

SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

**EASTERN PART OF FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICES
OFF HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE**

1/01
P/166/05/COU/TEM
Ward: CANONS

OUTLINE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 49 HOUSES AND 50
FLATS IN SINGLE, 2, 3, 4 AND 5 STOREY BLOCKS;
PARKING

PRP ARCHITECTS for DOMINION HOUSING GROUP

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: A1555/2.3/01, 02A

REFUSE permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposal constitutes overdevelopment by reason of excessive density, hardsurfacing and number of units, and inadequate public open space, private gardens, planting and setting space, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area.
- 2 The proposed layout shows an unsatisfactory relationship with employment uses to the south of the site, to the detriment of residential amenity and prejudicial to the operation of the employment uses.
- 3 Inadequate car parking is shown within the site to meet the requirements of the development, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway(s) would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the neighbouring highway(s).
- 4 The application is not accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment as required by PPG25.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential
H5 Affordable Housing
H6 Affordable Housing Target
EM14 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Designated Areas
Proposal Site 27
T13 Parking Standards
T15 Servicing of New Developments
EP11 Development within Flood Plains

continued/

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Employment Policy (EM14, Proposal Site 27)
 - 2) Affordable Housing (H5, H6)
 - 3) Appearance and Character of Area (SH1, SD1, D4, D5)
 - 4) Residential Amenity (SH1, SD1, D4, D5)
 - 5) Traffic and Parking (T13, T15)
 - 6) Drainage Issues (EP11)
 - 7) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	150
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	58
Site Area:	1.2ha	
No. of Residential Units:	99	
Density:	83 dph	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- located on east side of Honeypot Lane south of junction with Whitchurch Lane/Marsh Lane/Wemborough Road
- comprises 1.21ha of land at eastern end of former Government Buildings site now cleared of buildings
- vehicular access from Honeypot Lane
- controlled footpath link, owned by London Transport, from north-east corner of site to Whitchurch Lane opposite Canons Park station
- retained single storey Government buildings on land to north
- Jubilee railway line, on an embankment, abuts eastern boundary
- warehouse/office/industrial buildings within Parr Road industrial estate to the south
- vacant land abuts western boundary
- land slopes down gently from north to south and west to east

c) Proposal Details

- outline application, siting of buildings to be determined at outline stage
- development of site for affordable housing comprising 49 houses for social rent and 50 flats for shared ownership
- 14 x 1 bed, 38 x 2 bed, 40 x 3 bed and 7 x 4 bed roomed units proposed, 2 of which would be wheelchair accessible
- mainly 2 storey houses with gardens adjacent to northern and southern boundaries
- 1/2/3 storey houses in centre of site
- 4/5 storey flats adjacent to eastern and western boundaries
- parking mostly provided in form of lay-by spaces adjacent to access road within site, remainder in centre of site
- all other matters, including means of access, reserved for future approval

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/166/05/COU continued.....

d) Relevant History

Brockley Hill Government Buildings Site

EAST/1060/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment: 4.86ha to provide 96 detached houses and 2.34ha for public open space, access from Brockley Hill	GRANTED 29-JUN-00
P/1280/03/CDP	Details pursuant to Condition 2 (A,B,C) of planning permission EAST/1060/99/OUT	APPROVED 17-OCT-03

Application Site

EAST/1061/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment for affordable housing	GRANTED 29-JUN-00
P/373/03/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT to allow submission of affordable housing reserved matters by 29 June 2005	GRANTED 15-APR-03
P/190/05/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT to allow submission of affordable housing reserved matters by 29 June 2007	WITHDRAWN 13-APR-05

Adjacent land to west of application site (former Asha Site)

EAST/1062/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment for D1, D2, A1, A3 and C1 uses – cultural and community facilities with retail, food and drink and short stay accommodation, access and parking	GRANTED 05-JUL-00
P/571/03/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1062/99/OUT to allow submission of details of reserved matters by 5 July 2006	APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION DISMISSED 06-OCT-03

Application site plus former Asha site

P/2095/04/CFU	639 residential units (263 affordable), B1 offices, retail, finance/professional services, food/drink uses, community facilities, access and parking (This application site plus land formerly proposed for ASHA centre)	CURRENT
---------------	---	---------

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/166/05/COU continued.....

P/2139/04/CFU	598 residential units (249 affordable), B1 offices, retail, finance/professional services, food/drink uses, community facilities, access and parking	CURRENT
P/2110/04/CFU	Reinstatement of existing pedestrian access route to Canons Park Station with associated landscaping (existing access between application site and Whitchurch Lane)	CURRENT
P/2272/04/CFU	Duplicate of P/2110/04/CFU	CURRENT

e) Applicant's Statement

- application developed in response to more recent guidelines in draft Development Brief
- development makes significant contribution to provision of affordable housing in Harrow as all units are affordable with houses for social rent and flats for shared ownership

f) Consultations

EA:	Object
L.B. Brent:	No objections
London Underground Ltd:	
TWU:	No objections

Advertisement Major Development Expiry
21-APR-05

Notifications Sent Replies Expiry
1577 26 21-APR-05

Summary of Responses: Traffic impact, excessively high density, out of keeping with green belt, too many homes, too much traffic, too damaging to local environment, out of character, adverse impact on skyline, traffic congestion, overdevelopment, strain on public services and infrastructure, inadequate parking, crime, noise and disturbance, excessive height, no provision made for safe access onto Honeypot Lane, devaluation, would exacerbate problems of flooding, contamination, piecemeal development.

APPRAISAL

1) Employment Policy

This site is part of a designated B1, B2 or B8 employment site in UDP Policy EM14, and an Industrial Business Park in the London Plan. However UDP Proposal Site 27 proposes comprehensive development for either B1, B2 or B8 use, or business/residential purposes when an element of residential use would be acceptable.

continued/

Residential development on this area would leave the remainder of the overall site available for the provision of employment uses and would therefore comply with the employment objectives for the area.

2) Affordable Housing

The provision of affordable housing on this site represents the policy requirement for Laings private housing development at Brockley Hill which is currently under construction.

Outline planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT reserves all matters for subsequent approval although an illustrative layout showed the provision of 63 units in a form which was compatible with the ASHA development which was proposed at that time. Although the layout is unlikely now to be relevant given the changed circumstances of the adjacent site, this site has the potential to enable a valuable gain to the affordable housing stock of the Borough, subject to acceptable details.

3) Appearance and Character of Area

The proposed scheme largely respects the established character of the surrounding residential area which is mostly composed of 2 storey dwellings. The proposed provision of some higher buildings of up to 5 storeys can be accepted in principle in locations on the site which have no direct relationship with existing residential premises. However, it is considered that a cramped layout is proposed, with inadequate public open space, private garden areas and setting space in front of most of the proposed dwellings, and excessive hardsurfacing due to the arrangement of roads, parking spaces and footways, indicating an overdevelopment of the site. This is evidenced by the proposed density of 83 d.p.h. which is greater than the 50-80 d.p.h. range in the London Plan for a site in this location based on a parking provision of 1-1.5 spaces per unit. The proposed provision in this scheme of only 0.6 spaces per unit without adequate on-street controls is also indicative of overdevelopment.

4) Residential Amenity

The nearest neighbouring dwellings are over 60m from the application site and would thus not be affected by the proposals.

In terms of the amenity of the proposed dwellings, a terrace of 17 houses is shown adjacent to the existing employment area to the south of the site with rear garden depths of only 8/9m.

It is considered that this would give rise to unsatisfactory relationships with the adjacent employment uses in terms of outlook, privacy, and noise and disturbance in relation to the intended residents of the proposed development.

The close proximity of the proposed dwellings to the employment uses could also prejudice the operation of the adjacent employment premises in terms of the nature of the business, activity and hours of use, and undermine the allocation of the land in the UDP for B1, B2 and B8 uses.

continued/

5) Traffic and Parking

Were the scheme acceptable overall, then permission could be granted subject to a S106 agreement relating to possible on-street parking controls in the locality if the development gave rise to on-street parking.

However in the absence of such a strategy the proposals are objected to as showing inadequate levels of off-street parking.

In terms of traffic, including the Honeypot Lane junction, access is proposed to be a reserved matter for future consideration.

6) Drainage Issues

Environment Agency raised no objection to the original application for affordable housing on this site (EAST/1061/99/OUT) and suggested that conditions and informatives be included in any planning permission. However, following subsequent Government guidance in line with the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the Agency has introduced Flood Risk Standing Advice which requires the provision of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to accompany any application for operational development on a site greater than one hectare. In the absence of an FRA the Agency has lodged an objection to the application and accordingly the proposals are recommended for refusal for this reason also.

7) Consultation Responses

- Out of keeping with Green Belt - not Green Belt land
 - Strain on public services and infrastructure, contamination - no comments to this effect have been received from consultees
 - Crime, noise and disturbance - it is not considered that these would necessarily result from the proposals
 - Devaluation - not a material planning consideration
- Other issues discussed in report.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for refusal.

COMFORT INN, 2-12 NORTHWICK PARK ROAD, 57 GAYTON ROAD AND PART R/O 2 MANOR ROAD, HARROW P/507/05/CFU/RJS
Ward: GREENHILL

REDEVELOPMENT: 1 X 3/4 STOREY BLOCK AND 1 X 3 STOREY BLOCK TO PROVIDE 67 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING

MORRISON DESIGN LTD for COMFORT INN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 002 Rev.A - 006 Rev.A incl., 007, 008, 100, 101, 105, 106

REFUSE permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of excessive density and inadequate amenity space, to the detriment of neighbouring residents amenity in the surrounding area.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of excessive size and bulk would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 3 The proposed intensification of the parking area to the rear of the site by reason of unsatisfactory siting in relation to the neighbouring residential properties and associated disturbance and general activity would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of those properties and the character of the area.
- 4 An excessive number of on-site spaces is proposed, contrary to the Adopted 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan Policy T13 and contrary to PPG13 advice to reduce reliance on the private motor car.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
ST2 Traffic Management
EP25 Noise
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments
T13 Parking Standards
H4 Residential Density

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/507/05/CFU continued.....

H5	Affordable Housing
H6	Affordable Housing Target
H7	Dwelling Mix
H18	Accessible Homes
R15	Hotels and Guest Houses
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Hotel/Housing Policy (SH1, H4, H5, H6, H7, H18, R15)
 - 2) Site Layout and Character of Area (SD1, SH2, D4, D5, D6, D8, R15, C16)
 - 3) Amenity of Neighbours (D4, EP25)
 - 4) Accessibility (C16)
 - 5) Parking/Highway Safety (ST1, ST2, T13)
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	80
	Justified:	87
	Provided:	87
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- 0.4 ha site on eastern side of Northwick Park Road between Gayton Road and Manor Road
- site presently contains part 2/ part 3 storey hotel building fronting Northwick Park Road with 2-storey annexe fronting Manor Road. The proposed development site also incorporates the adjoining 2 storey detached building 57 Gayton Road that has previously been converted into 2 flats
- building is setback from Northwick Park Road frontage which includes on site parking. There is also extensive parking at the rear accessed via Manor Road
- surrounding buildings include:
 - 2 Manor Road adjoining is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse
 - 1B Manor Road opposite is a detached bungalow
 - 14 Northwick Park Road opposite is a 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouse
 - Hanbury Court, a 3 storey sheltered home lies opposite the junction with Manor Road
 - 51 Gayton Road opposite is a hotel (associated with the subject site), accommodated with a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse
 - 50-60 Gayton Road opposite form pairs of 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouses
 - No 59 Gayton Road adjoining is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse (associated with the subject site)
- it is noted that the applicant has highlighted that the opposite/adjoining properties 51 and 59 Gayton Road are associated with main hotel complex

continued/

c) Proposal Details

- the proposed development scheme can be broadly broken down into the following components:
 - demolition of all buildings on site
 - redevelopment to provide part 3/ part 4 storey block of 67 apartments (43 x 2 bed, 4 x 1 bed) and 3 storey block to provide 20 apartments (6 x 2 bed, 14 x 1 bed) as affordable units
 - the proposed building line along Northwick Park Road and Gayton Road would be reduced from the existing building line, involving:
 - Northwick Park Road: currently 4.70 - 7.00m: proposed 2.59 - 3.66m;
 - Gayton Road: currently 5.8 - 12.4m: proposed 2.20 - 8.00 metres; from Gayton Road (currently 5.8 - 12.4 metres)
 - the proposed building line along Manor Road would be increased from the existing building line. Currently 4.0 - 7.0m: proposed 4.33 - 6.70m
 - buildings would have a varied roof form with hipped ends, projecting gable features and dormer windows to Northwick Park Road & Manor Road and to the rear roofslopes
 - ground floor flats would have terrace gardens, whilst upper floor flats would have balconies located both on the front and rear elevations
 - basement car parking for 64 vehicles would be provided for the larger of the two buildings, accessed from Manor Road
 - an single disabled vehicle space would be located to the Manor Road frontage
 - surface car parking for 22 vehicles would be provided for the smaller affordable housing block of flats, accessed from Gayton Road;
 - 525m² of communal rear amenity space would be provided for the larger of the two buildings
 - 320m² of communal rear amenity space would be provided for the smaller affordable housing block of flats

d) Relevant History

The site has a long planning history establishing the hotel use, however recent applications for large scale redevelopment are listed below:

P/1057/03/CFU	Redevelopment: 46 flats in 2 x 2/3 storey blocks with access, basement and surface parking (revised)	REFUSED 16-OCT-03
---------------	--	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of excessive density and inadequate amenity space, to the detriment of neighbouring residents amenity in the surrounding area.”

P/272/05/CFU	Part single/part 3 storey rear extension; 1/2 storey extension on site of 57 Gayton Rd; revised car parking	REFUSED 20-APR-05
--------------	---	----------------------

continued/

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed development, by reason of excessive size and bulk would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
2. The proposed windows/ balconies in the rear elevation would allow overlooking of the adjoining properties and result in an unreasonable loss of privacy to the occupiers.
3. The proposed intensification of the parking area to the rear of the site by reason of unsatisfactory siting in relation to the neighbouring residential properties and associated disturbance and general activity would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of those properties and the character of the area.

e) Applicant’s Statement

- Since purchasing the hotel last year, our clients have invested substantial sums in upgrades and enhancements of the existing premises. Whilst trading has improved, the hotel does not have long-term viability in its present form;
- Our clients are committed hotel operators, who own a number of other hotels and their preferred approach is to develop the existing hotel facilities to become a more viable concern. In order to pursuer this aim our clients have submitted another application to extend the hotel (application ref. P/272/05/CFU);
- Should the application to extend the hotel prove unsuccessful, probably the only sensible alternative is to redevelop the site for residential use – hence the owners pursuing this option. However, if approval were granted for the hotel extension, the residential application will be withdrawn.

f) Consultations

EA: Unable to respond
TWU: No objections

Advertisement Major Development Expiry
03-MAR-05

Notifications Sent 86 Replies 13 objections +
1 letter of support Expiry 25-MAR-05

continued/

Summary of Responses: Many applications submitted over the last 2 years for the redevelopment of the site; many refusals due to narrowness of roads, being out of character and high concentration of flats; existing traffic and parking difficulties would be exacerbated; will increase traffic and accidents; height of building not in keeping with residential area; proposal for 67 flats is outrageous as a recent application for 46 flats was refused due to overdevelopment; proposed underground car park would cause disturbance to groundwater and would therefore impact on the stability of the water table and existing buildings in the area; development would impact upon local infrastructure (utility services, doctors etc); already many other proposed developments in immediate vicinity; development would cause detrimental impacts by overlooking, increased noise and general disturbance; site should be developed for executive housing and not for flats; with demand for hotels in the area likely to increase upon the completion of Wembley Stadium, the site should remain as a hotel; area being continually threatened by over development; blocks are too high and too bulky; more housing is needed on a national basis but there is already overcrowding in the south east; prefer this scheme to the hotel extension

APPRAISAL

1) Hotel/Housing Policy

Policy R15 of the Adopted 2004 UDP seeks to ensure that existing hotels are retained where practical. It also states that where redevelopment is proposed, the character, amenity and environment of the locality should be respected.

The applicant has stated that upgrades and enhancements of the existing premises have been undertaken and whilst trading has improved, the hotel does not have long-term viability in its present form. The applicant sought to expand and upgrade the hotel complex via Planning Application P/272/05/CFU, of which is encouraged by Policy R15 a). However this application was not supported on specific design, layout and amenity grounds.

With respect of the prior refused residential redevelopment scheme (P/1057/03/CFU), a submission at the time detailed financial forecasts for the long term viability of the hotel. As such the loss of the hotel was not specifically resisted, nor was it included as a reason for refusal. With this current scheme the applicant has again highlighted that the hotel does not have long-term viability in its present form. On this basis the potential loss of the hotel is not specifically resisted. However this does not negate more specific concerns relating to the design & layout of the proposal.

Although broad policies within the adopted 2004 UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range and types and sizes, due to the more specific design issues discussed below, the current scheme is not considered to be acceptable.

continued/

2) Site Layout and Character of Area

Although there are different forms and scales of buildings within the surrounding locality, the character of the area is clearly residential. More specifically there is a development theme involving buildings orientated to the frontage of their sites, with rear gardens behind. It is noted that the proposed residential redevelopment follows a pattern of orientating the building toward the road frontages of the site, whilst providing a combination of rear garden amenity space and ground level parking to the frontage of the site.

With respect of the previous application for a residential development scheme (for 46 flats), it is highlighted that this was refused on issues of representing an overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessive density & inadequate amenity space, that would be to the detriment of neighbouring residents' amenity. This current scheme has increased the number of proposed flats from 46 to 67 flats. However the proposal has not significantly increased the amount of rear garden amenity space, nor has addressed the more fundamental issue of excessive density. In essence to accommodate the increased in the number of flats, the setback of Northwick Park Road & Gayton Road has been reduced, the bulk of the façade to Manor Road has been increased and accommodation within the roofspace with associated balconies has been provided to the Manor, Northwick Park and Gayton Road frontages. On this basis, the current proposed development, as with the last proposal, is considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site.

In order to achieve a 67 flat development, the proposed development would be sited significantly forward of the existing building line both along Northwick Park Road & Gayton Road. Although the height of the building is comparable to that of the prior development the reduction of the existing frontage setback would interrupt the established front building line of the locality, whilst additionally creating a building with a significant mass and bulk to the streetscape. The reduced setback would also effectively limit the opportunity to provide for substantial and significant landscaping along the road frontage of the site. Again while the height of the building is comparable to the last proposal, there is the issue of the perceived height of the building being emphasised by roofspace accommodation being proposed. The cut away balconies proposed at roof level to the Manor, Northwick Park and Gayton Road frontages will in essence emphasise the development's 4 storeys of residential accommodation. This is clearly out of scale with the prevalent character of surrounding buildings.

In addition to the matters raised above, the proposal would intensify and formalise the existing parking area located behind 57 Gayton Road. This intensification is considered unreasonable as it would be adjacent to the rear gardens of adjoining properties, and would have an increased impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours.

