

Planning Committee

ADDENDUM

DATE: Wednesday 9 April 2014

HARROW COUNCIL

ADDENDUM

PLANNING COMMITTEE

DATE : 9th April 2014

1/01	<p><u>General Additional Information</u></p> <p>Officers had an on-site meeting with residents of Oak Lodge Close on Wednesday 2nd April. Aside from reiterating their general concerns about the development, residents specifically requested that the existing ‘keep clear’ sign outside of their access be retained rather than the implementation of a yellow box as proposed in the applicant’s Transport Statement. The Highway Authority has indicated that this is an acceptable alternative mitigation should planning permission be granted. The Planning Committee is therefore requested to consider the application on this basis.</p> <p>Officers have also considered proposals put forward on behalf of the Warren House Residents’ Association for alterations at the Valencia Road/Dennis Lane junction to make this an egress-only junction from Valencia Road onto Dennis Lane, and/or to install traffic calming measures along Valencia Road. Officers do not consider that the submitted proposals are necessary to enable the subject development to be granted planning permission.</p> <p>In response to a question by a ward Member, the applicant has advised that the food store would have an in-store collection desk (for pre-orders) but that home deliveries are not predicted to operate from the store.</p> <p><u>Recommendation A</u></p> <p>AMEND section 106 Planning Obligation Heads of terms as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><u>Employment and Training (page 2)</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">11. A commitment that the developer will submit for approval, implement and monitor a Training and Employment Plan to include reasonable endeavours to use local suppliers and apprentices during construction.</p> <p><u>Information</u> (page 4)</p> <p>AMEND Information (as clarified on submitted CIL form) as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Gross Floorspace: 18,480 sq. m Net Additional Floorspace: 16,894 sq. m GLA CIL Contribution (provisional): £646,800</p> <p><u>Proposal Details</u></p>
-------------	---

Summary of Uses/Units (page 6)

AMEND first bullet to read as follows:

- the retail store would have a net sales area of 818 square metres including an ancillary café; the opening hours would be 07:00-23:00 Monday to Saturdays and six hours between 10:00 and 18:00 on Sundays (see *condition 39, page 120*)

AMEND fifth bullet to read as follows:

- the proposed affordable housing mix would be 23 x one-bedroom flats and 27 x two bedroom flats

Summary of Amenity, Landscaping and Public Realm (page 8)

AMEND first bullet to read as follows:

- except for plot C.01 all flats would have their own private balconies

AMEND fourth bullet to read as follows:

- the TPO-protected Wellingtonia tree would be retained but all other trees within the site boundary are proposed for removal (although it is proposed to gradually replace the Cypress trees on the eastern boundary of the application site)

Revisions to Application following submission

AMEND first sentence of first paragraph (page 8):

Council officers have maintained a positive and constructive dialogue with the applicant during the course of the planning application to address matters arising from the appraisal of the application proposals.

AMEND final bullet to read as follows (page 9):

- confirmation that the hedge rear of Laburnum Court will be retained and gradually replaced, and that the roof terraces of the proposed houses can be fitted with appropriate privacy screens.

Applicant Submission Documents

Environmental Reports (page 10)

ADD an additional bullet:

- Arboricultural Assessment

External and Internal Consultee Responses

Above 'Greater London Authority (GLA) (conclusions) insert heading "**External and Internal Consultee Responses**" (page 10)

Greater London Authority (GLA) (conclusions) (page 10)

AMEND first sentence of third bullet to read as follows:

- Whilst the appearance, massing and height of the scheme are supported, a number of issues have been highlighted with the layout and quality of the public realm as a result of the significant quantum of car parking and lack of active ground floor uses.

Environment Agency (page 11)

The site is Flood Zone 1 and under 1 hectare. No objection.

Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Officer (page 11)

Ask that Harrow Community Safety Planning Condition and related informatives are set against all developments at this site.

LBH Housing Team (page 11)

1. Affordable Housing and Tenure Split (summarised)

The provision of shared ownership homes only does not comply with the London Plan policy requirement for 60% affordable/social rent and 40% intermediate and does not help to meet housing need from Harrow's housing register.

The NPPF, the Mayor's Housing SPG and the London Plan clearly state that to maximise affordable housing in London and provide a more diverse offer for the range of people requiring an affordable home, the affordable rent product should be utilised in the affordable housing offer in residential developments.

