

Committee Update - HW/FUL/20/00378 - Netteswell Hall, Park Lane, Harlow

Consultations

An objection from the Council's Waste Services has been received. This states:

"The applicant has not submitted a swept path analysis to provide assurance that the collection vehicle is able to access the development safely. Without such an analysis, the Council cannot confirm that the road design and layout is compliant to BS5906 and related building regulations.

With regards to the flats, we would not consider the bin store located off the road to be suitable unless the access road is to remain un-adopted/in private ownership. The Council will not be left in a position whereby we will be required to clear loose waste that escapes the bin store. We are also concerned with the 'screening' that will be installed to provide shelter to the store; the design must allow for a bin to be removed without the need to move another out of the way.

The developer will be required to liaise with the Council's waste management team to ensure that suitable and compliant waste containment is provided prior to occupation.

Waste Management could not offer their support to the application until the above details/queries are confirmed; in particular, the swept path analysis."

Officer response

An amended plan has been received which shows the required swept path analysis that demonstrates that a waste collection vehicle could access the site. The applicant has commented as follows:

"With regards to the flats, the access road is unlikely to be adopted due to the nature and size of the development and, therefore, the concern relating to the location of the bin store serving the flats is mute.

Regards the screening, the site plan is quite clear in that it shows screening to rear and sides, leaving both bins accessible from the road – details of this structure are required by one of your proposed conditions in any case.

The comment regarding the developer being required to liaise with the Council's waste management team to ensure that suitable and compliant waste containment is provided prior to occupation is noted."

It is considered that given that the swept path analysis demonstrates that the site can be accessed by a refuse vehicle and proposed condition 20 is considered sufficient to deal with this issue post determination.

Further comments have been received from Place Services (Design). These state:

"Just a couple of additional points on Netteswell to go alongside those you had previously.

- I consider that the layout has improved from previous revisions, and that the current proposal represents best use of a highly challenging site. The density of housing, from a

design perspective, is appropriate for the setting, and responds positively to Netteswell Orchard and Park Lane, providing a different contextual approach and density to suit the existing conditions in the area. It is with this in mind that I consider the terraced arrangement onto Park Lane as appropriate, particularly in light of the prevailing larger flatted blocks and terraces beyond that abut and face the site.

- I have no issue with the contemporary approach to the house types. This has been a point of discussion throughout the numerous revisions to this site, and it is my view that the use of simple contemporary forms, with appropriate materiality to reflect the prevailing character of the area being largely brick, is the best way to treat this site. From a design perspective, there would be no desire for a pastiche approach which replicates the form or detailing of the existing Non-Designated asset, nor those properties further within the Conservation Area. Attention has been given to replicating the arrangement and density of existing properties in the immediate and surrounding area, and I feel that the approach taken to varying densities through a range of house types across the site is appropriate given the wealth and breadth of properties that existing surrounding the site.
- Not discounting the above comments, I am still not convinced that panelling as shown is appropriate, particularly if this was to be timber. This is not a material which is widely used in this area in a contemporary form and indeed would not be entirely sympathetic to the prevailing material characteristics of the conservation area. I would recommend therefore that the panelling on the elevations is replaced with an alternative brick of a different hue or tone but within the same broad colour spectrum as the predominant brick. Again this should be conditioned (and approval should only be granted on design grounds if it is agreed to be undertaken by the applicant) and I would wish to see how the brick choices reflect the conservation area/non-designated asset in a contemporary idiom without being pastiche.
- CGI visuals taken at key points within and looking towards the development would have helped with articulation of the design and materiality. Likewise coloured elevational plans would have been welcomed. I would recommend that all materials are conditioned, and that sample boards are provided of all the confirmed materials which are expected to be high quality and should not resort to standard, stock bricks. I do not consider that the comment “facing brickwork with contrasting feature panels” provides the required level of surety that what will be specified will be of appropriate high quality.
- Whilst it appears to be the case in the cross-sections provided, we would require surety that all street and public facing boundary treatments are constructed of brick, and where appropriate potentially a combination of brick and trellis/fencing above to create a softer street scene.”

Officer response

The additional comments are welcomed and illustrates that the scheme has a quality in this location. The timber detailing and the quality of the bricks and finishes will be addressed through the discharge of condition 5.

Proposal

An amended site plans has been received from the applicant following the Waste Comments

Condition 21 should read as follows:

21 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as shown listed in the table below.

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

| Plan Reference | Version No. | Plan Type | Date Received |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------|
| 12/053/A/002 | A | Existing Site Plan | 16.10.2020 |
| 12/053/A/003 | | Existing Floor Plans (Main House) | 06/08/2020 |
| 12/053/A/004 | F | Proposed Site Plan | 08.04.2021 |
| 12/053/A/010 | | Proposed Floor Plans (Main House) | 06/08/2020 |
| 12/053/A/011 | B | Demolitions Site Plan | 09/02/2021 |
| 12/053/A/012 | | Existing Site Sections (A to H | 23/12/2020 |
| 12/053/A/013 | | Existing Site Sections (I to K and 08 to 10) | 23/12/2020 |
| 12/053/A/014 | | Existing Site Sections (01 to 07) | 23/12/2020 |
| 12-053-A-204 | | Proposed Plans and Elevations | 09.02.2021 |
| 12-053-A-015 | Contemporar y 2 Bed A to H | Proposed Site Sections | 09.02.2021 |
| 12-053-A-016 | I to K 8 to 10 | Proposed Site Sections | 09.02.2021 |
| 12-053-A-017 | 01 to 07 | Proposed Site Sections | 09.02.2021 |
| 12/053/A/001 | -- | Location Plan | 06.08.2020 |
| 12/053/A/002 | C | Existing Site Plan | 31.12.2020 |
| | Rev 3 | Tree Protection Plan | 26.03.2021 |
| 12/053/A/201 | A | Proposed Plans and Elevations Detached | 20/01/2021 |
| 12/053/A/202 | A | Proposed Plans and Elevations – Semi-detached | 20/01/2021 |
| 12/053/A/203 | A | Proposed Plans and Elevations | 20/01/2021 |

Tree Protection
Plan

Terraced
Tree Protection Plan

31/03/2021