



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 11 JANUARY 2006**

**ADDENDUM**

This page is intentionally left blank

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW**

**ADDENDUM**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2006**

**Section 1**

**1/03** Reason 1 to read:  
“The proposed development, by reason of excessive bulk, prominent siting and unsatisfactory design, would be unduly obtrusive with inadequate space about the buildings and would detract from the established pattern of development in the streetscene and the character of the locality.”

**1/04** Two additional objections were received raising the following concerns:

overlooking of adjoining rear gardens; height of development is effectively a four storey building; loss of light, overshadowing & overlooking; bulk and height of development; proposed bin area is adjacent to rear entrance and would pose a health risk and could attract vandals.

Referral comments received were from the Metropolitan Police, Crime Prevention Design Adviser, which resulted in the following additional conditions being proposed;

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of how the under croft parking area is to be adequately secured have been submitted to an approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: In the interests of creating safer and more sustainable communities and to safeguard residential amenity.

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of external lighting to the parking areas to standard BS5489 have been submitted to an approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: In the interests of creating safer and more sustainable communities and to safeguard residential amenity.

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of gates & boundary treatment to be erected have been submitted to an approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The fencing to the side and rear boundaries should be a minimum of 2.1 metres in height and should avoid any design features that allow climbing or access points. Fencing & gates should be installed level with the front building line in order to secure the rear of the property, should be a minimum of 2.1 metres in height and should avoid any design features that allow climbing, and must have a key operated lock appropriate to the design. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: In the interests of creating safer and more sustainable communities and to safeguard residential amenity.

Proposed Condition 10 '*Fencing to be Approved*' should be deleted as it has now been superseded by the proposed condition above.

Car Parking Summary      Justified: 11  
Standard: 11

**1/05                      RECOMMENDATION**

Add Informative:

"INFORMATIVE:

In considering the timing of functions or events that could involve attendance of more than regular numbers of community members, the applicant is urged to have regard to the possibility of events or functions that may be arranged on neighbouring sites, in order to obviate potential traffic generation or related problems."

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Notification</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	259	28	27-DEC-05

Summary of Responses: Traffic congestion and danger, on-street parking, inadequate on-site parking, roads unsuitable for additional study should be made of traffic effects, noise and air pollution from traffic, harm to character of area, unnecessary proposal no sufficient facilities already, potential civil unrest, harm to residential amenity green belt rules should be applied; harm to character of conservation area, loss of trees, strain on local utility services, explosion of activity in area in combination with other proposals.

### **Summary of Responses:**

- comprehensive study should be made of traffic effects, explosion of activity in area in combination with other proposals – a study has been carried out and is referred to in the Committee report
- unnecessary proposal as sufficient facilities already – Policy C10 does not include this criterion in the assessment of proposals for places of worship and community buildings.
- loss of trees – the proposals are not shown to directly affect trees within the site, which in any case are protected by virtue of the Conservation Area location.
- strain on local utility services – no objections have been received from the utility companies.
- Other issues discussed in Committee report.

**1/06**            **DEFER** at Officers; request to give further consideration to scale of development, design and impact on trees.

### **Section 2**

**2/03**

- Two additional objections were received to the re-notification of the application, raising the following issues: overlooking of gardens; location of parking area would cause disturbance; inadequate parking; out of character; over development of area; loss of green land.
- It is proposed to include an additional condition, in order to address the proposed buildings interface with the adjoining properties to the east and west, as follows:

The windows in the upper floors of east and west facing elevations of the approved development shall:

- a) be of a purpose-made obscure glass,
- b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8 metres above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

**2/05 c) Proposal Details**

To read:

“Revisions to previous proposal

- front part of extension has been deleted
- side extension set back
- lower roof over extension”

**2/06** Proposal Details: 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read “ ...at second floor level”.

**2/07 INFORMATION**

Delete reference to Nominated Member request.

**2/09** Change drawing no. to “388(5) Rev A”.

**2/10** **DEFER** at Officers’ request to clarify the application report in respect of revisions to the proposals.

**2/12** **DEFER** at Officers’ request to clarify details of proposal

Add Conditions:

TREE\_PRTEC  
GLAZ\_OBS\_M “flank wall”

Delete: Plan no. SP002 Rev E

Add: Plan no. SP002 Rev F

Add Informative:

INFORMATIVE:

The cherry tree at the front of the site appears to have a side scaffold limb wound with decay fungus, and presents a potential hazard.