Revised financial appraisals have shown that it is technically possible to include a number of affordable rent units on the scheme, although this would reduce the total number of affordable housing units (to approximately 28no. affordable rent units only, or approximately 22no. units of combined affordable rent and shared ownership tenure). However, further discussions with Notting Hill have highlighted the fact that the design of the blocks is not suited to mixing tenures in a block as they would have to share a communal entrance core.

2. Review Mechanisms

The proposed works have been phased in such a way that the initial works will concentrate mainly on the store, car parking provision and the residential units above the store, the majority of the residential units will be built at the later stages. The inclusion of a review mechanism is welcomed by Housing, although it would need to be negotiated to ensure that either additional affordable housing is provided on site as part of a later phase or an appropriate proportion of any financial surplus is awarded to the Council and ring-fenced for the delivery of additional affordable housing units.

3. Additional info on sales of shared ownership units in Harrow:

For recent shared ownership schemes in the central Harrow and surrounding area, 75-80% of the units have been bought by Harrow residents. This is what we would expect, based on sales of schemes in previous years. However, the Notting Hill scheme at Douglas Close in Stanmore only achieved 49% of units sold to Harrow residents. This suggests that the affordability of the shared ownership units is critical in enabling access to Harrow residents.

Notifications

3 additional replies received (see below)

Summary of Responses – residents/individuals

Rt. Hon. Bob Blackman M.P. (page 13)

Second representation raising the following additional points (summarised):

- strain on local infrastructure for new and existing constituents;
- given Harrow Council's limited resources I have doubts that [road] improvements will be forthcoming;
- share residents' sentiment that urge greater investment into making road safety a

priority for the area;

- deeply concerned by the accuracy of some of the points in the application including the views on public transport;
- there are also issues of air and noise pollution, in conjunction with previous points, as demonstrated by the large number of letters proposed;
- likely to be a severe massing effect in Coverdale Close, overwhelming and spoiling neighbouring properties;
- proposed buildings are too tall – one floor should be removed from each block;
- residents are concerned that this will become an imposition way beyond the existing saturation point in Stanmore, in terms of transport, business and community cohesion;
- residents regard Stanmore as a district centre which is distinctly different from a town centre;
- doubt that the development would be gentle, proportionate or have the opportunity to be genuinely loved by the local community;
- I hope you reject the application under the points which I have raised.

Stanmore Society

Second representation raising the following points on the application:

- Stanmore is on the eve of having a major change to the centre of town (or village, as older residents prefer to say);
- we suspect that most residents will welcome the presence of the store and will be spoilt for choice, however the inclusion of a coffee shop is an unnecessary addition as Stanmore is already well served and a further outlet can only be detrimental to the local businesses;
- the downside to the development will be the traffic generated;
- the access to the site is restricted by only two entrances;
- the Dennis Lane access is far from ideal as the main ingress/egress for Lidl and the proposed new store;
- this is a lot of building in a small area (the former RAF Bentley Priory is a 50 acre site with only 107 homes) resulting in a very high density development;
- without a scale model it is difficult for us to judge whether the height of the blocks will be visible from Stanmore Hill or The Broadway;
- the problem is that the development ticks all the boxes as far as Government guidelines go for urban development of a town centre location;
- the tailback of traffic at the bottom of Stanmore Hill at peak times needs to be addressed, widening of Stanmore Hill would help;
- the overdue pedestrian crossing at Stanmore Hill junction is a must;
- some landscaping to the existing service road would be good;
- we would like 30 minutes free parking time to the high street's 'pay & display' machines.

Resident responses – Adequacy of Transport Assessment (page 17)

Additional points (summarised):

- pleased to see that the Stanmore Hill junction will have a pedestrian phase and note that the proposal for a filter lane at the Dennis Lane junction has been abandoned;
- the Transport Assessment should be reviewed to reflect the increased congestion that results;
- query whether the additional congestion affects the Council's EIA Screening

Opinion (likely to have a detrimental affect on Stanmore).

Applicant's Response – Affordable housing issues

AMEND first sentence of first paragraph to read (page 18):

The provision of 42% affordable housing within the proposed scheme for Anmer Lodge is in accord with Harrow Council's aims as set out in Paragraph J of the Core Strategy Policy CS1 to provide 40% affordable housing Borough wide, whilst taking account of site circumstances and other scheme requirements.

