

# REPORT FOR: CABINET

---

<b>Date of Meeting:</b>	12 December 2013
<b>Subject:</b>	Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document
<b>Key Decision:</b>	Yes
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Caroline Bruce, Corporate Director of Environment and Enterprise
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Stephen Greek, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development and Regeneration
<b>Exempt:</b>	No
<b>Decision subject to Call-in:</b>	Yes
<b>Enclosures:</b>	Appendix 1: Schedule of Consultation Responses to the draft Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD  Appendix 2: Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document for adoption – <i>Due to the size of the appendix, it has been circulated in hard copy to Cabinet Members and Key Officers only. The appendix is available for viewing on the website and a hard copy has been placed in the Members' Library</i>

## Section 1 – Summary and Recommendations

This report summarises the responses received to consultation and how these have informed the final Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document which is proposed for adoption.

**Recommendations:**

Cabinet is requested to:

- a) Adopt the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas Supplementary Planning Document attached as appendix 2,
- b) Note the representations received to public consultation on the draft Stanmore and Edgware Conservations Areas SPD, provided at Appendix 1, and Council's response to the individual comments made.
- c) Note that the conservation area boundaries for the Little Common Conservation Area and Old Church Lane Conservation Area have been altered, and new Article 4(2) directions have been proposed for Old Church Lane, Stanmore Hill, Kerry Avenue and Canons Park conservation areas.
- d) Delegate authority to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regeneration to make typographical corrections and any other necessary non-material amendments to the SPD prior to formal publication of the SPD.

**Reason: (For recommendation)**

To ensure that when adopted the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications The SPD will also provide useful guidance to relevant Council departments when dealing with issues relating to Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas (CAs).

**Section 2 – Report****Introduction**

1. Work commenced in 2006 to prepare Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to cover geographical clusters of Conservation Areas within the borough, which include appendices of conservation area appraisals and management strategies. Following the adoption of the Harrow on the Hill, and Pinner SPDs, the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD is next to be completed.

2. The SPD for the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas will ensure the special architectural and historic interest of these areas, which add to the attractiveness of the borough as a place to live, is conserved.

## **Options considered**

3. The Council, at its Strategic Planning Advisory Panel meeting of 18 July 2006, agreed that Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) would be produced to cover the boroughs 28 Conservation Areas (CAs). To date, SPDs have been produced for Harrow on the Hill, and Pinner CAs. Not to produce an SPD for the Stanmore and Edgware CAs would be inconsistent with the approach adopted elsewhere and represent a gap in the guidance framework, with regard to these six Conservation Areas.

## **The Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas**

4. Work on the Stanmore and Edgware CAs SPD commenced in 2012 and covers six conservation areas:

- Little Common;
- Stanmore Hill;
- Old Church Lane;
- Canons Park;
- Edgware High Street; and
- Kerry Avenue.

5. A Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) is required for each of the above areas. The new CAAMS have been revised and updated accordingly from the previous CAAMS that were adopted for Old Church Lane and Edgware High Street CAs and the older policy statements produced from 1990 to 2003 for the other Stanmore and Edgware CAs.

6. The Stanmore and Edgware CAs SPD intends to link all six areas by providing a strategic overview of the issues affecting the CAs to inform guidance that will assist in their preservation and enhancement.

## **Consultation undertaken**

7. In accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 the draft SPD was subject to public consultation. On 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 Cabinet approved the draft Stanmore and Edgware for public consultation for a period of 6 weeks through June and July. This is longer than the statutory requirement of four weeks to encourage consultation responses on this document as the individual CAAMS will not be subject to a separate additional phase of consultation to the SPD.

8. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with Council Statement of Community Involvement and included:

- A public notice in the Harrow Observer newspaper;
- Notification letters were sent to ward Councillors, amenity groups (including the Canons Park Residents Association, the Stanmore Society and the Stanmore and Harrow Historical Society), the

Conservation Area Advisory Committee and other stakeholders, including the North London Collegiate School;

- The draft SPD was published electronically on the Council's website and on the Council's consultation portal; and
- A paper copy was placed on deposit at the Stanmore and Civic Centre libraries and at reception at Civic 1.

