

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

**DRINKWATER ROAD, COLES CRESCENT, RAYNERS  
LANE ESTATE**

**1/01  
P/1468/05/DET/TW  
Ward: ROXBOURNE**

DETACHED 4 STOREY BLOCK OF 24 FLATS AND 3 TWO  
STOREY HOUSES WITH ROOF ACCOMMODATION  
(REVISED DESIGN)

MEPK ARCHITECTS for WARREN HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: P-02, -03, -04, -05, -06, -07, -08

**APPROVE** details of siting, access, design and external appearance

#### 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
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- T13 Parking Standards

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of the Area
- 2) Car Parking
- 3) Legal Agreement
- 4) Amenity of Neighbours
- 5) Consultation Responses

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard: )
	Justified: ) See Report
	Provided: )
Site Area:	0.317ha.
No. of Residential Units:	39
Density:	123 dph
Council Interest:	Proposal involves the redevelopment of Council-owned land

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- application relates to an area of the Rayners Lane Estate at its south eastern end at the junctions of Coles Crescent with Drinkwater Road and Eliot Drive

**c) Proposal Details**

- details of reserved matters, pursuant to outline approval W/112/02/FUL
- demolition of existing buildings and construction of 36 flats and a terrace of 3 houses
- the flats would be accommodated within 2 x 4-storey blocks, one containing 24 flats (for rent), the other containing 12 flats (for sale)

**d) Relevant History**

W/112/02/OUT	Outline: Regeneration of estate, demolition of 515 flats, construction of 329 houses, 406 flats, with parking, community building, public open space	GRANTED SUBJECT TO S106 AGREEMENT 16-OCT-02
P/2393/04/DET	Two x 4 storey detached blocks to provide 36 flats and 3 x two storey terraced dwellings with car parking	APPROVED 11-NOV-04

**e) Consultations**

EA: Awaited  
TWU: Awaited

**Advertisement** Major Development Expiry  
21-JUL-05

**Notifications** Sent 9 Replies Awaited Expiry  
19-JUL-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of the Area**

As was acknowledged at the outline stage, the proposed redevelopment as a whole provides the opportunity to address a number of current concerns with the estate – improving housing conditions, providing accommodation better suited to residents needs and, by radically changing the built form and layout, making better use of the site to secure an addition to the Borough's housing stock.

The design of the proposed flats varies from that previously approved in the form of the roof. The previous approval included a hipped, tiled roof whereas the current scheme proposes gabled ends. Other elevational changes include alterations to the location of windows and balconies.

With regard to the terrace of 3 houses, the current scheme proposes a wider dormer to the front elevation (2.5m compared to 1.9m).

continued/

**2) Car Parking**

A total of 39 spaces are proposed for the 39 units. A recent survey of car ownership within the estate has shown an ownership of 174 cars for 259 households i.e. a rate of 0.67 cars per household. The outline approval contained provision for 1.4 spaces for the properties for sale and 0.8 spaces per dwelling for the remainder. Therefore 19 spaces would be required for the rented properties and 16 for the properties for sale. This application is therefore in accord with the outline approval.

**3) Legal Agreement**

As this application is for reserved matters pursuant to the outline consent, if approved, the development would be subject to the legal agreement, which controls such matters as affordable housing, public open space, community building and training and employment.

**4) Amenity of Neighbours**

The massing and siting of the proposed buildings is as envisaged during consideration of the outline application.

**5) 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 approval.

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLINGS AND REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 12 TWO STOREY HOUSES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for CLEARVIEW HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS; 04/2309/6b, 7a, 9, 10, 11

**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 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 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 5 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 6 Landscaping to be Approved
- 7 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 8 Levels to be Approved
- 9 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/wastehas 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.
- 10 Water Storage Works

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1354/05/CFU continued.....