AMEND third sentence of second paragraph to read (page 19):

Notting Hill Housing, as a registered provider, is able to support the provision of 42% shared ownership by unit, although this is technically unviable, as demonstrated by the viability assessment undertaken by Cluttons and independently verified by BNP Paribas, even based on an existing use value basis.

Applicant's Response – Traffic and transport issues

The applicant has advised that they are currently in discussion with two car clubs.

Applicant's Response – GLA Issues (insert before 'Appraisal' page 22)

The applicant responds to the issues raised as follows (summarised):

Principle of Development

The applicant welcomes the GLA's recognition of the proposal's contribution to housing supply and retail floorspace. The applicant considers that the provision is not too high given the need to re-provide 151 existing spaces.

Housing

BNP Paribas accepted that some of their initial assumptions should be revised including the benchmark value of the site. The applicant's viability assessment shows that the inclusion of affordable rented units would significantly reduce the overall quantum of affordable homes. There is no cross subsidy of the foodstore by housing.

The applicant is willing to review the future scope for on-site affordable rented units as part of the review mechanism required by the Heads of Terms.

Urban Design

There is a requirement to re-provide the existing 151 car parking spaces and provide a further 50 spaces for the proposed store. There is no scope to relocate these within the surrounding area. All viable options to reduce the visual impact of parking have been explored – the proposal includes a large basement car park.

The inclusion of ground floor uses to the western edge of the car park would not be viable and would reduce the number of parking spaces. The entrances to Blocks A & B have been located to create a residential public domain to the north part of the site and reduce distances to residential parking areas. Direct entrances to ground floor flats in Block C would have implications for accessibility (due to site levels), There would be good natural surveillance of the streets.

Children's Playspace

On site playspace will be controlled by proposed condition 25 and the s.106 contribution towards additional off site provision.

Inclusive Access

The applicant has demonstrated compliance with Lifetime Homes standards and this would be secured by proposed condition 2. Condition 3 requires an inclusive access strategy. Condition 14 requires that all homes comply with the minimum space standards and Housing Design Guide. Condition 5 requires details of arrangements for toilets for the proposed store.

Climate Change Adaptation

Information has been supplied in the Energy Strategy reports.

Transport

Surveys of car parking and bus stops, and reviews of walking and cycling facilities, were included in the Transport Assessment. Travel Plans will be secured by the s.106 Planning Obligation. Proposed condition 8 requires a Delivery and Servicing Plan; condition 9 requires a Demolition Method Statement; Condition 10 requires a Construction Method Statement and Logistics Plan.

Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers

Visual impact (page 45)

AMEND last sentence of first paragraph to read:

The Arboricultural Report submitted with the application identifies that part of the hedge that is within the application site as being removed, although the applicant has since indicated that efforts will be made to gradually replace the hedge (this can be controlled as part of the landscaping details).

External noise, vibration, dust, air quality and light pollution (page 51)

AMEND first sentence of first paragraph to read:

The proposed hours of use of the retail store are 07:00 to 23:00 Monday to Saturdays, and six hours between 10:00 and 18:00 on Sundays.

Traffic Generation

Commercial Traffic Generation (page 56)

AMEND Table 3 as follows:

Table 3			
	AM peak hour 2 way trips (8am - 9am)	PM peak hour trips 2 way (4pm - 5pm)	Saturday peak hour 2 way trips (12.30-1.30pm)
C3 (120 units)	41	39	25
A1 (1400m2 GFA)	36	60 (5pm-6pm)	69
TOTAL	77	99	69

Lifetime Neighbourhoods

Communal Areas & Dwelling Boundaries (page 81)

AMEND first sentence of third paragraph:

Except for plot C.01, each flat would also have its own private balcony. For the flats on the first floor of Blocks A & B this will require clear demarcation between the private balconies and the surrounding communal roof garden areas

Ecology and Biodiversity

Protection (page 93)

ADD additional paragraph after fifth paragraph on page 93:

As noted above, an inspection was carried out on 24th March 2014 and the results of the inspection have been reported to the Council. The report concludes that the existing buildings on the site have negligible/very low potential for roosting opportunities and no evidence of habitation by bats was observed. The Council's Biodiversity Officer has confirmed that he is happy with the report and its findings. As a precautionary measure, the report makes specific recommendations for the managed on of the buildings on the site and for the provision of habitat bat tubes in the new development. To facilitate the implementation of these recommendations, it is proposed to give effect to the report as a condition of planning permission. (*see amendments to proposed condition 31*)

Enhancement (page 94)

AMEND sixth paragraph on page 94 to read:

As noted in the *landscaping* section of this report, it is intended that the proposal will also make provision for green roofs. Green roofs bring environmental and ecological benefits and would so represent a further and significant biodiversity enhancement. The applicant has supplied a drawing to show that substantial areas would be available for the provision of green roofs. It is considered that details of the provision of green roofs can be adequately controlled by condition (see suggested condition 30).

Consultation Responses (page 205)

ADD additional responses to representations as follows:

Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Officer

- the proposal complies with Secured by Design principles as set out at pages 79-82 of the report
- proposed condition 7 would control the details in relation to Secured by Design matters

LBH Housing Team

- tenure split: the London Plan 60/40 tenure split is a long-term, strategic target; monitoring of affordable housing completions in Harrow shows that the tenure split over the period 2009/10 to 2012/13 was 69% rent and 31% intermediate; London Plan and Local Plan policies call for the maximisation of affordable housing output on individual schemes
- review mechanisms: a review mechanism is included in the proposed s.106 Planning Obligation heads of terms
- affordability of shared ownership units: shared ownership is an intermediate housing product and falls within the definition of affordable housing

Rt. Hon. Bob Blackman M.P.

- infrastructure/resources: the report sets out how infrastructure made necessary by the development will be provided; road and other improvements will be funded by the developer or through CIL
- road safety: proposals for a pedestrian phase at Stanmore Hill junction are set out

in the report

- accuracy of application: officers consider that the evidence submitted with the application is sound
- air and noise pollution: assessments of these impacts have been submitted with the application and are appraised in the report
- massing/tall buildings: the townscape/character/height impacts are dealt with in the report and are considered acceptable
- saturation point: officers consider that the transport, business and community cohesion impacts of the development are acceptable
- gentle/proportionate/loved by the community: the townscape/character/amenity impacts are dealt with in the report and are considered acceptable

Stanmore Society

- coffee shop: the inclusion of an ancillary café with the proposed food store is considered acceptable; competition is not a material planning consideration
- traffic/access: the traffic impacts and adequacy of the access arrangements are dealt with in the report and are considered acceptable
- density: the density of the development is dealt with in the report and is considered to be acceptable; Bentley Priory is not considered to be directly comparable as that is a Green Belt site
- height: information submitted with the application indicates that the development would not be visible from a number of surrounding vantage points
- Government guidelines: the application has been assessed against the development plan, the NPPF and other material considerations as detailed in the report
- Stanmore Hill traffic: traffic impacts upon the surrounding highway network are dealt with in the report and are considered acceptable
- pedestrian crossing: proposals for a pedestrian phase at Stanmore Hill junction are set out in the report
- landscaping of service road: this is outside the application site but funding from the development will enable the Council to carry out improvements
- 30 minutes free parking in the high street: this matter is beyond the scope of the planning application

Adequacy of Transport Assessment

Dennis Lane (filter Lane)

As referred to in the report the Marsh Lane/The Broadway/Dennis Lane junction is currently operating near/or above workable capacity at various times. The applicant had proposed to include widening of Dennis Lane at this junction to allow for an additional southbound lane in an attempt to create additional vehicle capacity on this southbound leg of the junction however this was not feasible as explained within the committee report.

The omission of this additional lane will not directly impinge on junction capacity as the Dennis Lane 'arm' is the least dominant and utilised out of the four arms and will remain so even if the development attains permission. Hence such widening would have minimal influence in term of calculating capacity. This is further supported by the anticipated moderate generation of in and outbound vehicles related to the retail element of the proposal which is not expected to measurably contribute to additional queue lengths in Dennis Lane itself. On this premise there is no requirement for further assessment.

In conclusion significant capacity improvement would need to be focussed on the A410 corridor itself or the Marsh Lane approach by virtue of physical widening of the roadways. However as this is not feasible this junction will rely on the signal optimisation initiative for the A410 corridor currently in progress with assistance from the provision of a 'junction wide yellow box' marking with camera enforcement as described in the report.