Overall it is deemed that the proposed development, by reason of excessive size & bulk would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.

continued/

3) Amenity of Neighbours

The size and bulk of the facades of the proposed building area design elements that would create a development that is overbearing and that does not respect the character of the locality, nor reflects the scale and form of the nearby residential dwellings. Such impacts over residential amenity are unreasonable and considered to highlight an unacceptable design solution. Likewise as raised above the proposed parking layout to the rear of 57 Gayton Road would have a detrimental impact over the amenity of adjoining residential properties.

Overall the residential redevelopment raised specific concerns related to the noise associated with the comings and going of occupants and a limited area of communal rear garden available to future occupants. Therefore the proposal for 67 flats was refused as constituting an over-intensive development scheme.

4) Accessibility

If the development were to be considered for approval a planning condition and informative could be utilised to ensure satisfactory levels of accessibility for the proposal.

5) Parking/Highway Safety

For a proposal of 67 flats (including allocation for visitor parking), the scheme would generate a maximum requirement of 80 on site spaces, calculated in line with current parking minimisation policies of central Government and the adopted 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan. However it is noted that the scheme proposes a total of 87 on site car spaces. Therefore an objection is specifically raised to the proposal on that basis that an excessive number of on-site spaces is proposed, contrary to the Adopted 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan Policy T13, and contrary to PPG13 advice to reduce reliance on the private motor car. Such an objection is strengthened by virtue of the site having good access public transport, given its location on fringe of Harrow Town Centre, which accommodates underground and main train lines and a bus interchange.

6) Consultation Responses

Apart from the points raised in the above sections of the report, the following additional matters of concern are addressed:

The proposed underground car park would cause disturbance to groundwater and would therefore impact on the stability of the water table and existing buildings in the area

The Environment Agency were consulted regarding the application of which they chose to nominate that they were unable to respond. Furthermore there are no development overlays (i.e.: floodplains etc) that would highlight such an issue for specific attention and consideration.

continued/

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for refusal.

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 12 FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for MR & MRS M BRADFORD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 04/2314/1, 04/2314/3

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacing
 - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
The boundary treatment shall be completed:
 - b: before the building(s) is/are occupiedThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Levels to be Approved
- 7 Construction work shall not begin until a scheme for protecting the proposed flats from noise from the railway has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. All works which form part of the scheme shall be completed before the flats are occupied, and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure that adequate precautions are taken to avoid noise nuisance and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Cont...

Item 1/03 - P/2914/04/CFU Cont...

- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
(b) and vehicular access thereto
has been submitted to, and 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: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 9 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
T13 Parking Standards
- 2 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc Act 1996

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Character of the Area (SD1, D4)
2. Amenity of Neighbours (D4, D5)
3. Car Parking/Highway Considerations (T13)

INFORMATION

Consideration of this application was deferred at the Committee meeting on 20th April in order to undertake a Members Site Visit on 11th May.

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	Max 15
	Justified:	12
	Provided:	12
Site Area:	0.011 ha	
Habitable Rooms:	30	
No. of Residential Units:	12	
Council Interest:	None	

Cont...

b) Site Description

- roughly rectangular shaped site measuring approximately 35m by 28m.
- the site is currently occupied by a meeting hall, and a detached dwelling.
- to the rear of the site is the railway line to the west are garages associated with Laburnam Court and Acacia Court. To the east is land in commercial use.

c) Proposal Details

- redevelopment to provide a detached 3 storey block of 12 flats.
- the building would be of traditional design with a hipped, tiled roof.
- 12 car parking spaces are proposed at this eastern side of the site.

d) Relevant History

History of adjacent site/garages

WEST/295/01/FUL	Redevelopment of a 3 storey block of flats and 24 car parking spaces	REFUSED 21-MAR-02 Appeal Dismissed
-----------------	--	--

The Inspector concluded that the proposal was unacceptable due to the loss of car parking and potential overlooking of no. 2 Collapit Close. The Inspector specifically accepted that the impact on properties on Pinner Road would be acceptable.

P/122/03/CFU	2 storey building to provide 4 flats with access and parking, including provision for existing flats	GRANTED DEC-2003
--------------	--	---------------------

e) Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry 16-DEC-2004
Notifications	Sent 53	Replies 7
		Expiry 03-DEC-2004

Summary of Response: Disruption during construction, lack of car parking, lack of privacy, effect on value of property.

Cont...

APPRAISAL

1. Character of the Area

The area consists of a variety of buildings, with mainly 2 storey residential properties on the Pinner Road frontage and more recent 3 storey blocks to the rear.

The space around the block would provide both a suitable setting and adequate levels of amenity space for the proposed block.

2. Amenity of Neighbours

The nearest residential neighbours to the proposed block are those houses on Pinner Road. A distance of approximately 30m to 35m would separate the existing houses and the proposed block. It is considered that this distance is more than sufficient to preserve the amenity of neighbours.

With regard to the impact of the proposed car park, the existing site is largely hard surfaced. The redevelopment of the site will bring the opportunity to reduce the impact of any car parking by the introduction of landscaping and boundary fencing.

3. Car Parking/Highways Considerations

The site benefits from good access to public transport and services, in these circumstances it is considered that the proposed provision is considered to be acceptable.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

2/01

LAND REAR OF RISING SUN PUBLIC HOUSE, 138 GREENFORD RD, HARROW

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

SITTING, DESIGN, EXTERNAL APPEARANCE AND ACCESS DETAILS OF 2 x TWO STOREY DWELLINGS (SEMI - DETACHED PAIR) WITH GARAGES (PURSUANT TO PLANNING PERMISSION WEST/707/01/OUT DATED 12.03.02

OAKCLIFFE PROPERTIES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 050303/01 Rev B

APPROVES the details (subject to the following conditions, if any)

- 1 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 19 - Flank Windows
- 2 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

D12 Locally Listed Buildings

H4 Residential Density

T13 Parking Standards

- 5 The reserved matter remaining to be discharged is landscaping.
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Impact upon character and amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
2. Impact upon locally listed building (SD2, D12)
3. Development intensity (SH1, H4)
4. Parking and access (T13)

Cont...

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to the Committee at the request of a Nominated member.

a) Summary

Listed Building:	Locally Listed	
Conservation Area:	None	
Residential Units:	2	
Car Parking:	Standard	4 max
	Justified	4 max
	Provided	4

b) Site Description

- land to rear of Rising Sun public house, Greenford Road, Harrow; site area of 323m²
- Rising Sun public house locally listed
- site faces access road to adjoining sports club and Hussain Close residential development
- site bounded by brick wall and contains some non-protected trees adjacent to side boundary
- former repair garage to rear of site now occupied by 'Southern Place' residential development of three storey flat blocks
- private residents-only parking in Hussain Close; parking along access road predominantly prohibited but with Council controlled residents' permit bay adjacent to no. 1 Hussain Close
- Sudbury Hill BR station within 100m walk of site; local bus services, shopping facilities and Sudbury Hill LU station (Piccadilly line) within easy reach on Greenford Road

c) Proposal Details

- details pursuant to outline permission WEST/707/01/OUT for residential development of two dwellings, each of two bedrooms/four habitable rooms; details sought as follows:-

(a) & (b) siting and design of buildings

- development to take form of one pair of semi-detached dwellings
- main front wall of dwellings sited 2.4 back from site boundary with access road and to span width of 10.2m; attached garage to each dwelling set-back 2.6m behind front wall and have width of 2.6m
- dwellings to have main depth of 7.7m with gabled roof over and further rear projection of 3.2m depth and 5.9m combined width – subordinate gable roof over

Cont...

(c) external appearance of buildings

- external walls to be rendered with brick detailing around corners at front and over ground floor window/door openings
- tiled roof with conventional eaves/gutter detailing; dummy pitched roof to front of garage with flat roof behind
- canopy roof over ground floor front entrance
- sash windows and first floor Juliette balconies at front; casement windows at rear

(d) means of access

- two new vehicle crossovers from access road; each 2.6 m wide in front of garages

d) Relevant History

Application Site

P/604/05/DFU 2 x two storey dwellings (semi - detached pair) with garages See Item 2/02

WEST/707/01/OUT Outline: Residential development GRANTED
12-MAR-2002

Subject to the following condition.

7. The development hereby permitted shall consist of units of no more than 3 habitable rooms each.

REASON: To guard against an overdevelopment of the site, given the limited amenity space available.

P/1422/04/CFU Redevelopment to provide 3 x two storey terraced properties REFUSED
11-NOV-2004

Reasons:-

1. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the amenities of the area.
2. Redevelopment to provide three houses represents an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the amenities of the area.

An appeal against this decision was lodged on 28th January 2005.

Cont...

Southern Place

WEST/495/02/OUT	Outline: One 3 Storey and One Part 2/Part 3 Storey Block to Provide 12 Flats with Access and Parking	GRANTED 14-MAR-2003
WEST/737/02/FUL	Outline: One x 3 Storey and One Part 2, Part 3 Storey Detached Block to Provide 11 X 2 Bed and 3 X 1 Bed Flats with Access and Parking	appeal against non-determination allowed 8-JUL-2003
P/1823/03/DDP	Approval of Details Pursuant to Conditions 1,4,7 & 10 of Outline Planning Permission WEST/737/02/OUT for 14 Flats in 2 Blocks with Access & Parking	GRANTED 4-NOV-2004

e) Applicant's Statement

Scheme A (Drawing 050303/01): Details pursuant to WEST/707/01/OUT

The proposal maintains the same siting of a pair of semi-detached houses with attached garages as shown on an illustrative layout plan included with the outline application. There would be an off-street parking space in front of both garages. The application provides a much improved design to the illustrative plan scheme. The materials would comprise cream painted rendered walls with orange detail brick, black wrought iron balcony railings and the roof would be of brown concrete tiles.

Two alternative applications have been made to maximise the marketing potential of the site. Two 2 bed houses would accord with the extant outline permission whilst two 3 bed houses would be achieved by internal layout changes only. The outline consent was restricted to 2 bed units to comply with rigid supplementary planning guidance standards relating to amenity space and parking. These standards were dropped by the Council in 2004 and there is no reason why the 3 bed units should be refused. Both schemes would be in keeping with the locality, would accord with UDP and national policies, would make good use of an under-utilised urban site and enhance the streetscene.

f) Consultations

LBH Highways:	No objection
LBH Drainage Services:	Water attenuation/storage works condition suggested
Thames Water:	Advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure there is no objection
Environment Agency:	Unable to respond

g) Notifications	Sent 28	Replies 0	Expiry 14-APR-2005
-------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

Cont...

APPRAISAL

1. Impact Upon Character and Amenity

The principle of residential development on this site remains established by reason of the extant outline permission from which this application follows-on. Further, the general characteristics of the proposal reflect, in footprint, form and siting those put forward on an illustrative plan with the outline application. It remains, therefore, only to consider the impact of the detailed aspects of the proposal on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers and the character of the locality.

The Rising Sun is a building of more substantial proportions, finished in render and with predominantly hipped roof form. By contrast the proposal would read, from surrounding vantage points, as a continuation of development in Hussain Close. To this end the use of a gabled roof, the narrow form of each dwelling and the proximity to the front boundary of the pair are considered to be appropriate. However it is considered that rendered finish to the front and flank elevations would be inappropriate and accordingly an amendment to show an entirely brick finish on these facades has been provided.

The dummy pitch roof over the garages would be perceptible in the streetscene and from surrounding sites, and would detract from the appearance of the development. An improved, more traditional solution has been provided.

The front windows would face the flank elevation and garden boundary of no. 14 Hussain Close at a distance of 10m. Such a distance is considered to be sufficient to address concerns about actual overlooking, including that from the first floor front bedroom, having regard to prevailing levels of privacy in this locality. However the Juliette balcony on the first floor front elevation of the eastern most unit would give rise to an unreasonable perception of overlooking of the rear garden of no. 14, to the detriment of the privacy amenity of the occupiers of that property. In addition both balconies, together with the neo-Georgian design of the front fenestration, would give the dwellings an inappropriately fussy appearance that would be out of character with other dwellings in Hussain Close. Further amendments to these aspects of the scheme have therefore been provided.

At the rear, bedroom windows would face the rear boundary at a distance of between 8m and 9m, whilst bathroom windows would face the boundary at a distance of only 5m-5.5m. Beyond the rear boundary lies part of the car park to Southern Park and it is not considered that any overlooking of the three-storey flat blocks, which would be at a more distant and oblique angle, would be detrimental to the privacy amenity of the occupiers of that development.

Cont...

Item 2/01 - P/603/05/DDP Cont...

The ground floor flank elevations of the rear projection would contain kitchen windows. These are also considered to be acceptable.

Given the relationship of the proposed dwellings with surrounding development it is not considered that the building would give rise to any unacceptable loss of light, outlook or overshadowing.

The layout and size of the proposed dwellings would secure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. Reasonable garden space would be provided and could be preserved as the existing outline permission already controls, by condition, permitted developments within the curtilage of the dwellings.

2. Impact Upon Locally Listed Building

The historic character of the pub, the merits of which are principally in the façade, are essentially urban and would not be adversely affected by the close proximity of small scale housing.

3. Development Intensity

Residential development in Hussain Close equates to a density of 50 units per hectare; the Close comprises a mix of three/four habitable room terraced and semi-detached dwellings with rear garden depths in the region of 15m and amenity space within the range of 60m² and 70m² per unit.

It is calculated that the proposed development would equate to a density of 61 units per hectare and that amenity space provision would be 58m² and 67m² respectively. Each dwelling would comprise two bedrooms, a dining room and living room – i.e. four habitable rooms; for the pair this would equate to 248 habitable rooms per hectare.

PPG 3 advises that less than 30 dwellings per hectare constitutes an inefficient use of land, that a density in the range of 30-50 units per hectare should be encouraged and that a greater intensity should be sought, *inter alia*, where good transport links exist. Policy H4 of the replacement Harrow UDP expects residential densities in new development to be not less than 150 habitable rooms per hectare.

The principle of residential development on this site has been established. It would contribute to housing supply at a high density, similar in character to the existing Hussain Close development and, in view of the locational advantages of the site, would be consistent with central Government advice. Notwithstanding condition 7 on the outline approval it is considered that the development, involving four habitable rooms per dwelling, would be acceptable in the circumstances described. The recently refused scheme on this site, which is now the subject of an appeal, had sought permission for 3 units of four habitable rooms each (372 habitable rooms per hectare); it is not considered that this proposal for two dwellings of four habitable rooms each would amount to a similar overdevelopment.

Cont...

4. Parking and Access

The proposal would provide one garage space and one forecourt space per dwelling, consistent with the scheme envisaged at outline stage. This level of provision would be consistent with the UDP maximum standard for dwellings of four habitable rooms. The width and siting of the proposed accesses are also considered to be acceptable.

5. Other Matters

Water storage/attenuation, tree works and approval of materials conditions were included on the outline permission and would remain to be discharged prior to the implementation of the development. Similarly landscaping (to include boundary treatment) remains a reserved matter to be determined at a later stage. Notwithstanding that parking has been provided in accordance with the Council's maximum standard and that this is a highly accessible location, a condition protecting the availability of the garages and parking spaces is also suggested in view of the limited availability of on-street parking capacity in Hussain Close and the access road.

6. Consultation Responses

see above

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for approval

LAND REAR OF RISING SUN PUBLIC HOUSE, 138 GREENFORD RD, HARROW

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

2 x TWO STOREY DWELLINGS (SEMI - DETACHED PAIR) WITH GARAGES

OAKCLIFFE PROPERTIES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 050303/02 Rev B

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacing
 - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Water Storage Works
- 7 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 8 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 19 - Flank Windows
- 2 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

Cont...

Item 2/02 - P/604/05/DFU Cont...

- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
- D12 Locally Listed Buildings
- H4 Residential Density
- T13 Parking Standards

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Impact upon character and amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
2. Impact upon locally listed building (SD2, D12)
3. Development intensity (SH1, H4)
4. Parking and access (T13)

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to the Committee at the request of a Nominated member.

a) Summary

Listed Building:	Locally Listed	
Conservation Area:	None	
Residential Units:	2	
Car Parking:	Standard	4 max
	Justified	4 max
	Provided	4

b) Site Description

- land to rear of Rising Sun public house, Greenford Road, Harrow; site area of 323m²
- Rising Sun public house locally listed
- site faces access road to adjoining sports club and Hussain Close residential development
- site bounded by brick wall and contains some non-protected trees adjacent to side boundary
- former repair garage to rear of site now occupied by 'Southern Place' residential development of three storey flat blocks
- private residents-only parking in Hussain Close; parking along access road predominantly prohibited but with Council controlled residents' permit bay adjacent to no. 1 Hussain Close
- Sudbury Hill BR station within 100m walk of site; local bus services, shopping facilities and Sudbury Hill LU station (Piccadilly line) within easy reach on Greenford Road

Cont...

Southern Place

WEST/495/02/OUT	Outline: One 3 Storey and One Part 2/Part 3 Storey Block to Provide 12 Flats with Access and Parking	GRANTED 14-MAR-2003
WEST/737/02/FUL	Outline: One x 3 Storey and One Part 2, Part 3 Storey Detached Block to Provide 11 X 2 Bed and 3 X 1 Bed Flats with Access and Parking	appeal against non-determination allowed 8-JUL-2003
P/1823/03/DDP	Approval of Details Pursuant to Conditions 1,4,7 & 10 of Outline Planning Permission WEST/737/02/OUT for 14 Flats in 2 Blocks with Access & Parking	GRANTED 4-NOV-2004

e) Applicant's Statement

Scheme B (Drawing 050303/02): Full planning application

This full application differs only slightly from the details pursuant proposal of scheme A. The building's design, external appearance and siting remain identical to scheme A; however the internal layout allows for a third bedroom by the reduction in size of the main bedroom to allow for the resiting of the bathroom at the front. It is not considered that this variation gives rise to any material harm.

Two alternative applications have been made to maximise the marketing potential of the site. Two 2 bed houses would accord with the extant outline permission whilst two 3 bed houses would be achieved by internal layout changes only. The outline consent was restricted to 2 bed units to comply with rigid supplementary planning guidance standards relating to amenity space and parking. These standards were dropped by the Council in 2004 and there is no reason why the 3 bed units should be refused. Both schemes would be in keeping with the locality, would accord with UDP and national policies, would make good use of an under-utilised urban site and enhance the streetscene.

f) Consultations

LBH Highways:	No objection
LBH Drainage Services:	Water attenuation/storage works condition suggested
Thames Water:	Advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure there is no objection
Environment Agency:	Unable to respond

g) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
28	0	14-APR-2005

Cont...

APPRAISAL

1. Impact Upon Character and Amenity

The principle of residential development on this site remains established by reason of the extant outline permission. The general characteristics of the proposal reflect, in footprint, form and siting those put forward on an illustrative plan with the outline application and these remain acceptable. It remains, therefore, only to consider the impact of the detailed aspects of the proposal on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers and the character of the locality.

The Rising Sun is a building of more substantial proportions, finished in render and with predominantly hipped roof form. By contrast the proposal would read, from surrounding vantage points, as a continuation of development in Hussain Close. To this end the use of a gabled roof, the narrow form of each dwelling and the proximity to the front boundary of the pair are considered to be appropriate. However it is considered that rendered finish to the front and flank elevations would be inappropriate and accordingly an amendment to show an entirely brick finish on these facades has been provided.