9. A public meeting was also held where the conservation officer attended with a paper copy of the document and there was an opportunity to provide comments and discuss the document in person. The Conservation Team also offered to hold separate meetings with interested parties to discuss the document.

## **Results of the Public Consultation**

10. A total of 27 responses were received. These are reproduced in full, alongside the Council's response, in the 'Schedule of Consultation Responses at Appendix A to this report. The main issues raised are summarised below.

### Overarching Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD

11. There were six responses to the overarching Stanmore and Edgware CAs SPD. English Heritage responded to state that they support the document as they 'welcome production of this SPD which will assist the borough in conserving and managing the conservation areas concerned'. Their two requests for amendments were made as they requested the document's definition of setting be amended to reflect the National Planning Policy Framework's definition and that reference to Conservation Area Consent be omitted once it was merged with Planning Permission when the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act came into force. They also confirmed that a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not required.

12. The President of the Stanmore Society responded to provide minor factual corrections, which were duly made and to state he welcomed the document as an 'extremely useful document' that he agrees with. Another resident responded to query why Wood Lane was not referenced as a busy traffic route which has now been addressed.

13. Two residents responded to state that breaches of planning enforcement need to be enforced otherwise the document is worthless. However, sections 8.7 to 8.14 already discuss enforcement measures and their importance so no further changes were required to the document. The list of breaches of planning control provided was passed to enforcement.

### Stanmore Hill Conservation Area

14. There were 13 respondents about the Stanmore Hill CA. The President of the Stanmore Society stated that Green Lane is a very busy road. This is now referenced in paragraph 2.25. Concern was expressed over a forthcoming proposal for a supermarket near the CA. It was not considered necessary to amend the document since it already outlines the need and how, to assess proposals in terms of their impact on the setting of this CA within

section 2.4.6. It is beyond the scope of this document to assess individual planning proposals. The respondent also stated that traffic lights at the bottom of Stanmore Hill were poorly arranged but this is well beyond the conservation area boundary and therefore not relevant to the consultation. Nevertheless the matter was referred to transport for their consideration and records.

15. Three responses were received from local residents who have entered the Council scheme to 'Adopt-a-Bed' and look after public areas of green space. They objected to proposals for the management of the green between Stanmore Hill and Green Lane which were to re-site benches and change a hedge for the green space. They suggested alternative ways to manage this green. The suggestions were therefore amended in line with these requests. Another resident responded to state the grass at the top of Green Lane is not being cut. The management of green spaces is already reported as an issue in the document and this specific concern has been reported to parks.

16. Three residents expressed concern with the proposed traffic calming which would affect the conservation area. The conservation team though considers these proposals would be sympathetic to the character of the conservation area and a separate consultation was carried out on this matter by Highways and so their responses have been forwarded to the Highways department to consider as part of this. Therefore no amendments were made to the document to address this point. Two requested the level of controls attached to Woolombe Cottage to be reduced as it does not have features in keeping with others in the area. However, the Council considers it important to retain the existing level of conservation area controls relating to this building since it is sited in the midst of the conservation area so it is very sensitive to any changes due to the impact this would have on the wider area. Therefore no amendments were made to the draft document in response to this request and an explanation for this was provided to the consultees that made this request.

17. One resident made enquires as to the controls that listing have on their building, how to apply to de-list it and sources of funding. These comments do not concern the document directly and so information provided directly to them in response. Another responded to say that parking is an issue near the Abercorn which is now identified by the draft document. One resident expressed regret that street cleaners have been taken away from the Stanmore shops and another that there is not a crossing beyond the library and Bushey Heath. Both these matters are well beyond the conservation area boundaries and do not directly concern this document so no amendments have been made to the document. The matters have been referred to street cleansing and traffic as appropriate.

18. One resident expressed concern that there would be proposals to redevelop the site of the Studio, Stanmore Hill shortly and if it was proposed to be converted to a dwelling house this would not be in keeping with the area given the need to retain the greenery. It is not considered necessary to make any amendments to the document in response to this as the general area is already identified by the document for the importance of its greenery (see section 2.2.8) and it is beyond the scope of this document to comment on specific planning proposals.