The Broadway/Church Road/Stanmore Hill

It is accepted that final designs on a pedestrian facility are still in progress and yet to be finalised with delivery anticipated to be achieved by way of substantive developer funding. In assessment terms the applicant has demonstrated that most of the junctions in question including this one are near to or exceed capacity. If the scheme attains planning permission and subsequent funding to provide a pedestrian phase then it is the responsibility of the Council in partnership with TfL to incorporate such provision within the signal optimising regime for the A410 corridor in order to best harmonise the operation of the pedestrian phase with an overall aim of maximising vehicle capacity at this junction.

Conditions

Ecology and Biodiversity (page 118)

AMEND condition 31 to read as follows:

31. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the ecological recommendations for nesting birds, reptiles and Japanese knotweed as set out in the letter from SLR Consulting Limited and dated 11th March 2014, and in accordance with the recommendations for bats as set out in the letter from SLR Consulting Limited and dated 27th March 2013 [sic].

Reason to remain as published.

Plan Nos. (page 122)

Delete Dwg	Replacement Dwg	Title	Changes
1126_PL_003 Rev. A	1126_PL_003 Rev. B	Proposed Site Plan	Minor changes to parking layout and landscaping to meet Lifetime Neighbourhoods and Secured by Design principles
1126_PL_004 Rev. A	1126_PL_004 Rev. B	Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan	Minor changes to parking layout and landscaping to meet Lifetime Neighbourhoods and Secured by Design principles Minor changes to proposed bin stores Plot C.01 amended to remove door to balcony
1126_PL_005 Rev.	1126_PL_005 Rev. B	Proposed Upper	Minor changes to

A			Ground Floor Plan	parking layout and landscaping to meet Lifetime Neighbourhoods and Secured by Design principles
1126_PL_006 Rev. B		1126_PL_006 Rev. C	Proposed First Floor Plan	Additional window added to north flank elevation of Block B to make first floor flat B1.1 dual aspect
1126_PL_007 Rev. B		1126_PL_007 Rev. C	Proposed Second Floor Plan	Additional window added to north flank elevation of Block B to make second floor flat B2.1 dual aspect
1126_PL_008 Rev. B		1126_PL_008 Rev. C	Proposed Third Floor Plan	Additional window added to north flank elevation of Block B to make third floor flat B3.1 dual aspect
1126_PL_009 Rev. B		1126_PL_009 Rev. C	Proposed Fourth Floor Plan	Additional window added to south flank elevation of Block A to make third floor flat A4.3 dual aspect
-		1126_PL_019	Roof Plan of PV's and Green Roofs	New drawing to show areas available for green roofs and photovoltaic panels
1126_PL_200		1126_PL_200 Rev. A	Block A Proposed Elevations	Minor changes to fenestration on south elevation
1126_PL_201 Rev. B		1126_PL_201 Rev. C	Block B Proposed Elevations	Revisions to podium balustrade on east elevation Revisions to north elevation windows ¹ General corrections to fenestration
1126_PL_250 Rev. A		1126_PL_250 Rev. B	Site Sections AA & BB	Minor changes to fenestration shown on west elevation of Block B
1126_PL_251 Rev. A		1126_PL_251 Rev. B	Site Sections CC & DD	Minor changes to fenestration shown on south elevations of Blocks A & B and north elevation of Block B
1126_PL_500 Rev. A		1126_PL_500 Rev. B	Proposed Phase 1 and Temporary Car Park Plan	Minor changes to parking layout of phase one

¹ NB – windows to flat nos. B1.1, B2.1 & B3.1 already shown on original drawings.

Addendum Item 1:

A third round of consultation was undertaken on the 25 March 2014 as a result of further revised plans received which included amendments to proposed Plot D and also to the soft landscaping within the site. One comment was received in relation to the revised plans. However, did not raise anything new from the previous responses, and was considered within the Committee Report.

Addendum Item 2:

REPLACE the existing information in relation to CIL monies owed.

This application is reported to Planning Committee as it is of significant public interest. The application is therefore referred to the Planning Committee as it is excluded by Proviso E of the Scheme of Delegation dated 29 May 2013.

