

**SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENT FOR
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
Wednesday 13 March 2024 at 7.30pm
Council Chamber, Civic Centre**

The attached documents are due to be considered at the meeting listed above and were unavailable for circulation when the agenda for the meeting was published. The agenda item to which the documents relate is noted below.

AGENDA

8. HW/FUL/22/00546 - 10 Wych Elm, Harlow (Pages 2 - 3)
10. HW/HSE/24/00026 - Lilac Cottage, Harberts Road, Harlow (Pages 4 - 5)
11. HW-LBC-23-00427 - Lilac Cottage, Harberts Road, Harlow (Pages 6 - 7)

Agenda Item 8 – 10 Wych Elm (HW/FUL/22/00546)

Since the publication of the Officer's Report, the following amendments have been made:

1. The applicant is Martorana Properties Ltd.
2. The applicant has contested the level of contribution sought from ECC Infrastructure towards Early Years & Childcare provision. This amounts to £19,427.

Their reason for this is that no contributions were sought for No.5 Wych Elm (determined at the Development Management Committee in February 2024). This Council believes the reason for this is down to the timings of their response but considers the applicant's request to be fair and justified. Representations were submitted to No.10 Wych Elm in April 2023, whereas representations were submitted to No.5 Wych Elm in October 2023.

This Council has queried the level of contribution sought and has requested an updated calculation based on up-to-date data. At the time of writing this addendum, no response had been received prior to this month's Development Management Committee and so it is requested that the Members delegate powers to officers to determine the final level of contribution towards Early Years & Childcare provision.

3. Condition 7 is amended to read:

No works except demolition shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles, and an assessment of the hydro geological context of the development, has been submitted to and certified as technically acceptable by the SuDS approval body or other suitably qualified persons. The certificate shall thereafter be submitted by the developer to the Local Planning Authority as part of the developer's application to discharge the condition. No development shall commence until the detailed scheme has been approved by the Local Planning Authority.

The approved scheme shall subsequently be implemented prior to occupation and should include but not limited to:

- *Limiting discharge rates to 1l/s for all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% allowance for climate change storm event. All relevant permissions to discharge from the site into any outfall should be demonstrated.*
- *Provide sufficient storage to ensure no off site flooding as a result of the development during all storm events up to and including the 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change event.*
- *Demonstrate that all storage features can half empty within 24 hours for the 1 in 30 plus 40% climate change critical storm event.*
- *Final modelling and calculations for all areas of the drainage system.*
- *The appropriate level of treatment for all runoff leaving the site including the undercroft car park, in line with the Simple Index Approach in chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual C753.*
- *As the site in the NHLW_08 Rivermill Critical Drainage Area, water butts must be included within the drainage design and shown on the drainage plan. Permeable paving must be used as extensively as possible.*

- *Detailed engineering drawings of each component of the drainage scheme. Where any contamination/made ground is discovered, unless remediation action is taken, the SuDS features should be lined with an impermeable membrane.*
 - *FFL's should be set 300mm above ground level.*
 - *A final drainage plan which details exceedance and conveyance routes, FFL and ground levels, and location and sizing of any drainage features.*
 - *An updated drainage strategy incorporating all of the above bullet points including matters already approved and highlighting any changes to the previously approved strategy.*
4. Condition 29 (operating hours) is deleted and condition 5 is amended to require the Construction Management Plan to include the developer's proposed hours of operation. The reason for this is to enable the contractor to determine appropriate working hours. The Council would still have control over the hours of operation as this condition requires discharging.

Agenda Item 10 and 11 – Lilac Cottage

Mr & Mrs R.J. White,
No.91, Hare Street Springs,
Harlow.
Essex.
CM194AS.

09/03/24.

Addendum to Development Committee – 13 March 2024

Ref: HW/HSE/23/00426.

&

HW/LBC/23/00427.

Dear Mr Walter,

We hope this finds you well.

We write to you in reference to the “Proposed” new garage block development at “Lilac Cottage” and the upcoming planning meeting.

Sadly, both Mrs White and myself shall be unable to attend as we are experiencing bad health at present.

We do however have further points we would like to express that we feel important and worthy of consideration at the meeting.