19. A member of the Stanmore Society stated that there ought to be a limit to the height of the trees to help protect views but there is no legal limit to the height of trees and it is beyond the scope of this document to provide comment on this matter.

20. Otherwise, comments received from two local residents made minor factual corrections (since made to the document), commented on the increased traffic over the years along Green Lane (now referenced within the document) and commented that they expect this document to have been drafted at great cost to the Council via external consultants. It is noted though that the document was created in house.

#### Little Common Conservation Area

21. Five responses were received about Little Common CA. A member of the Little Common Residents Association responded to highlight various issues within the CA namely: potholes in the gravelled area, redundant signposts excessive signposts, more unauthorised satellite dishes, a picnic table from around the ponds being stolen on the far side near the rugby club and not replaced and a permanent problem of the clutter of cars parked around Little Common and associated request for yellow lines. These issues and possible solutions are now referenced within the document (sections 1.3.2 and 1.4.2) and have been referred, where relevant, to Highways, Parks and Planning Enforcement teams. The picnic table is being replaced by the Council as part of the Green Grid project. It was also reported that concrete posts are missing from the grassed area outside Raw Lasan restaurant so this is now referenced within the document along with a recommendation for new timber posts. Smells from Raw Lasan restaurant were also reported. This is an ongoing matter with environmental health that is beyond the scope of this document, so no amendments were made. It was further reported that the former scout hut/mission hall had been broken in to and derelict for years with no action from the Council on an application to use the Scout Hut as an Arts Centre. The disuse and condition of the former scout hut/mission hall is now explained more thoroughly as an issue affecting the conservation area within section 1.3.2 and reference is now made to the need to consult with property services for a solution. A new hand car wash in the Raw Lasan car park was also reported. This is an existing planning enforcement case though so no amendments were made to the document. It was also reported that grass cutting is not well organised which has been referred to Parks.

22. The President of the Stanmore Society responded to express concern over the proposals to move the entrance for the new RNOH redevelopment into Wood Lane since this would increase traffic to 'unmanageable levels'. It is beyond the scope of this document to comment on specific planning proposals and so this issue was reported direct to the case officer. The issue of traffic along Wood Lane is already referenced in the draft document. He requested that reference be made to the Wood Farm development where the site has been sold off making part of the land accessible farm land which is now done in section 1.59.

23. A representative of the Elm Park Residents Association responded to report some unauthorised works towards Cloisters Wood. This has been referred to enforcement and requires no amendment to the document. They also commented that they had objected to a proposal on Wood Farm which was approved planning permission. This comment is not relevant to the document so no amendment was made to the document.

24. A local resident responded to request that their home be put forward for national listing. The document now suggests this building is considered for being put forward for listing to English Heritage within sections 1.3.2 and 1.4.2 following careful research, and guidance was provided to the respondent on how they could put it forward directly themselves.

### Canons Park Conservation Area

25. Five responses were received about the Canons Park Estate CA. The Chairman of the Canons Park Estate Association responded to state that he is 'broadly in agreement with the Management Proposals'. He stated he would prefer it if dormers were encouraged rather than skylights. However, the document thoroughly justifies its preference for skylights. In terms of windows and doors he stated his support for the proposed controls and that timber should be used wherever possible instead of UPVC. This support requires no amendment to the document. He stated that whilst replacement of garage doors is discouraged by implication in the document he has no objection to the garage doors being replaced as long as the look of the windows used to replace the doors is sympathetic, since many of the existing are of an unsuitable size. The document thoroughly explains and justifies its preference for the retention of garage doors. He stated that enforcement is vital and there are too many examples where this has not been implemented. The importance of enforcement is already referenced within the overarching SPD and this appendix.

26. Two residents who are members of the Canons Park Residents Association responded to state they support the proposed article 4 direction for windows. They also requested the extension of the CA to include Cavendish and Dorset Drive. However, the proposed extension of the CA is not considered appropriate since the buildings in these areas are not as of good or cohesive quality as those within the CA so would undermine the CA's value therefore this request has not been taken forward. The residents requested that they be on the Canons Park Estate Association list which has been done.