Statutory Return Type: E(20) Small-scale Major Development

Council Interest: None

Net Additional Floorspace: Residential Floor Space; 17,496.84 m². Commercial Floor Space: 2885.62sqm; Total. 20,382.46sqm.

GLA Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Contribution (provisional): £713,386.10 (Residential and Commercial Floor Space inclusive)

Harrow Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Contribution (provisional): £1,924,652.40

Addendum Item 3:

AMEND Condition 5 to read as follows;

5. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings, the development hereby permitted shall not proceed above ground floor damp proof course level until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority detailed sections at metric scale 1:20 through all external reveals of the windows and doors on each of the elevations. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To enhance the appearance of the development and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, in accordance with policy 7.4.B of The London Plan 2011 and policy DM1 of The Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013.

Addendum Item 4:

AMEND Condition 9 to read as follows;

9) The development hereby permitted shall not proceed above ground floor damp proof course level, details relating to the long term maintenance and management of the on site drainage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Details thereby approved shall be retained thereafter. Such a management/maintenance document shall fall with a 'Owners Manual' to provide greater long term functionality and should include (but not limited to):

- Location of all SudS techniques on site
- Summary of how they work and how they can be damaged
- Maintenance requirements (a maintenance plan) and a maintenance record

This will be determined by the type of SuDS but should include Inspection frequency; debris removal; vegetation management; sediment management; structural rehabilitation / repair; infiltration surface reconditioning

- Explanation of the consequences of not carrying out the specified maintenance
- Identification of areas where certain activities which might impact on the SuDS are prohibited
- An action plan for dealing with accidental spillages
- Advice on what to do if alterations are to be made to a development if service companies undertake excavations or other works which might affect the SuDS

The manual should also include brief details of the design concepts and criteria for the SuDS scheme and how the owner or operator must ensure that any works undertaken on a development do not compromise this.

REASON: To ensure that the development has adequate drainage facilities, to reduce and mitigate the effects of flood risk and would not impact the character and appearance of the development, in accordance the recommendations of Core Strategy (2012) policy CS1, the NPPF and policies DM1, DM9 & DM10 of the Harrow Development Management Local Policies Plan (2013).

Addendum Item 5:

REPLACE the existing CIL calculations at Informative 3 and 4 respectively with the updated figures as follows.

3. Mayor CIL

Please be advised that approval of this application by Harrow Council will attract a liability payment £713,386.10 of Community Infrastructure Levy. This charge has been levied under Greater London Authority CIL charging schedule and s211 of the Planning Act 2008.

Harrow Council as CIL collecting authority on commencement of development will be collecting the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Your proposal is subject to a CIL Liability Notice indicating a levy of £713,386.10 for the application, based on the levy rate for Harrow of £35/sqm and the stated increase in floorspace of 20,382.46sqm.

You are advised to visit the planningportal website where you can download the appropriate document templates.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/applications/howtoapply/whattosubmit/cil>

4. Harrow CIL

Harrow has a Community Infrastructure Levy which will apply Borough wide for certain uses of over 100sqm gross internal floor space. The CIL has been examined by the Planning Inspectorate and found to be legally compliant. It will be charged from the 1st October 2013. Any planning application determined after this date will be charged accordingly.

Harrow's Charges are:

Residential (Use Class C3) - £110 per sqm;

Hotels (Use Class C1), Residential Institutions except Hospitals, (Use Class C2), Student Accommodation, Hostels and HMOs (Sui generis)- £55 per sqm;

Retail (Use Class A1), Financial & Professional Services (Use Class A2), Restaurants and Cafes (Use Class A3) Drinking Establishments (Use Class A4) Hot Food Takeaways (Use Class A5) - £100 per sqm

All other uses - Nil.