The dummy pitch roof over the garages would be perceptible in the streetscene and from surrounding sites, and would detract from the appearance of the development. An improved, more traditional solution has been provided.

The front windows would face the flank elevation and garden boundary of no. 14 Hussain Close at a distance of 10m. Such a distance is considered to be sufficient to address concerns about actual overlooking, including that from the first floor front bedroom, having regard to prevailing levels of privacy in this locality. However the Juliette balcony on the first floor front elevation of the eastern most unit would give rise to an unreasonable perception of overlooking of the rear garden of no. 14, to the detriment of the privacy amenity of the occupiers of that property. In addition both balconies, together with the neo-Georgian design of the front fenestration, would give the dwellings an inappropriately fussy appearance that would be out of character with other dwellings in Hussain Close. Further amendments to these aspects of the scheme have therefore been provided.

At the rear, bedroom windows would face the rear boundary at a distance of between 8m and 9m from the rear main wall and 5m-5.5m from the rear projection. Beyond the rear boundary lies part of the car park to Southern Park and it is not considered that any overlooking of the three-storey flat blocks, which would be at a more distant and oblique angle, would be detrimental to the privacy amenity of the occupiers of that development.

The ground floor flank elevations of the rear projection would contain kitchen windows. These are also considered to be acceptable.

Cont...

Given the relationship of the proposed dwellings with surrounding development it is not considered that the building would give rise to any unacceptable loss of light, outlook or overshadowing.

The layout and size of the proposed dwellings would secure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. Reasonable garden space would be provided and could be preserved by conditional control of permitted developments within the curtilage of the dwellings.

2. Impact Upon Locally Listed Building

The historic character of the pub, the merits of which are principally in the façade, are essentially urban and would not be adversely affected by the close proximity of small scale housing.

3. Development Intensity

Residential development in Hussain Close equates to a density of 50 units per hectare; the Close comprises a mix of three/four habitable room terraced and semi-detached dwellings with rear garden depths in the region of 15m and amenity space within the range of 60m² and 70m² per unit.

It is calculated that the proposed development would equate to a density of 61 units per hectare and that amenity space provision would be 58m² and 67m² respectively. Each dwelling would comprise three bedrooms, a dining room and living room – i.e. five habitable rooms; for the pair this would equate to 310 habitable rooms per hectare.

PPG 3 advises that less than 30 dwellings per hectare constitutes an inefficient use of land, that a density in the range of 30-50 units per hectare should be encouraged and that a greater intensity should be sought, *inter alia*, where good transport links exist. Policy H4 of the replacement Harrow UDP expects residential densities in new development to be not less than 150 habitable rooms per hectare.

The principle of residential development on this site has been established. It would contribute to housing supply at a high density, similar in character to the existing Hussain Close development and, in view of the locational advantages of the site, would be consistent with central Government advice. Notwithstanding condition 7 on the outline approval it is considered that the development, involving five habitable rooms per dwelling, would be acceptable in the circumstances described. The recently refused scheme on this site, which is now the subject of an appeal, had sought permission for 3 units of four habitable rooms each (372 habitable rooms per hectare); it is not considered that this proposal for two dwellings, albeit of five habitable rooms each, would amount to a similar overdevelopment.

Cont...

4. Parking and Access

The proposal would provide one garage space and one forecourt space per dwelling, consistent with the scheme envisaged at outline stage. This level of provision would be consistent with the UDP maximum standard for dwellings of four habitable rooms. The width and siting of the proposed accesses are also considered to be acceptable.

5. Other Matters

Water storage/attenuation, tree works, landscaping and approval of materials conditions are suggested. Notwithstanding that parking has been provided in accordance with the Council's maximum standard and that this is a highly accessible location, a condition protecting the availability of the garages and parking spaces is also suggested in view of the limited availability of on-street parking capacity in Hussain Close and the access road.

6. Consultation Responses

see above

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

CONSTRUCTION OF 4 CHALET BUNGALOWS WITH
ACCESS FROM STRATTON CLOSE AND CAR PARKING

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for LONDON & DISTRICT HOUSING LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Red Line Plan, 04/2310/4A, 5, 6

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
(a) the extension/building(s)
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
The boundary treatment shall be completed:
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plans have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

continued/

8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste has been submitted to, and 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: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

9 Water Storage Works
10 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994

4 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- T13 Parking Standards
- T15 Servicing of New Developments

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
- 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 3) Parking and Access (T13, T15)
- 4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	7
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	6
Site Area:	2100m ²	
Habitable Rooms:	21	
No. of Residential Units:	4	
Density:	19 dph 100 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

continued/

b) Site Description

- north side of Whitchurch Lane, to the east of Whitchurch Gardens
- site comprises area of largely cleared backland behind nos. 123 – 137 Whitchurch Lane, mostly within curtilage of no.133, plus track along northern boundary
- lock-up garages plus garden rear of no. 137 to the west
- Dudley House and Kent House, which comprise 3 storey blocks of flats, to the north and east respectively
- access to Whitchurch Lane serves 26 lock-up garages to south of Kent House within Stratton Close, runs alongside no. 123 Whitchurch Lane

c) Proposal Details

- development of 4 detached bungalows
- staggered row of 3 on north-south axis behind nos. 131/133 Whitchurch Lane comprising 3 bed x 5 habitable rooms
- fourth unit close to eastern boundary behind nos. 123/125 Whitchurch Lane comprising 3 bed x 6 habitable rooms
- all units with pitched, hipped roofs
- row of three with front dormer window to light bedroom in roofspace
- single unit with front gable feature and 2 rear dormers to light 2 bedrooms in roofspace
- brick elevations, tiled roofs
- access enters site behind no. 123, shared surface shown with 6 designated parking spaces

d) Relevant History

Land r/o 123/125

P/2928/03/DFU	Detached bungalow with parking space and access	GRANTED 06-FEB-04
---------------	---	----------------------

Nos. 131/133 and land at rear

P/2918/03/COU	Outline: Redevelopment to provide 8 flats in two 2 storey blocks with access and parking	REFUSED 13-FEB-04 APPEAL DISMISSED 14-DEC-04
---------------	--	--

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. This proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenities of nos. 129 and 135 Whitchurch Lane by reason of noise and disturbance from traffic and activity generated by the use of the access road.
2. The character and the building line of the row of semi-detached houses would be abruptly interrupted by the gap caused in the streetscene by the demolition of two semi-detached houses to the detriment of the character of this section of Whitchurch Lane.”

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance and Character of the Area

The application site is located within an area of mixed housing types comprising 2/3 storey flats and 2-storey houses. The proposed provision of bungalows would not be out of place with the variety of development forms in the area and would also follow the principle established by the current permission for one bungalow behind Nos. 123/125.

In terms of layout, the proposal would permit acceptable levels of new planting on the site to provide a good setting for the buildings, replace some of the removed planting and benefit the appearance of the area.

Rear garden areas of at least 120m² would be provided and overall a satisfactory impact on the appearance and character of the area would be provided.

2) Residential Amenity

In terms of siting, the proposed adjacent dwellings would be sited some 14m and 19m from the rear walls of Kent House and 131/133 Whitchurch Lane, providing acceptable separation distances.

The northernmost unit would be located about 9m from the adjacent rear wall of Dudley House, and some 4m from the boundary between the 2 properties. Given the 1½ storey character of the proposed building (with an eaves height of only 3.7m) and the shallow pitched roof design it is suggested that this relationship would not be unduly detrimental to neighbouring amenity.

Application P/2723/04/COU was partly refused because of the adverse impact of vehicle activity along the access on the occupiers of 123 Whitchurch Lane. That scheme was for 9 units whereas this proposal is for only 4 units thereby at least halving the likely level of activity. In addition, the applicants consultants have estimated that a maximum of only 32 vehicle movements per day could be expected (i.e. 2 per hour between, say, 7am and 11pm). It is considered that this level of activity would not cause undue harm to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

3) Parking and Access

The provision of 6 designated spaces is considered to be sufficient given the close proximity of the site to public transport facilities both in Whitchurch Lane and at Edgware and Canons Park stations.

The layout would also permit additional parking on the access close to the proposed dwellings.

Application P/2723/04/COU was partly refused on access safety grounds.

In terms of this issue..... (Richard Michalski to complete re sightlines etc.)

continued/

Item 2/03 - P/653/05/CFU continued.....

4) Consultation Responses

- Inaccurate application address - a minor error has been corrected
 - Inaccurate drawings - there is no reason to believe that the submitted drawings are inaccurate
 - Removal of trees - the trees which have been removed from the site were not covered by a TPO and thus no breach of planning control has taken place
- Other issues discussed in report

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

RENOVATION & CONVERSION OF DERELICT OUTBUILDING, INCLUDING SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL DWELLINGHOUSE

MR.A.TERRONI for MRS JUDGE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordinance Survey, 100:jh:001, 100:jh:002f, 100:jh:003e, 100:jh:004, unnumbered A3 window plan

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
(a) the extension/building(s)
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 The building/extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling.
REASON: to safeguard the character of the locally listed building and this part of the conservation area.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D12 Locally Listed Buildings
D14 Conservation Areas
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
T13 Parking Standards

Cont...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Area of Special Character (SD1, D4, D12, D14, D15, T13)
 2. Setting of Locally Listed Building (D12)
 3. Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
 4. Traffic and Highway Safety (T13)
 5. Creation of a New Dwellinghouse
 6. Consultation Response
-

INFORMATION

The application was deferred from the Committee meeting of 20th April 2005 to allow a members site visit to be undertaken, which took place on Wednesday 11th May 2005.

a) Summary

Listed Building:	Locally Listed	
Conservation Area:	Harrow: Harrow Park	
Car Parking	Standard:	1.4
	Justified:	
	Provided:	3
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- Detached dwellinghouse with associated derelict stable building;
- The site is located within Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character and Harrow Park Conservation Area;
- The main building is covered by a local heritage listing listed;
- A large unsealed driveway area is located to the front of the dwelling and stable building, providing informal parking for the property;

c) Proposal Details

- Renovation of derelict stable, including a single storey side extension to be attached to the eastern flank elevation;
- Internally the renovated building would accommodate a kitchen, lounge/dining, W/C and bedroom with ensuite at ground floor and bedroom at first floor;
- With all facilities such as habitable living area, kitchen, bedrooms, W/C and ensuite the building in planning terms would constitute a separate and self contained dwellinghouse.

Cont...

d) Relevant History

None

e) Applicant's Statement

- the stable was brought as one with the Bell House and due to an existing covenant has to be sold as one property;
- there is not, and never was any question of the stable being turned into a separate unit for sale, as that would be prohibited under the covenants which protect the whole area;
- applicant lives alone with daughter and grandson living abroad. Increasing physical problems requires additional help, however wishes to avoid going into residential care;
- the intention is when needed to be into the stable with carers, and for the main Bell House to be used by the daughter;

f) Consultations

1st Notification

Advertisement:	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry
		25-NOV-04

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	8	3	09-NOV-04

1st Summary of Response: Application was incorrectly described; any proposed renovation of the building should conserve its scale, structure and overall appearance; the proposed conversion and extension of the existing stable block into a new separate residential dwelling is not permitted by the restrictive mutual covenants; the construction of a new dwelling on this site can only adversely affect this important amenity which is currently enjoyed by the other residents and visitors to these properties; construction of a new dwelling would significantly increase traffic, parking and potential for an accident on what is already a highly constrained single track road; existing problems with water pressure which is barely adequate at the moment; if approved it is likely to be subdivided as a separate dwelling.

CAAC: Objections: insensitive scale scheme that ruins the very attractive group of buildings. The proposed designs are poor and the scheme needs to look like subservient outbuildings to the main house. The new scheme should keep stable doors and original windows, rather than replacing them as proposed. New block is poorly designed and lacking in detail and the as existing drawings are incorrect. The drawings are inaccurate and therefore should be refused. No objections to the principle of the conversion but it is considered that a first floor element cannot be provided within these small scale buildings and that any proposals should be sensitive, which these are not.

Cont...

2nd Notification

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	16	2 objections + 1 of support	05-JAN-05

2nd Summary of Response:

(objections): The new building would more than double the living area on the site and increase the stables by some 25%; the size, height and scale would be out of character for a historic listed building; Julian Hill is a single lane road supplying 9 families and is inadequate for this purpose as cars entering are forced to reverse out into Sudbury Hill because of another car's approach; this is highly dangerous but happens quite often; parking on the site of the Bell House is already a problem and frequently cars are forced to be left on the common driveway outside the plot where they are at best an inconvenience and at worst an obstruction to emergency services; concern relating to water pressure that is barely adequate at the moment; covenant exists on the site to prevent any resident a second dwelling house on the same plot; if approved it is likely to be subdivided as a separate dwelling. Existing stable block is in a conservation area and an important historic building; any proposed renovation should conserve its scale, structure and overall appearance.

(support): The application has merits of restoring an old building that will otherwise fall into ruin, thus conserving the values of this area and allowing an elderly widow to live with her daughter & family; we own the access drive of Julian Hill and area happy that any increase in traffic would be acceptable.

CAAC: Objections: The plans are poorly drawn with inaccurate proportions. The design of the right-hand element should be a different style of architecture and should look more light weight, such as a lean-to extension with glazed roof. Original rear wall should be retained. Question impact on trees. Question where cars would be parked.

3rd Notification

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	16	0	05-APR-05

3rd Summary of Response: None.

CAAC: Objection: It must not be a separate unit to the main house, because of the potential planning impacts, such as parking etc. It must only be ancillary. Same comments as before apply.

Cont...

APPRAISAL

1 & 2. Conservation Area Character and Appearance & Setting of Locally Listed Building

The additions, alterations and conversion of the former stable block would preserve the conservation area by bringing a semi-derelict back into use. Furthermore the additions to the stable are considered to be of a scale that would ensure that they would not appear overly dominant, whilst utilising appropriate materials and design features. Accordingly the second revised design would provide an acceptable appearance and would ensure that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and Area of Special Character is preserved. Likewise by matching the general design, style and appearance of the existing stable building it would not be visually detrimental to the setting of the main locally listed building it is sited adjacent to.

3. Neighbouring Amenity

By virtue of the siting of the stable building and the extensive vegetation located between it and neighbouring residential properties, no concern are raised with respect of the proposed works causing detrimental impacts of overlooking or overshadowing/ loss of light for any adjacent property.

4. Traffic and Highway Safety

The additional traffic movements generated by the proposal is considered to be minimal and would not cause any specific concern regarding access and vehicular safety. Furthermore the informal forecourt parking area that already exists to the frontage of the site is deemed to be adequate to service the residential accommodation that would be provided on site.

5. Creation of a New Dwellinghouse

Although objections have been raised to the development on the basis of the existence of a restrictive covenant on the property, this is not a matter for Council to consider or pass judgement on. Specifically private covenants are a civil matter that are required to be to be enforced by beneficiaries of such covenants. As such Council cannot have regards to covenants in the determination of a Planning Application.

Nevertheless the applicant has provided a written statement that there is no proposal to hive off the converted stable building at a later date. Likewise a suitable condition is proposed to restrict the use of the building/extension to being ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling.

Cont...

6. Consultation Response

Apart from the relevant planning issues are addressed in the report above, the following comments are made:

- The quality of existing water supply is a matter for the relevant water authority and is not a relevant Planning consideration for Council to take into account;

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

ALTERATIONS TO FRONT AND CONVERSION TO TWO FLATS, PARKING AND ACCESS AT FRONT

D K SUGUNASINGHA for DR SARATH OBEYSEKERA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 01D, 02D, 03D, 04D, 05D, 06D.

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
- T13 Parking Standards
- EP25 Noise

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
 2. Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
 3. Residential Amenity
 4. Changes from Previous Schemes
 5. Consultation Responses
-

Cont...

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to the Committee at the request of a Nominated Member. The Council is considering a separate application for the redevelopment of the adjacent site at 218 Shaftesbury Avenue. As these are separate applications from separate applicants for separate planning units, it is not considered appropriate for them to be considered jointly.

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2.4 max
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	2
No. of Residential Units:	Existing: 1	
	Proposed: 2	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- 2-storey detached dwelling with front porch and integral garage.
- hard surfacing to front of garage with lawn to left and 1.8m close boarded fence to left (north-west) boundary.
- neighbouring dwellings in Shaftesbury Avenue are 2-storey maisonettes.

c) Proposal Details

- it is proposed to convert the detached property to two self-contained flats.
- the proposed conversion relates to the dwelling as existing. No extensions are proposed although the existing garage would be converted into a habitable room.
- access to the two units would be provided via 2 separate entrance doors in the front elevation of the existing porch. A ramp to the right hand entrance door is proposed to facilitate disabled access to the ground floor unit.
- the proposal includes 2 parking spaces, one at the left and one at the right of the existing frontage. The former would require a new crossover from Shaftesbury Avenue, whilst the latter would make use of the existing crossover. Both crossovers would be 3.5m wide.
- a storage area for 2 refuse bins is proposed at the front end of the south east flank wall of the building.

Cont...

Having regard to the Council's policy and guidelines, it is not considered that the proposal would constitute an over-intensive use of the site, nor is it considered that any detrimental change to the character of Shaftesbury Avenue, which predominantly comprises 2-storey maisonette buildings would occur as a result of the proposed conversion. Furthermore, given the policies of the Council in respect of meeting housing need and facilitating of a range of housing types and sizes, it is considered that the proposal should be favoured.

Standard of sound insulation measures between units

The vertical arrangement of the proposed layout would be generally acceptable in terms of noise reduction. Furthermore, the noise insulation condition suggested would serve to negate potential noise disturbance

Amenity space

The property would have a rear garden area of approximately 87 sq. m. The layout of the property is such that direct access would be available from the ground and 1st floor units. The ground floor unit would have a private amenity of c.36 sq. m and the 1st floor unit would have a private amenity area of c.51 sq. m. Although these areas are smaller than provided for the existing maisonettes along Shaftesbury Avenue, it is considered that the level of provision proposed would be sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers and would not result in the over-intensive use of the amenity area, or undue noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.

Parking and Forecourt Treatment

The recently adopted UDP sets a maximum of 1.4 parking spaces per unit. The submitted plans indicate provision of 2 spaces, one on the existing driveway and one on a new driveway abutting the north west boundary. Although not shown on the submitted plan, landscaping could be provided between the 2 driveways. Despite the shortfall of one space, given the relatively close proximity of local bus routes, the level of provision proposed is considered to be acceptable subject to the submission of full details of the landscaping and its implementation being required by condition. Whilst a formal response to the current application is awaited, the Council's Transportation Manager raised no objection to the previous application, which proposed the same parking layout.

The submitted plans indicate arrangements for the siting of bin enclosures. This would be sited against the south east flank wall of the building, 5m from the front boundary and 1m from the boundary with the adjacent property. Given that this is neither at the back of the footway along Shaftesbury Avenue nor beneath a window to a habitable room, its location is considered to be acceptable subject to it being adequately screened by the proposed landscaping.

Cont...

