

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.