They are as follows:

1) In regards of initial size - although changes have been made to Mr Lawrence’s “proposed” new development, I.e. “Ridge height” and “Footprint” we still find the footprint to be too great - may we reference SECTION 4. 12. 31 Harlow Design Guide - SPD in which it states:

“Proposals for sheds, outbuildings and garages should not exceed the size of an Average Double Garage @ 26m Square...”

Whereas Mr Lawrence’s “Proposed” detached double garage with overhead storage space would exceed this recommended requirement by a margin of some 3m Square totalling “29m Square.”

2) We do feel that to compare the “Proposed” new development to that of neighbouring “Pear Tree Cottage Annexe” and use this as a standard by which to judge to be somewhat unfair and also “misleading” as this building being itself, a habitable dwelling - Mr Lawrence’s “Garage Proposal” is not.

We do feel it would be better informed and therefore a “better comparison” to compare Mr Lawrence’s “Proposal” with the Double Garage which sits adjacent to the “Proposed New Development” and in turn Adjacent to Lilac Cottage itself, which is part of what forms “The 91 Hare Street Springs Estate” - the garage being able to accommodate Two Modern Motor Vehicles and with more than adequate overhead “Loft Storage” - we feel this would be a much better comparison by which to consider..

3) Furthermore, we would like to reference “Amenity Principles for Development” where it states the Habitable Living Spaces of neighbouring properties - I.e. No.’s 3, 4 & 90 Hare Street Springs, but not including No.91.. We feel that this is of great importance for consideration as as opposed to No.’s 3, 4 & 90, which are “houses”, No. 91 is a low rise “Bungalow Dwelling” and would be greater affected WRT loss of Natural Light & Amenity.

We thank you for your time and appreciate the hard work that goes into these cases.

With Warm Regards,

Mr & Mrs R.J. White.

Agenda Item 10 and 11 – Lilac Cottage

Mr & Mrs R.J. White,
No.91, Hare Street Springs,
Harlow.
Essex.
CM194AS.

09/03/24.

Addendum to Development Committee – 13 March 2024
Ref: HW/HSE/23/00426.
&
HW/LBC/23/00427.

Dear Mr Walter,

We hope this finds you well.

We write to you in reference to the “Proposed” new garage block development at “Lilac Cottage” and the upcoming planning meeting.

Sadly, both Mrs White and myself shall be unable to attend as we are experiencing bad health at present.

We do however have further points we would like to express that we feel important and worthy of consideration at the meeting.

They are as follows:

1) In regards of initial size - although changes have been made to Mr Lawrence’s “proposed” new development, I.e. “Ridge height” and “Footprint” we still find the footprint to be too great - may we reference SECTION 4. 12. 31 Harlow Design Guide - SPD in which it states:

“Proposals for sheds, outbuildings and garages should not exceed the size of an Average Double Garage @ 26m Square...”

Whereas Mr Lawrence’s “Proposed” detached double garage with overhead storage space would exceed this recommended requirement by a margin of some 3m Square totalling “29m Square.”

2) We do feel that to compare the “Proposed” new development to that of neighbouring “Pear Tree Cottage Annexe” and use this as a standard by which to judge to be somewhat unfair and also “misleading” as this building being itself, a habitable dwelling - Mr Lawrence’s “Garage Proposal” is not.

We do feel it would be better informed and therefore a “better comparison” to compare Mr Lawrence’s “Proposal” with the Double Garage which sits adjacent to the “Proposed New Development” and in turn Adjacent to Lilac Cottage itself, which is part of what forms “The 91 Hare Street Springs Estate” - the garage being able to accommodate Two Modern Motor Vehicles and with more than adequate overhead “Loft Storage” - we feel this would be a much better comparison by which to consider..

3) Furthermore, we would like to reference “Amenity Principles for Development” where it states the Habitable Living Spaces of neighbouring properties - I.e. No.’s 3, 4 & 90 Hare Street Springs, but not including No.91.. We feel that this is of great importance for consideration as as opposed to No.’s 3, 4 & 90, which are “houses”, No. 91 is a low rise “Bungalow Dwelling” and would be greater affected WRT loss of Natural Light & Amenity.

We thank you for your time and appreciate the hard work that goes into these cases.

With Warm Regards,

Mr & Mrs R.J. White.