2. Character of area

Given that the proposals comply with the criteria set out in policy H9 and there are no extenuating circumstances, it is not considered that there would be any detrimental impact on the character of Shaftesbury Avenue as a result of this conversion, especially as, with the exception of nos. 218 and 220, all the units in this part of Shaftesbury Avenue are purpose built maisonettes.

3. Residential Amenity

Similarly, given that the proposals comply with the criteria set out in policy H9, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners.

4. Changes from previous schemes

The main differences from the previous scheme (P/3174/04/DFU) are the reduction in the number of bedrooms in the 1st floor unit from two to one, with a consequent change to the internal layout of that unit, and the deletion of the previously proposed single storey rear extension. The previous scheme was considered unsatisfactory due to the proposed number of bedrooms in the 1st floor unit, and the reduction in size of the rear amenity area that would have been caused by the single storey rear extension. It was considered that the previous scheme would have resulted in the property being over intensively used, especially as the vertical arrangement of the rooms would not have minimised potential noise transmission. It is considered that the reduction in the number of bedrooms and the deletion of the rear extension, enables these problems to be overcome.

5. Consultation Responses

Noise and disturbance – addressed above

Traffic/Parking – addressed above

Overcrowding – addressed above

Future conversion of living area to additional bedroom – future use of rooms is a matter for occupiers of the apartments and not planning control

Proposed redevelopment of adjacent site – separate planning application being considered by this Council. Inappropriate to consider jointly with this scheme

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

**MAUREVILLE RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME, 44/46
RADNOR ROAD, HARROW**

2/06

P/736/05/CFU/RJS

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CONVERSION TO PROVIDE 8 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS;
3 REAR DORMER WINDOWS AND ROOFLIGHT AT
FRONT (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

BURTON J HELLING for MR & MRS WATSON

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Project No.21.06/04 Plans: Existing Roof, Site , Proposed Ground & 1st Floor,

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) – 4
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a revised 1:200 site plan is submitted detailing the bin storage facility adjacent to the side boundary with 48 Radnor Road to be satisfactorily re-sited elsewhere to the frontage of the property and has been 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: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their premises.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 5 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- | | |
|------|---|
| SD1 | Quality of Design |
| SH1 | Housing Provision and Housing Need |
| EP25 | Noise |
| D4 | Standard of Design and Layout |
| D5 | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| T13 | Parking Standards |
| H9 | Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats |
| C16 | Access to Buildings and Public Spaces |
-

continued/

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Loss of Residential Care Home
 - 2) Character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D9, H9)
 - 3) Residential Amenity/Amenity of Neighbours (SH1, SH2, EP25, D4, D5)
 - 4) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
 - 5) Accessibility (C16)
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	11
	Justified:	5
	Provided:	5
Site Area:	609m ²	
Floorspace:	350m ²	
No. of Residential Units:	8	
Habitable Rooms:	20	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- an elderly residential care home housed within two converted and extended dwellinghouses
- property is located in a corner bend in the roadway where Radnor splits off into Radnor Road and Radnor Avenue
- the original dwellings consisted of a two storey detached dwelling and a two storey semi detached dwelling. Additions to connect and extend the two dwellings for use as a residential care home were approved in 1985 and 1993 respectively
- the existing building accommodated 19 rooms (excluding bathrooms, en suites and utility areas) across two levels and within the roofspace, of these 19 rooms 14 are habitable bedrooms, 4 are living areas and 1 is a large kitchen
- two separate on site vehicle parking spaces with associated crossovers are located along the eastern roadway frontage, whilst three on site parking spaces and associated crossover are located along the northern frontage
- the remainder of the frontage is finished with a combination of brick fencing, ornamental paving and garden beds
- the rear garden of the property is open plan and accommodates a combination of paving, grass cover and garden beds

c) Proposal Details

- construct three dormers within the rear roofslope of the building and convert the existing residential care home into 8 self-contained flats (4 x 2 bedroom, 4 x 2 bedroom)
- 3 flats would be accommodated on the ground floor, 3 flats would be accommodated on the first floor and 2 flats would be accommodated within the roofslope

continued/

Item 2/06 – P/736/05/CFU continued.....

- the 5 on site parking spaces would be retained as part of the overall proposal

d) Relevant History

LBH/16823	Change of use of dwellinghouse to old persons home	GRANTED 19-JUN-80
LBH/28055	Two storey side extension and roof alterations to nursing home	GRANTED 10-OCT-85
WEST/45748/92/FUL	Change of use: C3 to C2 (residential to care home) (C2) and 2 storey flank extension	GRANTED 27-SEP-93
P/2769/04/CFU	Conversion to provide 10 self contained flats, 3 rear dormer windows and rooflight at front	REFUSED 18-MAR-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of associated disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and be out of character in the locality.
2. The left hand side dormer proposed within the rear roofslope of 44 Radnor Road is sited too close to the adjacent roof verge, which is considered to be visually obtrusive, and would detract from the appearance and character of the building.
3. The proposal does not provide adequate rear garden amenity space for 10 residential flats thus providing an inadequate standard of amenity for future occupiers thereof.
4. The proposed bin storage located to the front of 44 Radnor Road would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining property.”

e) Applicant’s Statement

- residential care home is a 24 hour undertaking
- 16 full time residents, 10 shift working staff and owners who visit twice a day
- 2-3 relative visits per day per resident
- delivery and collection of various items for general operation
- visits from medical practitioners, maintenance workers, religious and social service individuals etc
- greater sense of balance needs to be considered by objectors to get a true comparison between existing use and proposed development

f) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
77	1	04-MAY-05

Summary of Response: Change of occupancy will increase the noise level and will seriously affect quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties; parking restrictions have only been introduced, with further demand for limited space on existing residents.

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Loss of Residential Care Home

If approved the proposal would result in the loss of the residential care home, however it is acknowledged that there are no specific policies within the recently adopted UDP that would specifically require or encourage the retention of such a care home facility. Accordingly there is no planning policy basis to resist the loss of the care home and its conversion to residential flats must be considered on individual merit.

2) Character of Area

With regards to the proposed external modifications to the building and grounds, these embody relatively minor elements of work.

With specific reference to the proposed rear dormers, an objection was raised to the previous scheme regarding the visual appearance of one of the dormers. However with the current scheme it is noted that the dormer in question has now been re-sited. Therefore it is highlighted that the three proposed rear dormers would now all meet the siting and design requirements of Harrow's Supplementary Planning Guidance and would not be visually obtrusive, nor would detract from the appearance and character of the building.

Other elements of work such as the installation of a velux rooflight within the front roofslope and the replacement of an existing window in the rear elevation with a set of patio doors are considered entirely reasonable in terms of design and appearance.

To the road frontages of the site the existing on site car spaces, fences, and landscaped gardens are proposed to be retained. However to improve forecourt greenery as embodied within Policy D9, it is noted that existing paved areas located around the frontage of the site are proposed to be removed and replaced by lawn grass. This is considered to constitute a positive upgrade to the landscaped setting of the property located to the street frontage of the site.

Local concern has been raised against the proposal regarding the conversion of 2 former semi-detached dwellings into 8 self contained flats. However it is highlighted that the 2 former dwellings have accommodated additions in the past that has resulted in an increase of the buildings overall size. On this basis it is considered that the combined floorspace of the building is of adequate size to comfortably accommodate 4 x 2 bedroom and 4 x 1 bedroom flats. An objection was raised to the previous scheme regarding the over intensive use of the property, however at the time 10 flats were proposed. Specifically, the conversion of the property to 10 flats was considered to constitute a level of residential development that would tip the balance between what would be a reasonable level of residential accommodation, to an overly intense level of residential accommodation. Whilst 10 flats is considered to constitute an overly intense level of residential accommodation, 8 flats is considered to be a reasonable level of residential accommodation.

continued/

In broader terms the character of the area consists of a mixture of single dwelling houses, residential conversions and purpose built flat developments. The conversion of an existing residential care home into self-contained residential flats is not considered to conflict with the overall residential character of the locality.

3) Residential Amenity/Amenity of Neighbours

Although the previous application was not supported on grounds of the proposed conversion resulting in an over-intensive use of the property, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and would be out of character in the locality, this was specifically raised against the conversion of the building into 10 flats. Essentially the residential conversion to 10 flats was considered to be at the upper limit of what could be comfortably accommodated within the existing building. It was ultimately determined that the proposal for 10 flats would be to a critical point where it would result in the development detracting from the amenities of neighbouring properties and also the amenities of future occupants. Specific concerns related to the noise associated with the comings and goings of occupants and a limited area of communal rear garden available to future occupants of the 10 flats. Therefore the proposal for 10 flats was refused as constituting an over-intensive use of the property. Notwithstanding, the development has now been scaled back to 8 flats, which is considered to constitute a more comfortable conversion that could more appropriately fit into the locality. The proposal for 8 flats would reduce the overall intensity of the development and therefore would limit impacts of neighbouring properties.

With respect of the amenity of future occupants, half of the flats would have direct access to the rear garden area (3 ground floor flats and 1 upper floor flat via an external staircase). The remaining half would have access to the rear garden via the side of the building. This is considered to be an acceptable solution for the scale of the development that would not amount to overdevelopment or an overly intensive use of the rear garden area. The rear garden area available is considered reasonable to provide future occupants of the 8 flats with a positive level of residential amenity.

With respect of the flank windows in the side elevation of 48 Radnor Road (facing the rear garden of the site) it is noted that these are affixed with obscure glazing. Accordingly there is no concern that the proposed rear dormer at 46 Radnor Road would have a detrimental impact over the amenity of this adjoining property. With respect of the two proposed rear dormers within the roofslope of 44 Radnor Road, these would have a view towards the rear garden of 48 Radnor Road, however the view would be in excess of 15m and would be limited by an outbuilding within the rear garden of this adjoining property.

With respect of internal amenity, the layout of the existing building makes strict vertical alignment difficult to achieve. Nevertheless as this has been accommodated in the majority of the development, across all area at ground and first floor. It is therefore considered reasonable to supplement the minor deficiencies in layout between first and second floor with a condition requiring sound insulation. This will ensure that the amenity of future occupants is not compromised.

continued/

Although an objection was raised to the prior refused scheme regarding the location of a bin storage area located adjacent to 44 Radnor Road, the proposed bin storage facility has now been relocated between parking spaces 1 & 2 which therefore overcomes the objection raised.

4) Parking/Highway Safety

The proposal provides 5 on site parking spaces, coupled with excellent access to services and public transport. Furthermore it is highlighted that parking restrictions apply within the locality, thus to prevent further demand for on-street parking, the development will be deemed “resident permit restricted”, thus residential occupiers of the building will be ineligible for residential parking permits. This therefore will specifically discourage those residents are not allocated an on site parking space from owning a vehicle. The flow on effect is that whilst 8 flats may be proposed on site, it will limit associated vehicle movements to and from the site given that only 5 resident vehicles would access the site to take advantage of the 5 provided on site spaces. Therefore on the basis that future residents of the 8 flats would be ineligible for parking permits, there is no objection to the application on grounds of insufficient parking provision.

5) Accessibility

The current application does not appear to provide for disabled access to the upper floors of the building, however it is noted that none is currently provided, therefore the existing access arrangements are to remain unaltered. However the agent will be advised of the obligations contained within the Disability Discrimination Act, 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises), implemented on 1st October 2004.

6) Consultation Responses

Addressed in Report

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

29 BROOKE AVENUE, HARROW

2/07

P/348/05/DFU/PDB

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS AND CONVERSION TO TWO
SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; NEW VEHICLE
ACCESS

HOME PLANS for MS G MAGHELLA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1130/1E & 3

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme for the landscaping of the forecourt has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The new dwelling shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure that the forecourt of the development has a satisfactory appearance in the streetscene, in the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- | | |
|------|---|
| SD1 | Quality of Design |
| SH1 | Housing Provision and Housing Need |
| SH2 | Housing Types and Mix |
| EP25 | Noise |
| D4 | Standard of Design and Layout |
| D5 | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| D9 | Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery |
| H9 | Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats |
| H18 | Accessible Homes |
| C16 | Access to Buildings and Public Spaces |
| T13 | Parking Standards |

continued/

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Alterations (D4, D5)
 - 2) Conversion Policy (H9)
 - 3) Character of Area (D4, D5)
 - 4) Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
 - 5) Disabled Persons' Access (H18, C16)
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

a) Summary

None

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached Edwardian dwelling on north-east side of Brooke Avenue, South Harrow; dwelling has original gable-ended two storey rear projection and single storey rear extension; some internal and external alterations have already taken place
- single crossover serves one forecourt parking space; remainder of front garden soft-landscaped with stone front boundary wall and path to front door; pedestrian access to rear garden at side
- adjoining semi to south-east, no. 31, has two storey side to rear and single storey rear extensions; hardsurfaced area in front of side extension provides two off-street parking spaces otherwise forecourt soft landscaped and path to front door
- neighbouring property to north-west, no. 27, end dwelling in 1970s terrace of five set back in plot (7.5m behind that of application dwelling) and separated from application site boundary by 3m wide access way to rear garage court
- development in Brooke Avenue mixed: terraced, semi detached and detached single family dwellings, purpose built maisonette blocks, etc
- levels rise west to east
- on-street parking resident permit controlled

c) Proposal Details

- conversion to two self-contained flats: 1 x two bedroom flat with kitchen and living room on ground floor, access via new side door; 1 x two bedroom flat on first floor with living room and breakfast kitchen on first floor, access via existing front door
- alterations to form new door with pitched canopy over at side and to partially close-up existing/open-up new openings in ground floor rear elevation
- bin and recycling store at rear
- two parking spaces to front with altered 3.6m wide crossover; one parking space to be 3.2m wide

continued/

Item 2/07 – P/348/05/DFU continued.....

d) Relevant History

No. 31 Brooke Avenue

WEST/372/96/FUL	Replacement and new single storey rear extensions	GRANTED 11-SEP-96
WEST/217/97/FUL	Two storey side extension (revised)	GRANTED 11-JUL-97
WEST/599/97/CON	Retention of two storey side and single storey rear extensions and proposed single storey rear extension	GRANTED 14-JAN-98
P/3121/04/DFU	Alterations, front porch and conversion of dwellinghouse to 2 self-contained houses with access and car parking at front	UNDETERMINED

No. 29 Brooke Avenue

P/2802/04/DFU	Alterations and conversion to 2 self-contained flats	REFUSED 25-JAN-05
---------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed conversion, by reason of its internal layout result in the first floor living room above a ground floor bedroom, would fail to make adequate safeguard against noise and disturbance between the flats leading to unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.
2. The proposed forecourt car parking arrangement would necessitate an excessive vehicle crossover width, to the detriment of pedestrian safety and convenience.
3. The proposal fails to provide satisfactory access into the building for persons with disabilities.”

An Informative was included on the decision notice:

“The applicant is advised that a revised application including the following amendments would be likely to be more favourably considered:

- (i) revise the layout to ensure a uniform stacking of living rooms and bedrooms within the building;
- (ii) provide separate crossovers to the proposed parking spaces not exceeding 3.6m in width;
- (iii) provide an access ramp up to the flat entrances in accordance with the Council’s guidelines ‘Access for All’ (enclosed).”

Nos. 29 & 31 Brooke Avenue

P/2516/03/CFU	Redevelopment to provide three storey block of 12 flats with basement parking	REFUSED 19-JAN-04
---------------	---	----------------------

continued/

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, excessive bulk and siting, would be visually obtrusive and out of sympathy with the scale of neighbouring properties, and by reason also of an excessive number of units and associated levels of activity, would result in an overdevelopment and over-intensive use of the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its size, excessive bulk and siting, would be obtrusive in relation to neighbouring residential properties, result in the loss of outlook and give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties, to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity.
3. An excessive amount of hardsurfacing would be provided at the front of the proposed building, and give rise to an excessive length of vehicle crossing, to the detriment of the appearance of the area and the safety and convenience of pedestrians.
4. The proposal fails to provide satisfactory access into the building for persons with disabilities.”

e) Applicant’s Statement

The application is amended in accordance with the recommendations on the refusal notice and shows the living room to the ground floor relocated to the front and under the first floor living room. The bedroom to the rear is now under the first floor breakfast area and we would confirm that the existing separating floor is to be fully upgraded as specified to comply with Part E of the Building Regulations and will be subject to a pre-completion sound test.

A ramped pathway is provided to the front of the property and the entrance to the ground floor flat is provided with a ramped access and a level threshold.

f) Notifications	Sent 14	Replies 2	Expiry 17-MAR-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Summary of Responses: Work has been going on since December 2004 despite refusal; alterations inside and outside, fencing, ditches etc; mud and clay on footpath; skip on road without lights - hazardous; previous application unsuccessful; parking access remains an issue, crossover should not lose parking spaces (for which they pay) to allow flat occupiers access to off-street parking; work starts 7am every day including Good Friday, hours and days on site should be controlled.

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Alterations

Notwithstanding that the flank elevation is more open to view in the streetscene, by reason of the set-back of the neighbouring terrace, it is considered that the siting of the new door to the side would adequately prevent detriment to the symmetry of the original pair of villas. Subject to the use of matching materials the new entrance and canopy would not, of themselves, be of detrimental appearance in the streetscene nor cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

continued/

The new door would face the forecourts of the neighbouring terrace numbered 23-27. However as these forecourts are already open to view in the streetscene and the subject of access/egress activity associated with those dwellings, it is not considered that the introduction of the side door to a new flat would be detrimental to the privacy or residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The alterations at the rear are of minimal visual consequence and are considered to be acceptable.

2) **Conversion Policy**

The suitability of the new units to be created in terms of size, circulation and layout

The circulation arrangements of each of the flats are considered to be satisfactory and the sizes of the rooms are considered to be appropriate to their proposed functions. The flats created would provide reasonably spacious accommodation and would contribute to the range of housing supply within the Borough. All habitable rooms would have a window providing for natural light and outlook.

As amended the vertical layout through the building would ensure satisfactory stacking of room uses. In these respects it is therefore considered that the proposal would secure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers and consequently that the previous reason for refusal no. 1 has been overcome.

The standard of sound insulation measures between the units

A scheme of sound insulation could prevent unacceptable living conditions for occupiers of the flats that would otherwise occur by reason of noise and disturbance from internal activity and could be satisfactorily controlled by condition.

The level of useable amenity space

The rear garden area of 355m² would be retained and subdivided into two areas – one of 175m² closest to the house and directly accessible from the ground floor flat, and one of 180m² furthest from the house and accessible indirectly via a side passageway and the forecourt from the first floor flat. This provision is considered to be acceptable in both qualitative and quantitative terms. It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the rear garden area would change as a result of the proposal, but it is not considered that this would be so significant having regard to the mixed pattern of houses and flats in the road as to be detrimental to amenity or character.

Traffic and highway safety

As 1 x three and 1 x four habitable room units the new flats would generate a combined maximum requirement of 3 spaces under the replacement UDP. As a seven habitable room single family dwelling the property would generate a maximum requirement of 1.8 spaces, but only one forecourt space was provided. A shortfall of one space below the maximum standard would therefore be maintained and, consequently, the provision of two spaces for the development is considered to be numerically acceptable. (It should be noted that no objection on parking grounds *per-se* was raised when the last application, also for two flats, was considered).

continued/

Item 2/07 – P/348/05/DFU continued.....