27. One resident responded to express his full support for the importance of conservation. However, whilst they support the proposed controls for removal of chimneys on Canons Drive, he stated he felt this is less relevant for the offshoots of Canons Drive, particularly 2 Rose Garden Close which is a one off Modernist design without a chimney. The document already omits proposals for such controls along Lake View which is most altered already but explains and justifies proposals for such controls within the rest of the CA. It specifically excludes the Modernist house on Rose Garden Close as part of the proposed controls for roof alterations since such controls are not relevant for a building of this design. The resident also suggested the existing planning

restriction relating to hardsurfacing on Canons Drive should be retained but that it is less relevant for the offshoot roads since soft landscaping has been lost already in places. However, recent appeal decisions have supported the importance of this planning restriction within offshoot roads of Canons Drive and so this restriction remains in place.

28. One resident responded to state that Canons Drive and surrounding roads have been spoiled by the introduction of a controlled parking zone which is more harmful than any building alterations and that if this is not addressed the area should be de-designated as a conservation area. This view is not supported by the Council since whilst it has brought additional signage and road lines these do not conflict with the CA character as this is kept to a minimum and is necessary for safety reasons and so no amendments have been made.

29. Another resident responded to provide factual corrections which were made.

### Kerry Avenue Conservation Area

30. Six responses were received about the Kerry Avenue CA. One local resident thanked the conservation team for our efforts stating also 'It is much appreciated especially since we are so keen to preserve this wonderful conservation area'.

31. Three local residents, one stating they represented 1-32 Kerry Court, responded to outline a problem and issue within the conservation area which is minicab parking because they use the area in Kerry Court and Kerry Avenue to dump rubbish including non-biodegradable items and use the area as a car park. It was stated that this is particularly true since the Station no longer allows the taxis to wait there and that parking restrictions are ignored and the traffic warden's efforts ineffectual. It was reported that the bin nearby is not cleared out enough. It was suggested that the non-conservation area areas be used for this parking instead by restricting commercial vehicles parking in the conservation area. It was also reported that it of concern that over the last 2 years there has been a vast increase in traffic parking in Kerry Avenue South and Kerry Court as they introduce rubbish and create an eyesore about the once pretty central green that lent the conservation area a 'boulevard' feel and also to the semi-circular green with its established trees on Kerry Court. It was stated that past efforts to suggest that this area might better be designated a discrete and separate parking zone are worthy of revisiting.

32. One of these local residents reiterated and expanded upon these complaints in two further responses. She stated when there is a Wembley event such problems worsen and fire engines and ambulances can't get it. The matter with the excessive parking has been ongoing since 2008, worsening over the last two years. This resident stated in her third response she was representing Kerry Avenue and Kerry Court residents. She stated that Kerry Avenue is designated a parking rank for different firms of taxis. It was recommended that Morecambe Gardens be used instead and that they be banned from the conservation area. Reference is therefore now made to



the volume of parking, particularly taxis, and the issue of litter as an issue within the CA and recommendations are made for managing this in consultation with Highways. This matter has been referred to them.

#### Old Church Lane Conservation Area

33. A representative of the Elm Park Residents Association responded to state that the new doorway proposed in a recent Listed Building Consent and Planning Application for safety reasons is inappropriate as this is the longest unbroken stretch of wall around. The Listed Building Consent application for this was determined in line with national and local listed building and CA policy and public consultation and is not a matter for this document. The president of the Stanmore Society responded to comment that he was not sure if the former park shelter was originally intended as Cow Sheds or just intended to mimic them.

#### Edgware High Street Conservation Area

34. One resident responded to state that the fruit and vegetable store on the corner of Edgware High Street and Whitchurch Lane has encroached out onto the pavement. This matter is already with the planning enforcement team and the importance of the open space in front of shops is already referenced in the draft document, so no amendments were made in this instance.

### **Current situation**

35. The SPD has been revised in line with the above feedback and comments used to strengthen the document. The full results of the public consultation and how these have been addressed in finalising the SPD are presented in appendix 2.

