strategy Proposal; AG(0-) 21; AG(0-) A01 Rev A; AG(0-) A06 Rev A; AG(0-) A61 Rev A; AG(0-) A62 Rev A; Document titled: Storage Tank Design by Clark Smith Partnership (Camrose School); Document titled: Storage Tank Design by Clark Smith Partnership (Woodlands School); S-100-11 Rev E1; APL64-S-100-22 Rev E1; S-100-10 Rev E2

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

2/06

ADD following informatives:

INFORMATIVE

The applicant is advised that planning permission granted under this application must be implemented before the implementation of the prior approval granted under refs: P/1983/13 and P/2205/13. Operational development granted under this permission and the prior approval cannot be undertaken as one single operation.

INFORMATIVE

Please note that the LPA must be notified of any alterations to the layout of the units approved under refs P/1982/13 and P/2205/13, please contact Peter Barron on 020 8736 6086 in this regard.

Consultation response received from London Underground Limited (LUL). No objection has been raised however they have suggested a condition be imposed requiring detailed design and method statements for all the foundations, basement and ground floor structures.

With regards to the consultation comments received from LUL, it is not possible to attach the suggested condition as this specifically relates to matters which would normally fall under the Building Regulations. However the following informative is recommended advising the applicant to liaise with LUL in respect of these matters.

INFORMATIVE

The applicant is advised to contact London Underground Infrastructure Protection in advance of preparation of final design and associated method statements, in particular with regard to: demolition; drainage; excavation; construction methods; security; boundary treatment and safety barriers.

Consultation response received from Transport for London – No objection raised.

3/01

Consultations

Summary of Responses

- Additional objection was received from B Lake-Benson, Chair of the Harrow Residents' Association on 30th June, 2014 which states:
 - Proposal does not go far enough. Whilst ensuring soundness of the building and structure, all of the previously unauthorised changes should be removed and original work reinstated.
 - Harrow Council should not allow precedents which encourage others to follow suit. Retrospective applications on changes to listed buildings will embolden others to make a raft of unauthorised alterations to listed buildings on the off-chance that they will either completely get away with it or knowing that, at worst, they will only have to reverse some of them.
 - This story has already attracted press coverage and is being followed. Any weaknesses on behalf of the Council Planning Department to protect a listed building would be reported. Cases like this are likely to be used to defend similar actions by those seeking to treat listed buildings like any other property.
 - This should not be a question of the planning department making compromises following a series of what are purporting to be innocent mistakes by a third party. This erodes the validity of the planning process and the efficacy of the department to act in the interests of preservation. Listed building status is either fully enforceable, or it is meaningless.
- Additional objection was received from H Coombes on 8th July, 2014 which states:
 - Proposal is too limited as significant historical and functional features are not included e.g. the men's cells.
 - In its Heritage Statement, the Jaspar Centre states '5.10 The assessment presented here concludes that a less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset is brought about.' If they had believed this to be the case, having explored what alterations to the fabric of the building would be allowed with consent, the Jaspar Centre would have applied for permission in the normal way. Instead they went ahead and now seek retrospective permission for work which would not have been approved. Whilst recognising some changes would be needed to be make it useable, the Jaspar Centre's present reinstatement proposals do not go far enough. Harrow's planning department has failed to protect this listed building up to now.
 - As a nearby resident, I was relieved to see the Magistrates Court building being restored outwardly but dismayed to learn that similar care and attention had not continued with the interior.
 - Harrow Council's Planning Department needs to be more vigilant with its listed buildings. Other organisations will look to the Jaspar Centre and see that retrospective planning applications are an easier way to make alterations than having to conform to the rules and conventions laid down.

The Twentieth Century Society responded on 30th June 2014 to state:

- ‘The Society objects to this application, which causes substantial harm to a Grade II listed Heritage Asset.
- We will not re-iterate in detail the objections we raised in our letter of 31 July 2013 regarding application P/0955/13, suffice to say that the current application fails to address the concerns that the Society have on the intrusive works carried out on this listed building and many of the comments made in our previous letter apply equally to this current application.
- The alterations to and removal of the internal fittings and changes to the plan form of the building constitute more than substantial harm to the listed building. The current application makes very little attempt to redress the damage of earlier unauthorised works, especially in Court Room 2. The proposals currently contemplated are totally inadequate in addressing the re-instatement of the missing fittings and destructive changes made to this room, which the Society has repeatedly advised as being of critical importance to this heritage asset. This application is an extremely poor attempt at reversing the damage and only deals with a fraction of the work that is necessary.
- The Society would therefore urge Harrow Council to refuse this application, and prevail upon the applicants to reassess their treatment of this heritage asset’.

Consultation Responses

Consultation responses’ concern over loss of historic fabric and character and the way in which it does not go far enough to overcome the harmful unauthorised alterations are addressed in the body of the report.

The concern that the Council was not vigilant in monitoring its listed buildings is noted but the Council was unaware that works requiring Listed Building Consent were being undertaken. Also, guidance had been provided to the applicants as to the requirement for Listed Building Consent for any works which affect the special character of this Listed Building.

It is noted that retrospective listed building consent should not be provided for works that would not otherwise have received listed building consent prior to the unlawful works. It is also noted that this case has attracted local press coverage.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2008

by D A Hainsworth LL.B(Hons) FRSA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
4 March 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/A/07/2059924

Land at the rear of 540 Uxbridge Road, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 3PY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Miss Olawunmi Okukounmu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/2571/07/DFU, dated 31 July 2007, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2007.
- The development proposed is a single-storey detached house with basement and off-street parking and access from Poplar Close.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons for the decision

2. The main issues are the effect of the house on the street scene and whether there is enough space for it.
3. Development in and around Poplar Close consists of houses and bungalows of varying designs and ages. The location of the proposed house would be in keeping with the general pattern. Its design would be different to any of the other dwellings, but it would not harm the street scene.
4. The main concern is the amount of space available for the house. It would have a ground-floor living room, dining room, kitchen and w.c. and a basement with three bedrooms, one of them en-suite, and a family bathroom. It would occupy a large proportion of the site. The depth of the gardens would be about 2.5m at the front, 2.4m at the back, 1.5m on the northern side and 4.5m at the most on the southern side. Trees would overshadow part of the gardens.
5. Policy D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan states that new residential development should provide sufficient amenity space and maintain an adequate distance to site boundaries. The amount of amenity space and the distance to the boundaries would not be enough for a house of this size. In addition, there would be no outlook from the basement rooms. Natural light would be provided by light wells at the front and back that would have a limited effect, particularly the one at the back, which would be overshadowed by trees. Bedroom 2 would depend on artificial light. The fact that living standards would be reduced in these ways demonstrates that there is not enough space for the house.

D.A.Hainsworth
INSPECTOR

**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) |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 2/01 17 Glanleam Road, Stanmore | Purshoteam Tami and Maurice Leaman | Malcolm Pawley |
| 2/02 Cloister Wood, 540 Uxbridge Road, Hatch End | Mahesh Patel | David Kann |