Evaluation and remedial action is strongly recommended.

Response to objector letter of 9 January:

- The red line on the OS map submitted by the applicant identifies the site as the land adjoining a reduced curtilage of 3 West Drive Gardens, does not encompass the full extent of the original curtilage of no.3.

- The applicant has signed Certificate A confirming ownership of all land identified as within the site. Ownership issues are outside the locus of the Local Planning Authority, and are between the landowners concerned.
- Restrictive covenants, under Title Deeds, are not material planning considerations, and are between the landowners concerned.
- The forecourt treatment and access to the existing dwelling, 3 West Drive Gardens, can be altered under permitted development powers, and is outside the control of the Local Planning Authority.
- The clearance of gardens and removal of trees can be done at the landowners discretion, except in the case of a TPO.
- At the time of the application submitted in respect of no.7 West Drive Gardens, there was a valid, outline permission for a new, detached dwelling within the curtilage of no.3. Given these circumstances it was considered that any further intensification of the cul-de-sac might have a detrimental effect on the movement of traffic.
- Previous encroachment on a neighbouring property or removal of fences along a neighbouring boundary is a civil matter between the landowners concerned.

Alterations to officers report:

### **c) Proposal details**

bullet point 5

delete "forecourt" and replace with "frontage"  
delete "retained" and replace with "provided"

**2/13**

Add conditions:

4. The development hereby approved shall be undertaken, in relation to trees on the site, in accordance with the protection methods detailed in the 'Report on the impact on trees' reference TC/2-38-2139.

REASON: The existing trees represent an important amenity feature which the local planning authority considers should be expected.

5. LAND\_APPR
6. LAND\_IMPL

**2/15 RECOMMENDATION**

Amend Condition 2 to read

“Outline – Reserved matters

- a: siting of the building(s)
- b: design of the buildings
- c: external appearance
- d: means of access
- e: landscaping of the site.”

Petition with 88 signatures received raising the following points:

Application is vague and provides no detail or information regarding the intention behind the application; concerned as proposed site is too close to rear gardens; application and subsequent development will adversely affect residential amenities; if developed area will be too congested and there will be an unacceptable increase in traffic; on two occasions recently applications have been refused.

**2/17 c) Proposal Details**

add

“Revisions to proposed scheme

- provision of first floor set back of 1m
- removal of parapet wall
- provision of ground floor garden access for first floor flat

those three revisions would thereby overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous scheme.”

**2/19 RECOMMENDATION**

Amend Condition 2 to read:

“Outline – Reserved Matters:

- a) design of the building(s)
- b) external appearance of the building(s)
- c) landscaping of the site.”



**2/20**            **DEFER** at officers' request to give further consideration to the proposals.

Amend:

**APPRAISAL**

The Council's Licensing Panel resolved to grant an application to vary the licence on 4 August 2005. This application sought the same hours as proposed in this planning application.

Subsequently, an appeal was lodged by two objectors. This was to be heard by the Harrow Magistrates Court. Prior to this the parties agreed to reduce the proposed hours to 09.00 – 00.00 (Sun to Thurs), and 09.00 to 00.30 (Fri – Sat) with 30 minutes drinking up time. The matter is due to come before the Court today, and it is expected that this will be accepted as amended.

**2/21**            Bullet point 2 of **c) Proposal Details** should read:

- The single storey rear extension would comply with the householder SPG.

Bullet point 3 of **c) Proposal Details** should read:

- The extended house would be altered to create 2 self contained flats.

In the **APPRAISAL 1. Conversion Policy**, bullet point 4 para 3 "three" should read "two".

**Main Items**

**15**            Subject premises to read:  
1 Wildcroft Gardens, Stanmore

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 11 DECEMBER 2006**

**AGENDA ITEM 10**

**ADVANCE WARNING GIVEN OF REQUESTS TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS ON  
PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative
<b>Item 1/05</b> Cloisters Wood, (Formerly Cloisters Wood Fitness Club), Wood Lane, Stanmore	Mr Hugh Court	Ask Planning for Shree Swaminarayan Satsang
<b>Item 2/12</b> Site Adjoining 3 West Drive Gardens, Harrow	Mr Ramesh Dewan	Fidler Associates for Mr N Nagle

This page is intentionally left blank