As amended the proposal would have a separate crossover of 3.6m width serving the new forecourt parking areas. Such a width is considered to be compatible with pedestrian and highway safety and would therefore overcome the previous reason for refusal no. 2. The provision of the crossover would necessitate a reduction in the length of on-street parking bay immediately fronting this site and no. 31. However it is considered that the effect of the loss of on-street capacity, together with any notional increase in demand arising from the development, could be adequately mitigated by resident permit restriction of the new dwelling (disqualifying future occupiers from entitlement to a residents' on-street parking permits). In conclusion, it is not considered that the more intensive residential occupation of this site together with the partial loss of street bays fronting the property would be detrimental to local parking/highways conditions.

The landscape treatment and the impact of any proposed front garden/forecourt car parking

It is acknowledged that the proposed parking arrangement would open-up more of the site frontage to the streetscene, by reason of the partial loss of the front boundary wall, and that together with the proposal at no. 29 would increase the expanse of hardsurfacing. As already noted, development in Brooke Avenue is mixed and many buildings already have hardsurfaced forecourts open to the street. Nevertheless, a width of just under 5m would be retained between the edge of the parking area and the boundary with no. 31; other than the path to the front door this width would leave adequate space for a scheme of remedial soft landscaping. Provision has been made for refuse storage at the rear.

Subject to the agreement and implementation of a scheme of soft landscaping for these areas (condition suggested) it is not considered that the forecourt arrangement would be of detrimental affect in the streetscene, having regard to the existing character of Brooke Avenue.

3) Character of Area

Development in Brooke Avenue is characterised by a mix of building and occupation types. Accordingly the use of the existing property as two flats could not be said to be detrimental to the character the road.

4) Residential Amenity

It is acknowledged that the proposed conversion would increase the intensity of use on this site, by reason of increased activity at the front and within the building, and a greater level of use of the rear amenity space. However, taking into account the layout and mix of development in Brooke Avenue, it is not considered that the degree of additional noise and disturbance associated with the proposed conversion, together with that at no. 31, would be of such significance as to be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding occupiers.

continued/

5) Disabled Persons' Access

A ramped access up to the flank door would provide access to the ground floor flat at a level threshold. This is considered to be acceptable and would overcome reason for refusal no. 3 of the last refused scheme.

6) Relationship to Decision P/2516/03/CFU

Planning application P/2516/03/CFU had sought permission for the demolition of nos. 29 and 31 Brooke Avenue and its replacement with a three storey block of twelve flats with front and rear balconies. The development was to comprise 3 x two habitable rooms units, 8 x three habitable room units and 1 x four habitable room unit – giving a total of 34 habitable. Thirteen parking spaces were proposed – i.e. just over one per unit. Juxtaposed against the reasons for refusal in this case the current proposals for nos. 29 and 31 are considered as follows:

- The proposals would retain the existing buildings with only minor external alterations. In terms of use intensity, the current proposals for 29 and 31 Brooke Avenue (combined) would increase the number of households from two to four but, as amended, would maintain a constant number of habitable rooms (16). The accommodation schedule would comprise 1 x two habitable room dwelling, 1 x three habitable room flat, 1 x four habitable room flat and 1 x seven habitable room dwelling. Whilst some increase in use intensity over the existing two dwellings would inevitably result, it is considered that associated activity levels would be substantially less than those of the previously refused development. It is not considered that the current schemes proposed for nos. 29 and 31 would lead to such a use intensity that would be detrimental to the character of the area; accordingly previous reason for refusal no. 1 would be overcome.
- The existing buildings would be retained with only minor alterations and it is not therefore considered that there would be any detriment to the visual amenity of any neighbouring occupiers. Other than the proposed insertion of a living room window in the flank elevation of no. 31 – which is considered acceptable in privacy terms – the overlooking relationship between the property and surrounding dwellings would remain as existing. It is not therefore considered that there would be any detriment to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly previous reason for refusal no. 2 would be overcome.
- The previous scheme had proposed three forecourt parking spaces, a double width stepped access up to the building's main entrance, a ramped vehicle access down to under croft parking, and a forecourt refuse storage area. As a result the scheme would have led to the complete hardsurfacing of the forecourt and little scope for an acceptable disabled person's access arrangement. The subject proposals would retain sufficient soft landscaping to preserve the character of the streetscene and disabled persons' access has been satisfactorily addressed.

continued/

Item 2/07 – P/348/05/DFU continued.....

Neither is it considered that there would be any material, perceptible increase in associated noise/disturbance from vehicle movement/parking activity that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

7) Consultation Responses

Work has been going on since December 04 - noted despite refusal, alterations inside and outside, fencing ditches etc.

Mud and clay on footpath - not a planning consideration

Skip on road without lights – hazardous - not a planning consideration

Work starts 7am every day including Good Friday, hours and days on site should be controlled - not a planning consideration

All other matters dealt with in report.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

31 BROOKE AVENUE, HARROW

2/08

P/3121/04/DFU/PDB

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS, FRONT PORCH AND CONVERSION OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO 2 SELF-CONTAINED DWELLINGHOUSES WITH ACCESS AND CAR PARKING AT FRONT

HOME PLANS for MRS G MAGHELLA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1133/1C & 2A

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. 1133/1C shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 6 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme for the landscaping of the forecourt has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The new dwelling shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To ensure that the forecourt of the development has a satisfactory appearance in the streetscene, in the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 19 – Flank Windows
- 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 5 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|
| SD1 | Quality of Design |
| SH1 | Housing Provision and Housing Need |
| SH2 | Housing Types and Mix |

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/3121/04/DFU continued.....

EP25	Noise
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D9	Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
H18	Accessible Homes
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
T13	Parking Standards

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Alterations (D4, D5)
 - 2) Conversion to Two Houses (EP25, D4, D5, D9, T13)
 - 3) Character of Area (D4, D5)
 - 4) Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
 - 5) Disabled Persons Access (H18, C16)
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application is reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

a) Summary

None

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached Edwardian dwelling on north-east side of Brooke Avenue, South Harrow; dwelling has original gable-ended two storey rear projection and has two storey side to rear and single storey rear extensions; hardsurfaced area in front of side extension provides two off-street parking spaces otherwise forecourt soft landscaped and path to front door
- adjoining semi to north-west, no. 29 has original gable-ended two storey rear projection and single storey rear extension; crossover serves one forecourt parking space; remainder of front garden soft-landscaped with stone front boundary wall and path to front door; pedestrian access to rear garden at side
- neighbouring property to south-east, no. 37, is a detached 1930s dwelling to similar building line but sited on higher level (1.5m approx.) and with single storey projection to adjacent part of rear; facing flank wall sited 1m from boundary and has facing ground floor obscure glazed windows
- development in Brooke Avenue mixed: terraced, semi detached and detached single family dwellings, purpose built maisonette blocks, etc
- levels rise west to east
- on-street parking resident permit controlled

c) Proposal Details

- conversion of existing side to rear extension to form additional dwellinghouse: living/dining room, kitchen and bathroom on ground floor; one bedroom with dressing area and bathroom on first floor
- alterations to form new front door with pitched canopy over and new window in ground floor front elevation

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/3121/04/DFU continued.....

- bin and recycling store at rear
- two parking spaces to front of proposed new dwelling with 3.6m wide crossover; two further parking spaces to be provided in front of existing dwelling with separate 3.6m wide crossover

d) Relevant History

No. 31 Brooke Avenue

WEST/372/96/FUL	Replacement and new single storey rear extensions	GRANTED 11-SEP-96
WEST/217/97/FUL	Two storey side extension (revised)	GRANTED 11-JUL-97
WEST/599/97/CON	Retention of two storey side and single storey rear extensions and proposed single storey rear extension	GRANTED 14-JAN-98

No. 29 Brooke Avenue

P/2802/04/DFU	Alterations and conversion to 2 self-contained flats	REFUSED 25-JAN-05
---------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed conversion, by reason of its internal layout result in the first floor living room above a ground floor bedroom, would fail to make adequate safeguard against noise and disturbance between the flats leading to unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.
2. The proposed forecourt car parking arrangement would necessitate an excessive vehicle crossover width, to the detriment of pedestrian safety and convenience.
3. The proposal fails to provide satisfactory access into the building for persons with disabilities.”

An Informative was included on the decision notice:

“The applicant is advised that a revised application including the following amendments would be likely to be more favourably considered:

- (i) revise the layout to ensure a uniform stacking of living rooms and bedrooms within the building;
- (ii) provide separate crossovers to the proposed parking spaces not exceeding 3.6m in width;
- (iii) provide an access ramp up to the flat entrances in accordance with the Council’s guidelines ‘Access for All’ (enclosed).”

P/348/05/DFU	Alterations and conversion to two self-contained flats, new vehicle access	UNDETERMINED
--------------	--	--------------

Nos. 29 & 31 Brooke Avenue

P/2516/03/CFU	Redevelopment to provide three storey block of 12 flats with basement parking	REFUSED 19-JAN-04 continued/
---------------	---	------------------------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, excessive bulk and siting, would be visually obtrusive and out of sympathy with the scale of neighbouring properties, and by reason also of an excessive number of units and associated levels of activity, would result in an overdevelopment and over-intensive use of the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
2. The proposed development, by reason of its size, excessive bulk and siting, would be obtrusive in relation to neighbouring residential properties, result in the loss of outlook and give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties, to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity.
3. An excessive amount of hardsurfacing would be provided at the front of the proposed building, and give rise to an excessive length of vehicle crossing, to the detriment of the appearance of the area and the safety and convenience of pedestrians.
4. The proposal fails to provide satisfactory access into the building for persons with disabilities.”

e) Applicant’s Statement

This proposal involves sectioning off the recent side extension to the original dwelling on this site to create a separate one-bedroom house. Other than the formation of a new entrance door and porch canopy to the front and inserting a window to the side there are no external alterations proposed to this property. The existing forecourt and rear garden are to be subdivided to provide parking and amenity area for both dwellings.

f) 1st Notification	Sent 10	Replies 3	Expiry 05-JAN-05
----------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Summary of Response: Description wrong, developer has tendency to ignore planning approval and continue to make changes - should ensure development adheres to plans, development out of character with road and adjacent houses, increased occupation will affect amenities, water/sewerage may be affected, residents' parking bays will be sacrificed to provide off-street parking (residents have to pay for limited parking which will be reduced by proposal); proposal will add to parking problems, Brooke Avenue has fair share of flats, family houses add to character of road, work has already started at no.29, work starts before 8am.

2nd Notification	Sent 10	Replies 0	Expiry 28-JAN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

3rd Notification	Sent 10	Replies 0	Expiry 15-FEB-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Alterations

The formation of a new entrance to the front elevation would emphasise the perceptibility, in the streetscene, of the subdivision of this property. However this is not considered unacceptable given the mixed character of development in the road and the subordinate appearance of the existing extension – preventing detriment to the symmetry of the original pair of villas. Subject to the use of matching materials the new entrance and canopy would not, of themselves, be of detrimental appearance in the streetscene nor cause demonstrable harm to the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The new flank window would face the side boundary with no. 37 at a distance of only 1.8m and would be a conventional size/clear glazed. Whilst the Council's supplementary planning guidelines require in normal circumstances a distance of 3m between such windows and flank boundaries – in the interests of neighbouring occupiers' privacy amenity – a number of site circumstances are considered to provide material mitigation in this instance. These are: the change in site levels between no. 31 and 37 together with the existing fence between the two, the absence of clear-glazed windows in the facing flank elevation and the existing single storey projection to the rear of no. 37. Their affect is to prevent any direct overlooking of the area to the side of no. 37 nor, obliquely, of its rear garden; there would be no harmful overlooking of the facing windows (which are obscure glazed). In these circumstances it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the privacy amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The internal layout of the ground floor of the proposed new dwelling has been amended so that the living/dining area would be served by an existing window to the front, as well as that proposed on the flank elevation. Accordingly it is not considered that the flank window – which would not be 'protected' in these circumstances - need prejudice the outcome of any future application at no. 37. An informative to this effect is suggested, for the avoidance of doubt.

2) Conversion to Two Houses

The suitability of the new units to be created in terms of size, circulation and layout

The size and layout of the existing two storey side to rear extension is such that it is considered to be capable of forming an acceptable new residential unit. The room sizes would be satisfactory and other than the kitchen, which would have only a door to the rear elevation, all room would have conventional window. As amended the proposed new living/dining room would have a window to the front, as well as the flank, providing for satisfactory light and outlook.

The existing dwelling would retain four habitable rooms on the first floor and three habitable rooms together with a kitchen on the ground floor. It is considered that this would continue to provide satisfactory living conditions for the existing and future occupiers.

continued/

The standard of sound insulation measures between the units

As a single family dwelling the vertical arrangement of the rooms would be satisfactory. A scheme of sound insulation of the resulting party wall could prevent unacceptable living conditions for occupiers of the existing and new dwellings that would otherwise occur by reason of noise and disturbance from internal activity and could be satisfactorily controlled by condition.

The level of useable amenity space

The rear garden area of 510m² would be retained and subdivided into two areas – one of 210m² to the rear of the proposed new dwelling and one of 300m² to the rear of the remaining existing dwelling. This provision is considered to be acceptable in both qualitative and quantitative terms. It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the rear garden area would change as a result of the proposal, but it is not considered that this would be so significant having regard to the mixed pattern of houses and flats in the road as to be detrimental to amenity or character.

Traffic and highway safety

As a two habitable room unit the new dwelling would generate a maximum requirement of 1.2 spaces under the replacement UDP and the existing dwelling, retaining in excess of five habitable rooms, a maximum requirement of 1.8 spaces. The provision of two spaces per unit is therefore considered to be numerically acceptable.

As amended the proposal would have two crossovers of 3.6m width serving each of the forecourt parking areas. Such a width is considered to be compatible with pedestrian and highway safety. The provision of the crossovers would necessitate a reduction on the length of on-street parking bay immediately fronting this site and no. 29. However it is considered that effect of the loss of on-street capacity, together with any notional increase in demand arising from the development, could be adequately mitigated by resident permit restriction of the new dwelling (disqualifying future occupiers from entitlement to a residents' on-street parking permits). In conclusion, it is not considered that the more intensive residential occupation of this site together with the partial loss of street bays fronting the property would be detrimental to local parking/highways conditions.

The landscape treatment and the impact of any proposed front garden/forecourt car parking

It is acknowledged that the proposed parking arrangement would open-up more of the site frontage to the streetscene, by reason of the partial loss of the front boundary wall, and that together with the proposal at no. 29 would increase the expanse of hardsurfacing. As already noted, development in Brooke Avenue is mixed and many buildings already have hardsurfaced forecourts open to the street. Nevertheless, a width of just under 3m would be retained between the edge of the parking area and the boundary with no. 29; other than the path to the front door and provision for refuse storage for existing no. 31 (not shown) this width would leave adequate space for a scheme of remedial soft landscaping. Between the parking area for the existing dwelling and that to serve the proposed new dwelling would be a strip 1m wide (though increasing in width to the front boundary) that could also be planted to separate the two areas and provide visual relief.

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/3121/04/DFU continued.....

Subject to the agreement and implementation of a scheme of soft landscaping for these areas (condition suggested) it is not considered that the forecourt arrangement would be of detrimental affect in the streetscene, having regard to the existing character of Brooke Avenue.

3) Character of Area

Development in Brooke Avenue is characterised by a mix of building and occupation types. Accordingly the use of the existing property as two dwellings, instead of one, could not be said to be detrimental to the character the road.

4) Residential Amenity

It is acknowledge that the proposed conversion would increase the intensity of use on this site, by reason of increased activity at the front and within the building, and a greater level of use of the rear amenity space. However, taking into account the layout and mix of development in Brooke Avenue, it is not considered that the degree of additional noise and disturbance associated with the proposed conversion, together with that at no. 29, would be of such significance as to be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding occupiers.

5) Disabled Persons Access

A ramped access up to the front door would provide access at a level threshold. This is considered to be acceptable.

6) Relationship to Decision P/2516/03/CFU

Planning application P/2516/03/CFU had sought permission for the demolition of nos. 29 and 31 Brooke Avenue and its replacement with a three storey block of twelve flats with front and rear balconies. The development was to comprise 3 x two habitable rooms units, 8 x three habitable room units and 1 x four habitable room unit – giving a total of 34 habitable. Thirteen parking spaces were proposed – i.e. just over one per unit. Juxtaposed against the reasons for refusal in this case the current proposals for nos. 29 and 31 are considered as follows:

The proposals would retain the existing buildings with only minor external alterations. In terms of use intensity, the current proposals for 29 and 31 Brooke Avenue (combined) would increase the number of households from two to four but, as amended, would maintain a constant number of habitable rooms (16). The accommodation schedule would comprise 1 x two habitable room dwelling, 1 x three habitable room flat, 1 x four habitable room flat and 1 x seven habitable room dwelling. Whilst some increase in use intensity over the existing two dwellings would inevitably result, it is considered that associated activity levels would be substantially less than those of the previously refused development. It is not considered that the current schemes proposed for nos. 29 and 31 would lead to such a use intensity that would be detrimental to the character of the area; accordingly previous reason for refusal no. 1 would be overcome.

continued/

The existing buildings would be retained with only minor alterations and it is not therefore considered that there would be any detriment to the visual amenity of any neighbouring occupiers. Other than the proposed insertion of a living room window in the flank elevation of no. 31 – which is considered acceptable in privacy terms – the overlooking relationship between the property and surrounding dwellings would remain as existing. It is not therefore considered that there would be any detriment to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly previous reason for refusal no. 2 would be overcome.

The previous scheme had proposed three forecourt parking spaces, a double width stepped access up to the building's main entrance, a ramped vehicle access down to undercroft parking, and a forecourt refuse storage area. As a result the scheme would have led to the complete hardsurfacing of the forecourt and little scope for an acceptable disabled person's access arrangement. The subject proposals would retain sufficient soft landscaping to preserve the character of the streetscene and disabled persons' access has been satisfactorily addressed.