	<p>The Harrow CIL Liability for this development is: £1,924,652.40</p>
<p>2/01</p>	<p>ADD specification to proposal details on page 163 as follows:- Each CU Phosco Lighting Ltd FL500 luminaire will be fitted with one SDNP-T 250 watt sodium lamp</p> <p>One additional letter of response received raising the following additional comments:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drawings listed in the report are very hard to read on the planning portal. The planning officer provided hard copies to me on 12th March and I used these in preparing my objection to the application which I submitted after the Expiry of the 3rd Notification on 20th March. In fact the objections I raised have been covered by the other objectors, except for the reference to Metro-Land. • Maintain my objection to the application. <p>Officer's comments: This is noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character and appearance – Metroland. West End Lawn Tennis Club is a private recreation tennis club. The six courts built on two levels in 1928 are orientated north/south to avoid the glare of low east/west sun for daylight play. The tennis club is part of Cuckoo Hill Estate, a 1920s metro land estate of more than sixty houses. <p>Officer's comments: The metroland character of the area is noted. There are no special designations for this area to preclude or prevent development such as a conservation area designation. Character of the area is addressed on pages 170 and 171 of the committee report. The orientation of the existing courts are noted, however, the lighting is required for periods of time when there is low lighting levels or darkness due to seasonal variations.</p> <p>The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details which shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with London Plan policy 6.9 and Policy DM42 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan.</p>
<p>2/02</p>	<p>AMEND condition 13 to read:- Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until revised plans showing two car parking spaces only on the front forecourt including the construction of a boundary wall no higher than 1 metre between the two vehicle crossings, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details which shall be fully implemented before the first occupation of the development and shall be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>REASON: To ensure that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with London Plan policy 6.9 and Policy DM42 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan.</p>
<p>3/01</p>	<p>AMEND recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delegated Authority to be given to the Divisional Director of Planning to determine the Planning application following the end of the consultation period on 28th April 2014 2. REFUSE planning permission for the application described in the submitted plans,

drawings and Environmental Statement for the reasons set out in the agenda.

Correction to consultation section on page 227:

Advertisement: Departure from the Development Plan; Major Development; Environmental Impact Assessment Development; General Advertisement

Expiry: 10 April 2014

1st Site Notice Erected: 14 January 2014

2nd site notice in relation to EIA development erected: 28 March 2014

Expiry: 25 April 2014

1st Notification

Sent: 709

Expiry: 23 January 2014

Neighbours Consulted:

Altham Court, Broadfields: 1-8

Broadfield Court, Broadfields: 1-4

Parkfield House, Broadfields: 1-45

Oak Tree Court: 1-12

Laura Court, Parkfield Avenue: 1-8

Verwood Road: All properties

Parkfield Avenue: 16-90 (even), 23-63 (odd)

Parkfield Crescent: 1-28, 29, 30, 32

Parkfield Gardens: All properties

Holmwood Close: All properties

Barmor Close: All properties

Broadfields: All properties

Pinner Park Avenue: 36-100(even), 29-95 (odds)

Randon Close: All properties

Headstone Lane: The Lodge at Broadfield Sports and Social Club; Broadfields Sports and Social Club, Headstone Lane Sports Ground, Mount Pleasant House, Headstone Lane Railway Station, 103-209 (odds), 130-298 (even)

Greystoke Avenue: 8

Almond Way: All properties

Barmor Close: All properties

Temsford Close: All properties

Manor Park Drive: 4-46 (even)

Fulbeck Way: All properties

Willow Court, Fulbeck Road: 1-10

Fernleigh Court: All properties

Melbourne Avenue: Pinner Park Infant and Nursery School, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33

Greystoke Avenue: 1a, 1b, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12

Pinner View: The Pavilion, Headstone Manor Recreation Ground

Summary of responses

Objections: 314

Petition of objection: (4228 signatures)

For clarification, no second consultation took place on this application so the reference to this on page 228 should be discounted.

Summary of petitions on page 235.

- Reference to petition 1 to be deleted
- Petition 2. (4228 signatures) in relation to application P/4030/13

Two additional objections received since the report was published:

- Caravan park is not in keeping with the area
- Increased traffic and pollution
- Detrimental effect on traffic and noise levels
- Increased risk of burglaries.

These objections do not raise new issues and are already addressed within the officers report.

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)
1/02 Colart Ltd, Whitefriars Avenue, Harrow	Patrick Masterson	Rebekah Jubb
2/01 West End Lawn Tennis Club, Cuckoo Hill Road, Pinner	Alan Thackrey and Christine Wallace The Committee may by motion agree to allow a maximum of two objectors to address the Planning Committee (Procedural Rule 30.5)	Loraine Beaumont
2/02 Abbeyfield House, 32-34 West End Avenue, Pinner	Gerald O'Keefe	John Kelly