36. In addition to those above, two further changes were made to the document. One is that in response to a listing assessment by English Heritage, the Old Church Lane CA is now being extended to include the old coach house. This is because English Heritage's report of 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2013 concerning the proposed listing of the coach house stated that although it was not worthy of national listing, the building has 'group value' in relation to the Manor House and Gate House within the CA and is itself of local interest 'as a purpose-built inter-war garage and chauffeur's flat associated with the Manor House'. The second is that one more Article 4 direction is proposed now for number 147 Stanmore Hill. This would bring the planning controls for it in line with its neighbours to similarly protect features of interest, namely roof tiles, windows, front boundary treatment and its front garden.

37. Once adopted the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD will form a material consideration in the determination of planning applications both at planning committees and appeal proceedings. The SPD will also provide useful guidance to relevant Council departments when dealing with issues relating to Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas (CAs).

## **Legal Implications**

38. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) states that, if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

39. Although the proposed SPD is not a development plan document it will, upon adoption, be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications affecting the conservation areas.

40. The Council is required under the Town and Country Planning (Local Plan) (England) Regulations 2012 to consult on the SPD and to take into account all consultation responses received before adopting the SPD. Upon adoption, the Stanmore and Edgware Conservations Areas Supplementary Planning Document will form part of Harrow's formal planning policy.

## **Financial Implication**

41. The costs of adopting the SPD, and publishing it online is a relatively minor cost which can be adequately contained within the existing LDF budget.

## **Performance Issues**

42. Harrow has a total of 28 Conservation Areas across the borough. 20 of these (71%), currently have an up-to-date Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, and are afforded weight as a material planning consideration. The adoption of the Stanmore and Edgware SPD will add a further six conservation areas to this list, bringing the figure of CAs in active management by the Council up to 93%.

## **Environmental Impact**

Does the proposal comply with all relevant environmental legislation? Yes

43. The policies that the SPD supplements have been the subject of a comprehensive Sustainability Appraisal, incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment, in compliance with the regulatory requirements for preparing local plan documents. The government has confirmed that, where the parent policy has been appraised, it is not necessary to appraise any guidance that simply seeks to give effect to the policy.

44. However, for completeness, in the course of preparing the SPD the Council undertook a screening opinion on the SPD and consulted English Heritage who confirmed that a Strategic Environmental Assessment was not required.

## Risk Management Implications

Risk included on Directorate risk register? No

Separate risk register in place? No

## Equalities implications

Was an Equality Impact Assessment carried out? No

45. By definition, supplementary planning documents cannot introduce new policies nor modify adopted policies and do not form a part of the development plan. Rather, their role is to supplement a 'parent' policy in a development plan document. The SPD supplements Policy DM7 of the Local Plan, which has already been the subject of a full equalities impact assessment at each formal stage in the policy's preparation.

## Corporate Priorities

46. The adoption of the Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD contributes to the corporate priority of a fairer Harrow by ensuring the heritage assets within these six conservation areas are appropriately managed and conserved for future generations to enjoy and appreciate. It also brings these conservation areas into line with the management arrangements already in place for the Harrow on the Hill and Pinner conservation areas.

## Section 3 - Statutory Officer Clearance

Name: Jessie Mann	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Chief Financial Officer
Date: 14 November 2013		
Name: Abiodun Kolawole	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	on behalf of the Monitoring Officer
Date: 15 November 2013		

## Section 4 – Performance Officer Clearance

Name: Martin Randell



on behalf of the  
Divisional Director  
Strategic  
Commissioning

Date: 12 November 2013

## Section 5 – Environmental Impact Officer Clearance

Name: Andrew Baker



on behalf of the  
Corporate Director  
(Environment &  
Enterprise)

Date: 12 November 2013

## Section 6 - Contact Details and Background Papers

**Contact:** Lucy Haile, Principal Conservation Officer  
Tel: 020 8736 6101

**Background Papers:** 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 Cabinet Report on the draft Stanmore and Edgware Conservation Areas SPD  
<http://www.harrow.gov.uk/www2/documents/s104747/Stanmore%20Edg%20CA%20-%20SPD.pdf>

**Call-In Waived by the  
Chairman of Overview  
and Scrutiny  
Committee**

**NOT APPLICABLE**

*[Call-in applies]*