Neither is it considered that there would be any material, perceptible increase in associated noise/disturbance from vehicle movement/parking activity that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

7) Consultation Responses

Description wrong - this has been addressed and neighbours renotified

Developer has tendency to ignore planning approval and continue to make changes - should ensure development adheres to plans: can be monitored by enforcement team in event of any breach being report

Water/sewerage may be affected - a matter for utilities suppliers

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

4-10 COLLEGE ROAD, HARROW

2/09

P/3262/04/DFU/PDB

Ward: GREENHILL

CONVERSION OF SECOND FLOOR FROM
LANGUAGE SCHOOL TO 6 SELF CONTAINED
FLATS AND ALTERATIONS

DAVID R YEAMAN & ASSOCIATES for MR SONI & MR SHAH

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 001A, 021, 022A, Site Plan, DRYA letter dt.14-DEC-04

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The development hereby approved shall be implemented only in conjunction with planning permission P/2629/03/DFU as amended by letter dated 22nd April 2005 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To ensure a satisfactory relationship between residential units in the interests of future occupiers.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 4 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- | | |
|------|---|
| SD1 | Quality of Design |
| SD3 | Mixed-Use Development |
| SH1 | Housing Provision and Housing Need |
| EP25 | Noise |
| D4 | Standard of Design and Layout |
| D5 | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| D7 | Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres |
| H8 | Empty Homes and Property in the Borough |
| H9 | Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats |
| EM15 | Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas |
| EM25 | Food, Drink and Late Night Uses |

continued/

T13 Parking Standards
T16 Servicing of New Developments
T17 New Access - St. Ann's Road
15 (Proposal Sites)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Loss of Employment Floorspace (EM15)
 - 2) Conversion Policy (H9)
 - 3) USP New Access Policy and Proposal Site (T17)
 - 4) Amenity and Character of Alterations (D4 and D7)
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	8 max
	Justified:	8 max
	Provided:	0
No. of Residential Units:		6

b) Site Description

- three storey building fronting south side of College Road, Harrow; ground floor forms three commercial units - estate agents, hairdresser and stationers - entrance at front leads to upper floor offices (second floor offices used as educational facility)
- car park at rear with access to Havelock Place
- adjoining building to east single storey and in restaurant use
- adjoining building to west two storey with post office at ground floor
- within Harrow town centre; site included as proposal site 9 and as service road extension proposal in adopted replacement Harrow UDP (2004)

c) Proposal Details

- conversion of second floor from language school to 6 x two habitable room self-contained flats accessed by existing front door and communal hall/stairs
- application form states that there is 317m² gross B1 office floorspace though it is noted from the drawings that the active use is actually educational
- no parking provided
- windows to be replaced with upvc double-glazed units
- two new window openings to front elevation (first and second floors)

d) Relevant History

P/2629/03/CFU	Provision of 3rd floor comprising 6 self-contained flats (resident permit restricted)	GRANTED 19-JAN-04
---------------	---	----------------------

continued/

e) Applicants Statement

The lease for the second floor expires in 2005. The current educational user intends to relocate within Harrow; there is good availability of alternative accommodation in the Harrow area which may be more appropriate.

An application for an additional floor [residential] was approved in January 2004. The second floor has been designed to incorporate access to the new third floor but the two should be viewed independently.

College Road predominantly consists of small shop units at ground floor level with offices over. Providing a residential element will greatly enhance the activity and help to revitalise the streetscene out of office hours, while improving the security of the town centre and creating much needed small units. The central location provides good transport links, both tube and bus services are within a short walking distance.

f) Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	20	0	12-JAN-05

APPRAISAL

1) Loss of Employment Floorspace

Although the second floor is in educational use the lawful planning use of the premises appears to be as a B1 office. Policy EM15 of the replacement UDP seeks to resist the loss of B1 floorspace, on employment grounds, subject to the assessment of individual proposals against specific criteria. In relation to each these:-

- a) The Council's survey of available business premises, dated January 2005, show there to be 365,225m² available office in the Borough as a whole, ranging from prime office rents of £96.84 to £285.14 per square metre and rents of £64.56 to £150.64 per square metre for older premises. Such a level of provision for the Borough is considered to be generous, though may not be evenly distributed. Within Harrow town centre there is 16,966 square metres of vacant office floorspace, a relatively low figure for the past ten-year period and of mixed quality. The proposal would result in the loss of 317m² floorspace of non-modern type but would not, on its own, detract from the range of office sizes and type available within the centre in the short term. In the longer term it is considered that the loss of older, less suitable accommodation – reducing overall supply within Harrow town centre – could increase values and therefore stimulate the development of more suitable accommodation. In these circumstances it is not considered that the proposal would result in any conflict, in this case, with criterion A.
- b) There is no evidence to suggest that the use of the premises for residential occupation would be harmful to the local economy for the purposes of criterion B. Indeed, the addition of the residential units might help to support some aspects of the town centre's retailing and service functions.
- c) No evidence has been submitted to suggest that any attempt has been made to market the premises for its lawful B1 use upon the expiry of the current educational users' lease during 2005.
- d) It is believed that the premises are still occupied, but not for their lawful use.

continued/

Item 2/09 – P/3262/04/DFU continued.....

- e) Criterion E does not apply.
- f) For the purposes of criterion F access to the site is considered to be very good.
- g) As B1 offices it is unlikely that access for delivery vehicles is necessary on any significant scale, though it can be noted that there is a service road at the rear. Accordingly there is no conflict with criterion G.

As noted above, the premises are believed to be in active operational use but for educational not B1 office use. Educational uses are recognised as being appropriate uses for vacant offices, both in terms of their own employment contribution and the contribution of their student populations to the local economy. The relocation of the existing user to alternative premises within Harrow town centre, as the applicant suggests (list of potential premises supplied), would amount to a neutral impact in local economic terms. Although no marketing evidence has been put forward, based on that supplied for similar premises at nearby 321-323 Station Road (P/3224/04/DFU) it is considered unlikely that these premises could be easily let in the current market.

The policy goes on to state that where a site is no longer considered suitable solely for its business use class or any combination of the business uses (B2 and B8 would not be suitable here) the mixed use to include a business element should be investigated. The reasoned justification refers to the possibility of live/work units and affordable housing provision. No such proposals have been put forward in support of the scheme. However the first floor would be retained in office use and, balanced against the economic contribution of additional households within the town centre, is considered to be acceptable on its own merits.

2) Conversion Policy

The suitability of the new units to be created in terms of size, circulation and layout

The flats would be accessed via a communal hall/stairs, which are considered to be of sufficient size as to allow for proper circulation and access through the building. For the type of units proposed – i.e. modest non-family flat accommodation - they would be of reasonable size and circulation. Some flats would have their bedrooms sited adjacent to living rooms, but as similar arrangements would exist in respect of the approved additional floor it is not considered that any objection on this basis could be raised. The vertical arrangement of the flats on this floor would conflict with those of the approved third floor scheme; however an acceptable amendment to the third floor scheme has been submitted during the course of this application which would secure broad alignment of room uses. Subject the implementation of the amended arrangement to the third floor it is considered that the proposal would secure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers. A condition requiring the subject development not to be implemented other than in accordance with the amended third floor layout is therefore suggested.

continued/

The flats would all have a satisfactory outlook. Although there is an air conditioning unit on the rear ground floor of the building, with similar equipment to the rear of neighbouring premises in Station Road, their distance from the second floor together with the proposal to install replacement double glazed windows would, it is considered, adequately safeguard against potential noise and vibration to future occupiers.

The standard of sound insulation measures between the units

It is considered that the first floor office use would be unlikely to cause significant noise nuisance subject to standard sound insulation safeguards. A condition requiring sound insulation measures to be agreed and implemented is suggested.

The level of useable amenity space

The proposed flats would have no outdoor useable amenity space. In view of this town centre location where residential developments generally have no such facilities, however, this is considered to be acceptable. Future occupiers would be able to utilise public open spaces at Harrow-on-the-Hill and, at a further distance, Harrow Recreation ground for outdoor recreation. The submitted drawings indicate space for refuse storage at the rear which is considered to be acceptable.

Traffic and highway safety

The UDP sets a maximum standard of 1.2 spaces for one or two habitable room units. This equates to a maximum of eight spaces for the development proposed. No parking would be provided, but within this highly accessible location with good accesses to shops and services it is not considered that future occupier would be disadvantaged by non-car ownership. In these circumstances and subject to central Government advice it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal is justified or could be sustained. To prevent detriment to the amenity of the occupiers of residential areas surrounding the town centre and to meet sustainability objectives, however, it is recommended that the scheme be the subject of controls disqualifying future occupiers from entitlement to a resident parking permit.

3) UDP New Access Policy T17 and Proposal Site 9

The UDP seeks to extinguish the existing vehicle access road that crosses the pedestrianised part of St. Ann's Road by the formation of a new service access from College Road. The reasoned justification to the policy explains that such an access will be required in any proposals to redevelop 2-36 College Road. This objective is re-iterated as part of proposal site 9, which goes on to state that an element of replacement residential accommodation could be appropriate as part of a mixed use scheme.

However, the principle of residential use within the application building has been established by the previously approved application. Although this approval pre-dates the adoption of the UDP the proposal is long established and was at an advanced stage when that application was considered. Accordingly it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of prejudice to a proposal site could now be sustained.

continued/

4) Amenity and Character of Alterations

The proposed alterations are considered to be of minimal visual consequence to the overall appearance of the building and would not detract from its character when viewed in the streetscene.

5) Consultation Responses

None

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

**HARROW TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, HARROW
VIEW, HARROW**

2/10

P/835/05/CFU/CM

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

INSTALLATION OF 3 ANTENNAE ON EXISTING
TOWER ON ROOF, EQUIPMENT CABINET,
REMOVAL OF 3 DOLPHIN ANTENNAE AND
SUPPORTS

ALAN DICK UK LIMITED for UK BROADBAND

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: P19529_00_004_M04_4; P19529_30_100_M12_12; P19529_30_150_M12_12

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The equipment cabin hereby approved shall be so installed, used and thereafter retained as to prevent transmission of noise vibration into any neighbouring premises.
REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not give rise to noise nuisance to neighbouring residents.
- 3 Within one month of the installation of the antennae and equipment cabin as hereby approved, the three existing Dolphin antennae and associated supports on the roof shall be removed, and the roof made good.
REASON: To safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring residents and the appearance of the building.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 Standard Informative 28 – Telecommunications Development 1

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D24 Telecommunications Development

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Telecommunications Development (D24)
 - 2) Residential Amenity (D24, SD1)
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

continued/

b) Site Description

- proposed siting on roof of Harrow Telephone Exchange, Harrow View
- existing lattice tower of total height 19.6m above ground level
- existing 3 no. Dolphin antennae on tripods, one to south and two to north of lattice tower
- existing 2 no. T-Mobile antenna on monopole to north east of lattice tower
- existing equipment cabin to east of lattice tower
- existing BT dishes, T-Mobile antennae and 02 stub mast to south of lattice tower
- building set back from the highway and with high mature trees to front
- surrounding properties are predominantly two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, with three storey block of flats at St. Saviours Court opposite

c) Proposal Details

- the antennae and equipment cabin would be installed on the roof of Harrow Telephone Exchange
- the 3 antennae would be placed on an existing lattice tower (mast) on the building, and would be no higher than the mast itself, at a height of 18.17m
- the equipment cabin would be sited within the existing cabin on the front of the roof
- three existing Dolphin antennae and the associated supports, one on the south side and two on the north side of the roof, would be removed and the roof made good

d) Relevant History

LBH/32499	Aerial Mast on Roof	GRANTED 06-JUL-87
WEST/320/94/DTD	Radio antennae on roof	NOT REQUIRED 08-JUN-94
WEST/869/99/DTD	Determination: Installation of equipment and associated cabin, on roof	NOT REQUIRED 25-NOV-99
WEST/975/99/FUL	One 5m monopole with 3 cross polar antennas, 4 dish antennas & radio equipment cabin	GRANTED 19-APR-2000

e) Applicant's Statement

The service will be of direct public benefit as it will extend choice and availability of broadband services, will support a range of planning objectives relating to social well being and inclusiveness, economic prosperity and sustainable development; will be compliant with ICNIRP guidelines; modest works will not result in any material increase in visual prominence and will in fact improve the appearance of the building due to the removal of the three dolphin antennas and the proposed use of the existing lattice tower rather than introducing a new mast; the additional antennas can be installed without any modification to the structure itself and the additional radio equipment housing can be located within the existing dolphin cabin therefore does not necessitate additional buildings; ventilation equipment is only likely to operate during the day and the level of emissions is unlikely to exceed current background noise levels; antennas specified are approximately half the size of the existing antennas affixed to the rooftop operated by T-Mobile and 02.

continued/

f)	Notifications	Sent 234	Replies Awaited	Expiry 10-MAY-05
-----------	----------------------	-------------	--------------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Telecommunications Development

Policy D24 of Harrows UDP states that proposals for telecommunications development will be considered favourably provided that certain criteria can be fulfilled.

The first consideration is whether any satisfactory and less harmful alternative is available within the area of coverage deficiency as identified by the operator. It was concluded by the applicant that this site was most appropriate in terms of coverage and for reasons of environmental and visual acceptability. No alternative building or structure was available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. The site complies with these criteria by using the roof of a telephone exchange with existing masts/antennae. In respect of choosing which existing structure to use, the applicant discovered that the T-Mobile and O2 masts are fully utilised or would require additional height in order to become available for sharing. While the existing dolphin antennae are capable of being used, the use of the existing lattice tower would serve the triple benefits of a greater level of coverage, use of an existing structure without the need for alterations and the possibility to remove some of the existing structures.

The site is not located in a Conservation Area or is not a Listed Building and would impinge on local views, landmarks or other structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves the use of the existing lattice tower rather than new poles, which is considered to be acceptable given the high level of existing structures on the roof. No additional height would be involved and the positioning on the mast would appear to allow for future shared use. The equipment cabin would be sited within the existing dolphin cabin and thus would not be visible. The proposal would consolidate the use of the lattice tower but this relatively minor increase in bulk would be balanced by the removal of the dolphin antennae and supports to either side. Thus the proposal would not result in a proliferation of structures on the roof and would in fact improve the appearance of the building. Although higher than the other existing masts on the roof, the lattice tower is less bulky and obtrusive, and according to the applicants statement the proposed antennae would be approximately half the size of the existing T-Mobile and O2 antennae. Furthermore, although the telephone exchange is of greater height than most of the surrounding residential properties, it is set further back in the streetscene and is partially screened by the mature trees along the frontage on Harrow View. Thus the proposal is considered to minimise the visual impact and would not affect the character of the area.

continued/

Item 2/10 – P/835/05/CFU continued.....

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. Although the proposal does not involve mobile phone antennae, the same ICNIRP considerations would apply. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the Local Planning Authority should not consider the health aspects further.

2) Residential Amenity

The proposal would have most potential for impact on amenity in respect of visual amenity and noise emanating from the ventilation equipment required to cool the radio equipment housing (equipment cabin).

For the same reasons as outlined above, it is considered that as the proposed additional bulk on the existing lattice tower would be minimal and the proposal involves the removal of three other masts and their support structures, the proposal would not result in undue loss of outlook or visual amenity to the nearby residential occupiers. Indeed, the new antennae would be sited to the centre of the rooftop and thus would be further from the surrounding properties than the dolphin structures to be removed.

Similarly, the new equipment cabin would be sited within the existing cabin on the rooftop and thus should not give rise to any increased noise emissions than the existing situation.

Thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of safeguarding the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

3) Consultation Responses

None

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

KENTON TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, 10 KENTON PARK PARADE, KENTON ROAD, KENTON P/792/05/CFU/CM

Ward: KENTON WEST

INSTALLATION OF 3 X 850MM ANTENNAE ON EXISTING POLES, 2 EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND AUXILLARY EQUIPMENT ON ROOF

ALAN DICK UK LTD for UK BROADBAND

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 20230.004/01, P20230_30_100_M17, P20230_30_150_M17

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The equipment cabin hereby approved shall be so installed, used and thereafter retained as to prevent transmission of noise vibration into any neighbouring premises.
REASON: to ensure that the proposed development does not give rise to noise nuisance to neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
D24 Telecommunications Development
- 2 Standard Informative 28 - Telecommunications Dev't 1

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Telecommunications Development (D24)
 2. Residential Amenity (D24, SD1)
 3. Consultation Response
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

Cont...

b) Site Description

- proposed siting on roof of Kenton Telephone Exchange.
- existing plant room with elevation poles on three corners, as originally erected for 3 no. cellnet antennae in 1995.
- existing T-Mobile stub tower with total of 5 no. antennae to east of plant room, with equipment cabin to rear.
- existing 3 no. O2 support poles, on east and west edges of rooftop, each with 2 no. antennae.
- existing generator and fuel store in yard to rear, fence and gate on rear site boundary with service road.
- service road between exchange site and rear gardens of residential properties at Kenton Park Close.

c) Proposal Details

- the antennae and equipment cabin would be installed on the roof of Kenton Telephone Exchange, with an associated electrical meter to be sited in the rear yard inside the fence on the boundary with the service road. The antennae would be installed on the existing elevation poles on three corners of the plant room, which were previously occupied by Cellnet antennae. The antennae would be 850mm in length, while the rooftop equipment cabinet would measure 2.2m in height and would be located centrally on the rooftop between the stub tower and the plant room. The electrical meter would be 1.2m in height.

d) Relevant History

EAST/615/95/DTD	3 antennae and 2 microwave dishes - Permitted Development	PERMITTED DEV 14-SEP-1995
EAST/857/98/DTD	Determination: radio equipment cabin on roof	NOT REQUIRED 05-NOV-1998
EAST/929/98/FUL	5m lattice tower and 4 microwave dishes	GRANTED 29-DEC-1998
EAST/918/99/DTD	Determination: telecommunication equipment, cable trays, three antennae (two with microwave dishes)	REFUSED 19-OCT-1999
EAST/193/00/DTD	Determination: six antenna in chimney surrounds, two dishes and equipment cabin on roof	REFUSED 22-MAR-2000

Cont...

Item 2/11 - P/792/05/CFU Cont...

EAST/945/00/DTD	Relocation of (i) stub tower with 4 microwave dishes and (ii) microwave dish on tripod frame; replacement equipment cabin	REFUSED 28-SEP-2000
EAST/1018/00/DTD	Determination: replacement equipment cabin	GRANTED 26-OCT-2000
EAST/1186/01/DTD	Determination: 6 antennas on 3 supports on roof, equipment cabin at rear	WITHDRAWN 20-NOV-2001
EAST/1226/01/FUL	3 antennas on roof and associated equipment cabins at rear and on roof (revised scheme)	REFUSED 05-AUG-2002

e) Applicant's Statement

The service will be of direct public benefit as it will extend choice and availability of broadband services, will support a range of planning objectives relating to social well being and inclusiveness, economic prosperity and sustainable development; will be compliant with the ICNIRP guidelines; the proposal would comply with Policy D24 of HUDP.

f) Notifications	Sent 155	Replies Awaited	Expiry 12-MAY-2005
-------------------------	-------------	--------------------	-----------------------

APPRAISAL

1. Telecommunications Development

Policy D24 of Harrows UDP states that proposals for telecommunications development will be considered favourably provided that certain criteria can be fulfilled.

The first consideration is whether any satisfactory and less harmful alternative is available within the area of coverage deficiency as identified by the operator. It was concluded by the applicant that this site was most appropriate in terms of coverage and for reasons of environmental and visual acceptability, having considered alternative sites at Hillingdon House, Brent House and a new freestanding mast in Kenton.

Cont...

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. The subject site complies with these criteria by using the roof of a telephone exchange with existing masts/antennae. In respect of choosing which existing structures to use, the applicant claims that the T-Mobile stub tower would need to be increased in height and bulk in order to be suitable, and this would result in greater visibility than the proposal. Furthermore, previous applications to alter or relocate this tower have been consistently refused by the Council. The O2 tripod supports have been fully utilised and cannot accommodate further antennae.

The site is not located in a conservation area or is not a listed building, and would not impinge on local views, landmarks or other structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal would use the three existing elevation poles (erected following EAST/615/95/DTD as permitted development) attached to the plant room rather than requiring new structures. Furthermore, the proposed antennae are approximately half the size of the other existing antennae used by T-Mobile and O2. The equipment cabinet would be located between the T-Mobile stub tower/cabin and the main plant room in the centre of the roof. It would be considerably smaller in height and bulk than these other structures and would be of similar appearance in terms of materials and colour as the T-Mobile cabin. Given the height above ground level and the modest scale of the proposal when compared with the other existing structures on the roof, the antennae and equipment cabin are considered to be acceptable. The proposed electrical meter in the rear yard would also be a modest structure, particularly when compared with the existing generator store room. Furthermore it would not be perceived from the neighbouring residential properties given the existing fence along the boundary and the intervening service road.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. Although the proposal does not involve mobile phone antennae, the same ICNIRP considerations would apply. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the LPA should not consider the health aspects further.

2. Residential Amenity

The proposal would have most potential for impact on amenity in respect of visual amenity and noise emanating from the ventilation equipment required to cool the radio equipment housing (equipment cabin).

Cont...

For the same reasons as outlined above, it is considered that as the proposed additional bulk on the existing elevation poles would be minimal and the equipment cabin would be modest in comparison with the other cabinets and plant room, the proposed rooftop works would not result in undue loss of outlook or visual amenity to the nearby residential occupiers. Indeed, the new antennae would be sited to the centre of the rooftop and thus the furthest possible distance from the surrounding properties. The proposed electrical meter in the rear yard would be screened from the rear gardens at Kenton Park Close by the fence along the boundary and the intervening service road.

The new equipment cabin on the roof would be sited between the existing plant room and T-Mobile on the rooftop and thus should not give rise to any increased noise emissions than the existing situation.

Thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of safeguarding the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

3. Consultation Responses

Awaited.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

CLARENDON ROAD AND PART OF KYMBERLEY ROAD, BETWEEN ST. GEORGE'S CENTRE AND COLLEGE ROAD, HARROW P/906/05/CFU/TEM
Ward: GREENHILL

ELEVATED ILLUMINATED PLANTING STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PUBLIC HIGHWAY TO PROVIDE A SHARED SURFACE, MOTORCYCLE AND CYCLE PARKING, RE-SITING OF DISABLED PARKING

ALSOP DESIGN LTD-CAROLINE KOO for LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1162-P-001P1, 90P1, 100P1, 110P1, 120P1, 130P1, OP-160P1, OP-300P1, OP-301P1, OP-400P1, OP-500P1

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacing
 The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Details of illumination of the elevated planting structures shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to their being brought into use.
REASON: In the rests in the appearance of the area.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 5 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|
| SD1 | Quality of Design |
| D4 | Standard of Design and Layout |

continued/

Item 2/12 – P/906/05/CFU continued...

D7	Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres
T9	Walking
T12	Reallocating Available Roadspace and Managing Traffic
T14	Public Car Parking
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, D7)
 - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
 - 3) Highway Issues (T9, T12, T14)
 - 4) Accessibility (C16)
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Site Area: 2400m²
Council Interest: Highway Authority

b) Site Description

- Clarendon Road between College Road and south side of town square in front of St. Georges Centre
- 3 storey building on east side of northern end of Clarendon Road with 7 storey building on east side of southern end, open service yard with ramps to and from multi-storey car park located between
- 8 storey building, King's House on western side together with 5 storey high St. Georges Centre
- site also includes sections of Kymberley Road on north and south sides of Kings House

c) Proposal Details

- provision of 3 x elevated illuminated planting structures consisting of a rectangular planting box with an illuminated glass panel on each side, mounted on circular columns to a height of 4 – 4.7m to stainless steel underside of planting box, total height of some 5.2 – 5.9m
- 1 structure on eastern side of Clarendon Road between College Road and exit from St. Annes car park, columns and lighting coloured various shades of blue and purple
- second structure adjacent to part of western flank wall of shop unit on southern side of St. Georges town square, green columns, orange/yellow planting box
- third structure adjacent to part of eastern flank wall of St. Georges Centre, opposite second structure, orange/green columns, orange/yellow planting box
- alterations to public highway to provide shared vehicular/pedestrian surface, with different materials used to define vehicle carriageway, pedestrian channel, double yellow lines, boundaries with Kymberley Road, and crossing places
- reconfiguration of 4 parking spaces for disabled badge holders at northern end of Clarendon Road
- provision of 10 parking spaces for cycles/motorbikes on northern side of junction of Kymberley/Clarendon Roads

continued/

Item 2/12 – P/906/05/CFU continued...

d) Relevant History

None

e) Applicants Statement

- application accompanied by Road Safety Audit carried out before application was submitted

f) Notifications

Sent
112

Replies
Awaited

Expiry
12-MAY-05

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance and Character of Area

Clarendon Road is a relatively narrow, currently unattractive street which serves as a major pedestrian link between the St. Anns Precinct, with its major shopping facilities and the bus/underground stations in College Road. As well as providing a feature of distinctive interest, in accordance with Policy D7, the proposed elevated structures would also provide lighting and greenery to improve the appearance of the street and area and its function as a public thoroughfare.

The proposed highway works would, inter alia, involve the provision of more attractive surface materials than existing, and the removal of unattractive railings and street furniture, thereby benefiting the character of the area.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

The planting structures would mostly be located in front of blank walls, and would have no undue impact in terms of amenity.

3) Highway Issues

The proposals would improve the local area for pedestrians by the provision of better lighting and surfacing. They also cater for the parking needs of blue badge holders, cyclists and motorcyclists in compliance with relevant Transportation policies in the UDP.

4) Consultation Responses

Awaited

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

PINNER PARK FIRST SCHOOL, 10 MELBOURNE AVENUE, PINNER

P/777/05/CFU/TEM

Ward: HEADSTONE NORTH

REMOVAL OF PREFABRICATED CLASSROOM,
DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE STOREY DEXTENSION

HARROW COUNCIL, URBAN LIVING DEPT. for PEOPLE FIRST DEPT.

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: E5330/101A, 102

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
 REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 5 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 6 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5	Structural Features
SD1	Quality of Design
SC1	Provision of Community Services
EP32	Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses
EP33	Development in the Green Belt
EP34	Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
C7	New Education Facilities

continued/

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Education Policy (SC1, C7)
 - 2) Impact on Green Belt and Appearance of Area (SEP5, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4)
 - 3) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Green Belt:	Part of application site
Floorspace:	149m ²
Council Interest:	Freehold owner and Local Education Authority

b) Site Description

- First and Middle School complex with access from Melbourne Avenue
- flanked by Headstone Lane to south-east, residential and sports ground to east, allotments to west, and sports ground to north
- northern part of site within Green Belt
- occupied by single and 2 storey buildings with hardsurfaced play areas and car parks, together with playing fields

c) Proposal Details

- removal of mobile classroom at north-western end of First School main building
- provision of single storey extension in similar position to provide classroom, entrance lobby/cloakroom, store and quiet area/meeting room
- brick and glazed elevations, flat roof
- proposal would be sited within Green Belt area

d) Relevant History

LBH/31110	Single storey classroom	GRANTED 04-DEC-86
-----------	-------------------------	----------------------

e) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
18	Awaited	18-MAY-05

APPRAISAL

1) Education Policy

Relevant policies seek to ensure the provision of adequate education facilities. No objections are raised in terms of the criteria set down in Policy C7 in view of the modest scale of the proposal.

2) Impact on Green Belt and Appearance of Area

The siting of the existing mobile classroom and proposed permanent structure relates to an area behind the main school complex which is within the Green Belt.

continued/

Item 2/13 – P/777/05/CFU continued.....

Educational use is not an appropriate Green Belt use. However, Policy EP34 allows for extensions to existing buildings in the Green Belt subject to certain criteria.

In this case, the proposal would project some 11.4m beyond the main school building compared with a 12.4m projection by the existing mobile. Thus although a greater overall footprint is proposed (149m² against 80m²) the extent of encroachment into the Green Belt would be reduced.

In addition, a large amount of space would be provided around the building and in view of this and its single storey scale, no concern is raised in terms of Policy EP34(A) and Green Belt impact.

The proposal would be sited at least 80m from Melbourne Avenue and would give rise to the removal of an unattractive mobile classroom and the provision of a more appropriate replacement structure.

it is considered therefore that an acceptable impact on the appearance and character of the area would be provided.

3) Neighbouring Amenity

The extension would be located some 25m from the neighbouring Sports Ground and over 100m from the nearest residential properties with intervening buildings. Neighbouring amenity would not therefore be adversely affected.

4) Consultation Responses

Awaited

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

LEE HOUSE, 5 POTTER STREET HILL, PINNER

2/14
P/537/05/CFU/CM
Ward: PINNER

CONSTRUCTION OF STORAGE AREA AT SIDE OF HOUSE AND EXTEND RETAINING WALL. CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED SUMMER HOUSE

N P RASPIN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site Plan 1; 2:Elevations; 3:Elevation; 4:Floor Plan

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the storage area and retaining wall hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 The whitewood to be used in the construction of the external walls of the summerhouse hereby permitted shall be stained chestnut brown, and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. 3:Elevation shall be installed in the flank/rear wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 5 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 31 – No Future Extensions
- 3 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SEP5 Structural Features
- SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- EP31 Areas of Special Character
- EP33 Development in the Green Belt
- EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/537/05/CFU continued.....

SD1	Quality of Design
SD2	Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D14	Conservation Areas
D15	Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
D16	Conservation Area Priority
D17	Article 4 Directions

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character (EP31, EP34, SEP5, SEP6)
 - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (D14, D15, D16, D17, SD2)
 - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Area of Special Character:

Conservation Area: Pinner Hill

Green Belt

TPO

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- two storey detached property approved in 1981 rear of 'Micklefield House', Park View Road
- no extensions to house since 1981
- 2.2m walls with gates to either side of property, leading to path at north side of house
- mesh fence and high trees (approximately 10m) along north and east boundaries
- ground level approximately 1m lower than at 'Potters End' to north, levels at that property rise to rear of site
- existing brick retaining wall of height 1.3m on boundary north of garage
- 'Potters End' is a replacement house approved in 1988, with two flank windows in nearest single storey element

c) Proposal Details

- construction of small storage building to north of garage, attached to rear of existing 2.2m wall, in materials matching house and wall
- continuation of brick retaining wall of height north of garage, to provide path to rear garden, in materials matching house and wall
- summerhouse in north-eastern corner of site, at end of garden, of Scandinavian whitewood stained chestnut brown and green felt shingle roof

continued/

d) Relevant History

WEST/286/02/FUL	Provision of 2.2m high brick walls with gates on either side of property	GRANTED 05-JUN-02
-----------------	--	----------------------

e) Consultations

CAAC: No objections but would prefer to see proper slates on roof.

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 21-APR-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

Notifications	Sent 3	Replies 0	Expiry 19-APR-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character

Policies within the adopted UDP seek to restrict extensions to houses within the Green Belt in order that they should not represent disproportionate additions or impact on the openness of the area. When this property was approved in 1981 on land to the rear of 'Micklefield', a condition was imposed restricting permitted development rights relating to the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, in order to restrict the amount of site coverage by buildings. No extensions have since been developed, and the only alterations carried out relate to the provision of 2.2m brick walls with gates to either side of the house and the hardsurfacing of the driveway.

The proposed storage shed to the north side of the house would be situated behind the approved 2.2m wall, and would occupy the space between the retaining wall and the gate. At a height of 2.1m it would not be visible from the street due to the existing wall, and thus would not compromise the sense of openness around the property. Due to its modest scale and proximity to the house, as well as the trees which provide screening along the boundary with 'Potters End', the storage shed is considered to be acceptable in terms of this Green Belt location. The extension to the retaining wall would represent minor works which do not impact on the character of the Green Belt, in particular due to its siting behind the 2.2m fronting the street, and would in any case be permitted development. The proposed summerhouse would be located to the rear of the proposed storage shed, in the bottom corner of the garden. There are high trees along the boundaries with 'Potters End' and 'Garth', and shrubs within the garden, which would surround the summerhouse and provide significant screening. The structure would be relatively modest and sited at the furthest possible distance from the house, thus it would not result in a proliferation of buildings on site.

continued/

In terms of overall site coverage and the impact on the Green Belt, the storage shed would have a footprint of 7.48m² and the summerhouse a footprint of 12.1m², resulting in a total increase of 7.4% over the footprint of the original dwelling. Despite the relatively small size of the plot when compared with the neighbouring properties, it is considered that the modest scale of the proposed buildings would be acceptable, given the above circumstances. Thus, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would be harmful to the openness or character of this part of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character. However, it is noted that any further extensions to the property might compromise the openness and character of the area, and an informative to advise the applicant has been attached.

2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area

The property is located in Pinner Hill Conservation Area. There are no objections to this proposal, as it would not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The storage area and the retaining wall extension would be hidden behind the existing front wall and would not therefore be visible in the streetscene. The property itself is a modern 1980s building without significant architectural or historic merit, so the structures would not have a negative impact on its character/appearance. The materials to be used in the structures (old stock bricks and felt roof) are considered to be acceptable.

Despite the more prominent siting for the summerhouse, the building would be relatively discreet given its size and design. The materials, with timber walls (to be stained chestnut brown) and green felt roof, would blend in with the semi-rural surroundings and would not look out of place.

There is a Tree Preservation Order in place for the front of this property, and significant trees along the north and east boundaries. However, the proposed buildings would not affect the existing trees on site.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposals would be sited adjacent to the boundary with 'Potters End' to the north. The storage shed and retaining wall would be sited more than 20m forward of the dwelling at that neighbouring site and due to their modest size and the screening by high trees, they would not be perceived by the neighbouring occupiers. The summerhouse would be sited closer to the house at 'Potters End', at a distance of approximately 7m from the nearest single storey element, and it would have a maximum height of 2.9m at the ridge. There are two windows in the flank wall of that property, however due to the siting of the garden at 'Lee House' at a lower ground level than 'Potters End' and the significant screening offered by the high trees on the boundary, this separation distance is considered to be adequate in terms of amenity.

continued/

4) Consultation Responses
None

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

LAND R/O 613 KENTON LANE, HARROW

2/15

P/1734/03/DFU/AMH

Ward: HARROW WEALD

RETENTION OF STORAGE BUILDING

DAVID BARNARD for C MORIARTY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 260/1a, Block Plan, Site Plan

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 The building hereby permitted shall be used for storage purposes only.
REASON: To safeguard the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers.
- 2 Noise from Plant and Machinery
- 3 Within 3 months of the date of this permission a scheme detailing an improved external appearance, to include the closure of the west flank wall and roof, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and within 6 months of the date of this permission the approved scheme shall be implemented and thereafter retained. In the event that such details are not received after 3 months, or in the event that the approved scheme is not implemented after 6 months, the building shall be demolished and all materials removed from the site.
REASON: To safeguard the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers and the character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

SD1 Quality of Design

EP25 Noise

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers
 - 2) Appearance of Building
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

Cont...

INFORMATION

This application was reported to Committee at the request of a nominated member. Consideration of this application was deferred at the Committee meeting on 20th April in order to undertake a Members Site Visit on 11th May.

a) Summary

None

b) Site Description

- site to rear of parade of shops fronting Kenton Lane and College Hill Road
- site currently occupied by fencing company
- rear garden of residential dwelling fronting College Hill Road, lies along western site boundary
- site is bordered to the south and east by the shops with residential units above, the rear elevation of these buildings face the application site
- block of flats to the north

c) Proposal Details

- application seeks permission for retention of wooden storage building
- the building is sited to the southwest corner of the application site
- 8.8m wide by 6.m deep, shallow sloping roof rising from 2.45m at the rear (southern elevation) of the shed to 2.9m at the front (northern elevation)
- two additional buildings on the site in conjunction with the one subject to the application form an 'L' shape of buildings around the southeast corner of the application site.

d) Relevant History

ENF/162/00/EAST	Fencing business at rear of shops	CASE CLOSED
ENF/260/03/P	Building erected onsite. No planning permission	

e) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
28	2	15-AUG-03

Summary of Responses: Encroachment, larger than previous building, no permission for change of use, what is to be stored?, noise, materials not in keeping with surrounding residential area, break-ins, flooding, damaged wall is safety hazard, wood piled high causing damage, ugly structure, no gutters/drainage, machinery being used.

Cont...

APPRAISAL

1. Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

The building subject to this application is sited along the eastern side boundary with number 14 College Hill Rd, some 11m from the rear elevation of this building. This adjacent garden is some 10m wide and 30m long.

Given the siting of the new building in relation to the existing adjacent dwelling (No. 14 College Hill Road), the generous size of the adjacent garden, and the modest height of the new building (c2.75m average), it is not considered the new building would adversely impact upon the visual or residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. However, this should be subject to further works to complete the west flank elevation.

Concerns raised regarding possible encroachment could not be adequately verified during a site inspection, although the applicant has signed Certificate A confirming they are the sole owners of the site to which the application relates. In conjunction with a letter from the applicant re-affirming that they are the sole owner of the site, it is considered this application is valid and may be determined.

As the new building has been built in the place of a previous building, which has been demolished, it is not possible to compare the impact of the new building to the old building on site. Notwithstanding this, for the reasons given above the impact of the new building on the adjacent occupiers is considered to be acceptable.

Noise - an appropriate condition is suggested above.

Storage - an appropriate condition is suggested above.

2. Appearance of Building

The application site lies in an area of mixed character, with exception of the residential garden to the west, the immediate locality comprises workshops, storage, rear service roads to shops, and the rear elevation of flats above the shops.

Given the mixed character of the immediate locality, it is not considered the proposal shed appears out of character with the locality.

3. Consultation Responses

Planning considerations addressed in above report.

Issues relating to the following matters are not considered relevant to this application: break-ins; flooding; damaged wall is safety hazard; wood piled high causing damage.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

NEW ENTRANCE GATES AND PIERS

ORCHARD ASSOCIATES for MR & MRS P MARCUSE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 394-12-D

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 The existing southern access shall be closed when the new access hereby permitted is brought into use, the verge shall be reinstated and a hedge provided on the remainder of the property frontage, in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 The driveway surface must be constructed in accordance with the 'No Dig Construction' methods detailed in the attached leaflet 'Trees in Focus: Practical Code and Management. Driveways Close to Trees'.
REASON: To ensure that no harm is caused to the trees sited near the front boundary of the property.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SEP5 Structural Features
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
SD1 Quality of Design
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens

Cont...

- EP31 Areas of Special Character
- EP32 Green Belt-Acceptable Land Uses
- EP33 Development in the Green Belt
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
- D16 Conservation Area Priority
- D17 Article 4 Directions
- D18 Historic Parks and Gardens

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Green Belt & Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP31, EP32, EP33, D4)
2. Appearance or Character of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D15, D16)
3. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
4. Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Archaeolog.Area/TPO:	Tree Preservation Order
Conservation Area:	Pinner Hill
Green Belt:	Green Belt
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- Large detached property in substantial grounds at end of Pinner Hill, near pedestrian path to Pinner Hill Golf Course
- Two existing gates for access, with thick hedge of laurel and rhododendron and high trees along front boundary
- Existing stone piers and metal gates at northern access to front of main house, with house visible to rear
- Other smaller gate without piers to south adjacent to 'Hillcote House', almost covered by hedge

c) Proposal Details

- Removal of existing southern driveway with verge to be re-instated
- New access to centre of site with metal gates and stone piers to match the existing entrance to north

Cont...

d) Relevant History

P/625/04/CFU	Single storey side extension, replacement double garage, building in rear garden, replacement and extended drive	GRANTED 16-JUN-2004
--------------	--	------------------------

e) Applicant's Statement

House has a manorial appearance and the existing stone piers and gates reflect the character; gates are light in appearance providing views of the house and are not obtrusive; proposal would maintain the vernacular appearance of the property and preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

f) Consultations

CAAC: No objections: semi rural character is less obvious in this section of conservation area. Not very visible in conservation area terms. Encourage owners to grow greenery over gateposts to match originals

Advertisement:	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 12-MAY-2005
-----------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------

Notifications	Sent 3	Replies 0	Expiry 04-MAY-2005
----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

APPRAISAL

1. Green Belt & Area of Special Character

The proposal would have a minimal impact on the character and openness of the site, taking into account its location in an Area of Special Character and the Green Belt. Conditions have been imposed to ensure that the existing dense planting and trees, which run along the front boundary, would not be affected. The existing southern gate would be removed and the verge re-instated, and the new gate and piers would match the existing northern entrance in terms of design and materials. Due to the modest scale of the proposal and the variety of entrance gates in the surrounding area, and in particular due to the remote siting of the property at the end of Pinner Hill, the proposal is not considered to affect the character, appearance, setting or openness of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

Cont...

2. Appearance or Character of Conservation Area

Within Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area, there is normally a presumption against boundary treatments that involve urban fencing materials such as iron railings, in order to preserve the character and appearance of the street scene. However, each case needs to be judged on its individual merits, and Link House is a case in point. The property is quite secluded from the rest of the conservation area, with the thick boundary hedge obscuring most details from view. The property already has two driveways complete with metal gates along the frontage of Pinner Hill and has recently been granted permission (P/624/04/CFU) to move the southern driveway approximately 9m northwards to form a new access point within the boundary hedge. This grant of permission preserved the character and appearance of the conservation area, as it involved the re-siting of a driveway and the re-instatement of soft landscaping.

It can be argued therefore, that the proposed gate would also preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, given that it will effectively act as a replacement for the existing southern gate. Although the proposed gate would be wider than the one it replaces and would have two stone piers, this is considered to be acceptable in conservation terms, as the proposed design and dimensions match the existing northern gate and would achieve a degree of symmetry along the front boundary.

However, the grant of permission for the proposed metal gate should not set a precedent for the rest of the conservation area, for the reasons stated above concerning the specific location of Link House and the existing boundary arrangements. Furthermore, any future proposals for boundary alterations at Link House would be judged on their own individual merits.

3. Visual and Residential Amenity

No impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is foreseen due to the siting away from the neighbouring dwellings and the intervening dense planting at the boundaries. Due to the modest scale of the proposal and the variety of entrance gates in the surrounding area, no impact on residential amenity is envisaged.

4. Consultation Responses

See report above.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for grant.

SECTION 3 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

218 SHAFTESBURY AVENUE, SOUTH HARROW

3/01

P/678/05/CFU/RJS

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A DETACHED 2 STOREY BLOCK OF 4 FLATS WITH FORECOURT PARKING

DALE VENN ASSOCIATES for MR M A ASLAM

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 4334-2, Location Plan

REFUSE permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed driveway and associated parking layout does not provide adequate forecourt manoeuvring area, and, given the present highway and traffic conditions, would be likely to have an adverse effect on highway and safety movement.
- 2 Refusal - Parking in Front Garden – Appearance
- 3 The proposed building by reason of unsatisfactory design (i.e. lack of ground floor front doors to the front elevation), would be out of character and detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene.
- 4 The proposed bin storage areas would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining properties.
- 5 The proposal provides for inadequate disabled access to the ground floor flats.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
SH2 Housing Types and Mix
EP25 Noise
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
T13 Parking Standards
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of Area, Site Layout and Residential Density (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, D8, D9, C16)
- 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, EP25, D4)
- 3) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
- 4) Consultation Responses

continued/

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	5
	Justified:	4
	Provided:	4
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- detached two storey house on north side of Shaftesbury Avenue, south west of the junction with Whitmore Road
- integral garage to south eastern boundary
- hard-surfaced forecourt
- front boundary wall newly erected
- 2 'gaps' in wall for vehicular access from Shaftesbury Avenue, but as yet only one vehicular crossover to the south western corner of the site
- the site is flanked by a detached house to the north west, of which it is noted that there is currently a proposal to convert the building into 2 flats (application is included on the May Committee agenda)
- site is flanked by a block of 4 maisonettes to the south east
- Shaftesbury Avenue is characterised by blocks of 4 maisonettes which have the general appearance of 2 storey semi-detached properties
- there are no formal parking restrictions along Shaftesbury Avenue, however due to the narrow width of Shaftesbury Avenue and the high volume of traffic it accommodates, an informal arrangement exists where residents do not park on the south western side of the street (the opposite side of the street to the property)

c) Proposal Details

- demolition of existing building on site
- construction of a 2 storey, hipped roof building that would accommodate 4 maisonettes. The overall siting style and design of the building would replace the predominant development pattern of Shaftesbury Avenue which consists of 2 storey blocks of 4 maisonettes
- each of the 4 maisonettes would accommodate 2 bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen and lounge area
- the rear garden of the property would be utilised as a communal garden area
- a new crossover is proposed that would provide access to 4 on site spaces to the frontage of the building. The crossover has been sited so as to retain the street tree located to the centre of the grass verge located outside the site

d) Relevant History

P/909/03/CFU Two storey side and rear extensions, rear REFUSED
dormer, conversion to provide 6 self-contained 06-NOV-03
flats, new vehicular access forecourt parking

continued/

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal does not make adequate provision for parking within the curtilage of the property and given the present highway and traffic conditions in this road, is likely to have an adverse effect on highway safety and movement; the proposal thus conflicts with the adopted conversion policy of the Local Planning Authority.
2. The proposed hardsurfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene.
3. The proposed development, by reason of excessive number of units, size of building and hardsurfaced parking areas, with the associated disturbance and general activity, would result in an overintensive use and amount to overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area
4. The proposed extensions by reason of excessive depth, the bulk of the crown roof and the width of the rear dormer would be unduly obtrusive and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties and the character of the locality.”

P/1585/04/DFU Conversion to four self-contained flats with alterations to vehicular accesses and two storey side to rear extensions, single storey rear extension and rear dormer REFUSED 09-SEP-04

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed development, by reason of the excessive number of units, with the associated disturbance and activity, would result in an overintensive use and amount to overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of neighbouring residents.
2. The space provided for parking is inadequate in size for the number of parking spaces, which do not provide room for manoeuvre and, given the present highway and safety conditions, would be likely to have an adverse effect on highway and safety movement.”

e) Applicants Statement

- Previous application was refused for reasons including: inadequate parking, appearance of parking within front garden and general bulk and external appearance.
- Latest proposal offers significant improvements upon submission in these key areas of concern.
- Proposal involves the demolition of the existing dwelling and the construction of 4 new build flats rather than conversion with substantial extensions and alterations of the existing detached house.

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/678/05/CFU continued.....

- The external form of the new block is of a size, bulk and external character reinforcing, and consistent with the general streetscene. The predominant residential building form on both sides of Shaftesbury Avenue being blocks of 1930's 2 storey maisonettes with pitched hipped roofs, external access stairs and bay windows. The proposal would maintain adjacent ridge and gutter levels.
- Flats of a size likely to attract smaller families and as such unlikely to have a detrimental impact on neighbourhood in terms of the residential mix.
- Provision has been made with the proposal for 4 communal car parking spaces with adequate manoeuvring spaces to accepted standards. A single point of access centred on the site and replacing the existing site access is proposed retain tree within the grass verge.
- On-street parking would not be reduced or compromised in terms of traffic safety (vehicle movements) or loss of on-street parking.
- The forecourt layout envisages the provision of soft landscaping within the block paving with detriment to vehicle movements or visibility
- The positioning of the new block whilst maintaining front building line would not compromise daylight, outlook nor privacy to/from adjacent residential properties; provision has been made at the rear of the property for communal amenity space including designated areas for refuse/cycle storage and clothes drying.
- We ask that these variations from previously inferior schemes are highlighted for the benefit of any concerned local residential and Committee members alike.

f)	Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
		48	9	19-APR-05

Summary of Responses: With 4 flats with 2 bedrooms each and parking space for 3 vehicles in the forecourt it is difficult to envisage with current car ownership that parking will be adequate for occupants; cars parked outside of 220 and 218 are already parked up to the corner severely limiting visibility for vehicles; additional cars will increase traffic hazards; objections remain the same to previous schemes; when considering the application alongside to the application at 220 they should be rejected on grounds of overdevelopment, out of character with surrounding area; increase in vehicle traffic in a congested area; insufficient parking to support the size of the development and loss of privacy to the neighbours; cars parking along Shaftesbury Avenue already creates 'bottle necks' for traffic, which has caused vehicles to be damaged in the past; the development would exacerbate these issues; proposed building would create visual intrusion for neighbours, traffic problems are made worse by location of bus stops, previous applications have been refused on overdevelopment issues, no visitor parking, disruption during construction

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Character of Area, Site Layout and Residential Density

Shaftesbury Avenue (between Whitmore Road and Porlock Avenue) is characterised by blocks of 4 maisonettes, which have the general appearance of 2 storey semi-detached properties. Specifically this format of development forms the prevailing character of this section of Shaftesbury Avenue. It is highlighted that the proposed development has aimed to respond to the overall design characteristics of the blocks of 4 maisonettes. This is achieved by proposing a building that replicates the same siting, façade width, eave height, and hipped roof of other buildings in the immediate vicinity. On this basis, it is considered that the design and scale of the proposed building would generally address and respect the prevailing built form of the locality. However, the building has not proposed ground floor access to the front elevation, which is considered to be out of character with the locality. Furthermore the access arrangements for the ground floor flats is considered to be awkward, by virtue of being partially concealed under the upper floor stairs. Likewise with only 0.9-1.0m setback between the stairs and side boundary it would cause concern for providing adequate disabled access to the ground floor flats. Accordingly objections are raised to these elements of the proposal.

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed two storey building is comparable to the siting of the existing two storey dwellinghouse. Likewise a separation distance in excess of 20m exists between the rear elevation windows and the rear elevation of the nearest property abutting the rear boundary of the site. In view of these factors, it is considered that there would be no increase in overlooking, or loss of privacy caused by the development that would justify a specific objection to the scheme.

With regard to the proposed flank elevations of the building, they meet relevant Council policy tests for light access and overshadowing impacts for neighbours. Therefore no specific objection is raised to the scheme on the basis of overshadowing or loss of light. Additionally there are no openings in the flank elevations other than from doors for the maisonettes, which would face the flank walls of the adjoining property, which feature only windows to bathrooms and landings. Therefore such a layout would not result in material overlooking.

On matters of general layout, it is considered that the proposed bin storage facilities adjacent to the boundaries with adjoining properties could be better sited to avoid detrimental impacts for adjoining neighbours. As it currently stands an objection is raised to this issue.

3) Parking/Highway Safety

The application nominates that there is available space for the parking of 4 vehicles to the frontage of the site, however due to the retention of the existing street tree, the crossover would be offset from the centre of the site. This would have the effect of making it difficult to access 2 of the on site spaces to the left hand side of the frontage of the site. As such the proposed parking layout would not provide for adequate manoeuvring space and accordingly the development would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/678/05/CFU continued.....

A better parking layout solution would be to propose only two on site parking spaces to the frontage with associated aesthetic landscaping. However it is then argued that the development would be deficient in on site parking, which would then generate an objection on the basis of the intensity of the development being excessive with respect of provided on site parking and the development would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.

As a secondary issue alluded to above, Policy D9 of the adopted UDP refers to landscaping of the forecourt area. Whilst it is acknowledged that the forecourt of the property is entirely sealed with hardsurface, it is nonetheless argued that if a residential conversion of the existing dwelling were to be supported, that it is reasonable to require that a reasonable amount of forecourt landscaping be provided. As it stands the proposed forecourt layout would provide little if any space for aesthetic landscaping, which is deemed unacceptable as part of a residential conversion proposal.

4) Consultation Responses Addressed in report.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for refusal.

9 WEST DRIVE GARDENS, HARROW

3/02

P/3293/04/DFU/PDB

Ward: HARROW WEALD

RETENTION OF, AND MODIFICATIONS TO,
ROOF EXTENSION AT SIDE, REAR AND
FRONT AND FRONT AND REAR DORMERS
(REVISED)

JPB ARCHITECTS for MR & MRS M MASTERSON

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 106A, 109A, 110C, 111, 112

REFUSE permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The roof extensions, by reason of siting and design, appear unduly massive and overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring property and in the streetscene, and are at odds with the prevailing form and massing of roofs in West Drive and West Drive Gardens, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Amenity and Character (SD1, D4, D5)
 - 2) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

a) Summary

TPO

b) Site Description

- two storey detached dwelling located on wedge shaped site to south side of West Drive Gardens, Harrow Weald
- original property had hipped roof over, with catslide roof and subordinate forward projecting hip features to front elevation; two storey side extension with flank wall to irregular side boundary & forward projecting garage
- prior to unauthorised works, side extension had a parapet wall around a flat roof over
- substantial tree and vegetation screening to rear boundary with no. 5 West Drive

continued/

Item 3/02 – P/3293/04/DFU continued.....

- West Drive and West Drive Gardens characterised by 1930s semi-detached and detached two storey dwellings, generally with hipped roofs, some feature subordinate gabled elements, half hips, and front/side dormers
- neighbouring hip-roofed semi-detached dwelling to west, no. 11, sited forward at 45° in relation to West Drive Gardens and application property, to face junction with West Drive; benefits from single storey extension at side and conservatory at rear
- neighbouring gabled detached dwelling to east, no. 7, sited forward in relation to application dwelling and on higher site level, with secondary windows to lounge and bedroom in facing side elevation

c) Proposal Details

- retention of first floor front dormer and unauthorised roof extension but with modifications as follows:
 - existing narrow and gabled second floor dormer replaced with wide hipped roof dormer
 - replacement of front gable with hip and dormer
- front dormers have already been removed and reduced in number to two; part of catslide has also been removed and a conventional, recessed first floor front wall re-instated

d) Relevant History

HAR/22007	Erect 2 storey extension for additional rooms and double garage	GRANTED 18-JUN-64
EAST/533/98/FUL	Pitched roof over side extension and front dormer	GRANTED 17-NOV-98
EAST/383/00/FUL	Alterations and roof extension at side with front dormers; front and rear dormers to existing roof; pitched roof over ground-floor front extension	REFUSED 09-NOV-00

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed roof extension and dormer windows, by reason of unsatisfactory design, size and siting, would be unduly obtrusive and overbearing, and out of character with the locality, to the detriment of the appearance of the property and the area, contrary to Harrow Unitary Development Plan policies E6 and E45”

EAST/456/01/FUL	Alterations and roof extension at side with front dormers; front and rear dormers to existing roof; pitched roof over ground-floor front extension	GRANTED 07-AUG-01
EAST/631/02/FUL	Roof extension at side, rear & front ; front & rear dormers	REFUSED 13-SEP-02

continued/

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The roof extensions, by reason of siting and design, appear unduly massive and overbearing when viewed from neighbouring property and in the streetscene, and are at odds with the prevailing form and massing of roofs in West Drive and West Drive Gardens, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the visual amenity and character of the locality, contrary to Policy E45 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).
2. The front dormers, by reason of their number and uniform siting, give the building an excessively fussy appearance in the streetscene, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality, contrary to Policy E45 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).”

An enforcement notice was served on 11th February 2003, requiring alterations to the front elevation to secure compliance with that approved under EAST/456/01/FUL, the restoration of a subordinate hipped roof to the front, a reduced pitch to the side roof planes (also as approved under EAST/456/01/FUL) and works to make good the affected remaining parts of the roof planes. Both the decisions to refuse permission and pursue enforcement action were subsequently the subject of appeals. However the appeals were dismissed, though the Inspector varied the enforcement notice to allow as an alternative remedy the restoration of the house to its original condition prior to the breach of planning control.

P/424/04/DFU	Retention of, and modifications to, roof extension at side, rear & front and front and rear dormers	REFUSED 26-APR-04
--------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The roof extensions, by reason of siting and design, appear unduly bulky and overbearing when viewed from neighbouring property and in the streetscene and are at odds with the prevailing form and massing of roofs in West Drive and West Drive Gardens, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the visual amenity and character of the locality, contrary to Policy E45 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).
2. The front dormers, by reason of their number and uniform siting, give the building an excessively fussy appearance in the streetscene, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality, contrary to Policy E45 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).”

e)	Notifications	Sent 6	Replies 1	Expiry 14-SEP-04
----	----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

Summary of Responses: Permission for increased height and volume not granted; Council asked to reinstate but applicant has not done; each adjustment to try and suit the planners and then consult neighbours - wrong way round; should make an application based on old house for consideration within normal guidelines - existing structure could be adjusted to suite; each application is an attempt to get something for which permission has not been granted.

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and Character

In supporting the Council's decision to refuse permission for the existing, unlawful development, the appeal Inspector concluded that the gable constituted a "dominant and somewhat overbearing element". He went on to find that the vertical emphasis of the altered house was visually awkward, incongruous and obtrusive, and that "the extent of catslide roof in the front elevation and the number and uniformity of the dormer windows in it are another strident feature of the altered property. The expanse of roof conveys a massing effect that adds to the overbearing nature of the features I have described". However, the Inspector concluded that there was no harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by reason of privacy, sunlight or daylight loss, nor any diminution of outlook from the nearest neighbouring gardens and windows.

Finally, in considering the remedial measures prescribed in the enforcement notice, the appeal Inspector stated that: "I have considered whether any lesser changes such as a reduction in size of the dormers or replacement of some of them with velux roof lights would overcome the harm to amenities, but these relatively minor alterations would not overcome the harm that results from the roof form and height".

In the context of the Inspector's findings it is acknowledged that alterations already undertaken have reduced the visual impact from that considered by the Inspector. The proposal would go further, to reduce the dominance of the gable by hipping the front and inserting a dormer. However the resulting development would fall short of the remedies sought under the terms of the enforcement notice. Specifically, in relation to the development approved under EAST/456/01/FUL (being less onerous to the applicant than the alternative remedy of re-instating the dwellinghouse that had previously existed) the proposal would fail to (i) reduce the ridge height, (ii) reduce the roof pitch on the sides and (iii) subordinate the front hip in relation to the main house roof. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would continue to detract from the visual amenity and character of this established residential locality for the reasons hitherto identified.

2) Consultation Responses

- | | |
|---|--|
| Each adjustment to try and suit the planners and then consult neighbours – wrong way round | - each application has to be considered on its own merits |
| Should make an application based on old house for consideration within normal guidelines – existing structure could be adjusted to suit | - sufficient information about history to enable application to be determined as submitted |
| Each application is an attempt to get something for which permission has not been granted | - each application has to be considered on its own merits |

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this application is recommended for refusal.