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

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

T13 Parking Standards

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Planning History
- 2) Character of the Area
- 3) Amenity of Neighbours
- 4) Highways/Parking
- 5) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	max 18
	Justified:	18
	Provided:	21
Site Area:	0.34ha	
No. of Residential Units:	12	
Density:	35 dwellings per hectare. 126 habitable rooms per hectare.	
Council Interest	None	

**b) Site Description**

- land formed by parts of rear gardens of nos. 11-29 Alexandra Avenue
- the site adjoins rear gardens of houses on Somervell Road, Balmoral Road and Alexandra Avenue
- the site is irregular in shape and measures approximately 70m from north to south and 45m west to east

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolish nos. 19 and 21 Alexandra Avenue to form access into the site
- construction of 12 houses in 4 terraces
- provision for 21 car parking spaces is proposed, 4 within garages
- the house would be traditional in design with pitched tiled roofs

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1354/05/CFU continued.....

- the houses would be arranged around a central access area with rear gardens of 14m to 17m in depth

**d) Relevant History**

P/2684/04/CFU Demolition of existing dwellings and redevelopment to provide 14 two storey terraced houses with access and parking REFUSED 09-DEC-04

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The density of the development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the properties in the surrounding area by reason of noise and disturbance generated by the number of units on the site.
2. The proposal represents a backland development to the detriment of the status of similarly situated sites in the locality, which will give rise to an increase in such developments since a precedent would have been set.”

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

This application follows the recent Inspector’s Decision, where the single area of concern was the proximity of the proposed Plots 1 and 14 to the rear of the existing properties 15 & 17 Alexandra Avenue;

To overcome this issue, we have reduced the number of properties by two, which has resulted in a significant increase in the rear to flank distances;

We have also included a dropped eaves feature to the proposed Plots 1 and 12;

We consider that this addresses the Inspector’s concerns;

**f) Consultations**

EA: Unable to respond

TWU: No objection

**Advertisement** Major Development Expiry  
07-JUL-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
84 51 29-JUN-05

**Summary of Responses:** Noise and pollution, loss of openness, loss of light, loss of privacy, increased traffic/ congestion, lack of parking, out of character, pressure on local services, affect water pressure, flooding, impact on wildlife, will set a precedent.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Planning History**

A specifically comparable development for 14 dwellings (P/2684/04/CFU) was previously refused by the Development Control Committee at the December, 2004 meeting. For reference the officer’s recommendation to support the proposal was overturned. Following the refusal, an appeal was lodged with the Planning Inspectorate. Although the Planning Inspector determined to uphold the Appeal due to one specific ground, concern however was not raised with the overall principle of the development on the subject site.

continued/

The Inspector's views are clear from the following paragraph: *"The Council, supported by many local residents, argues that the proposal would bring about a level of activity that would have a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. However, the gardens in this part of Alexandra Avenue are substantial and I see no objection, in principle, to the redevelopment of the appeal site for housing. In view of the relatively large gardens of many nearby properties the open spacious character of the area would be maintained. Further, the access would be well landscaped and not material parking or traffic problems would arise in the slip road alongside Alexandra Avenue"*.

The only aspect that the Inspector was not supportive of was with respect of the setback between the rear elevations of Nos 15, 17 & 25 Alexandra Avenue and the proposed houses No 1 & 14. With respect of this issue it was stated: *"the rear elevation of Nos 15 & 17 Alexandra Avenue would only be some 20 metres from the north-east elevation of house No 1 and the rear elevation of No 25 a similar distance from house No 14. I consider that the relatively short separation distance would mean that the occupiers of these properties in Alexandra Avenue would have a poor outlook. The proximity of the flank walls of the proposed houses would mean that the outlook would be limited and oppressive. Moreover, this part of the development would be at odds with the relatively spacious surroundings and would appear cramped. This harm the character of the locality"*.

Having regard to the Inspectors comments, the current scheme has been redesigned by reducing the number of dwellings from 14 to 12, and specifically increasing the setback from the rear elevations of the dwellings at, 15, 17 & 25 Alexandra Avenue. Plot 1 would now increase the setback from the rear elevation of 15 & 17 Alexandra Avenue by 4 metres at ground floor level and 6.5 metres at upper floor level. Equally Plot 12 would now increase the setback from the rear elevation of 25 Alexandra Avenue by 3.7 metres at ground floor level and 6.5 metres at upper floor level. Apart from some very minor modifications to the layout of the scheme it is predominantly the same as previously proposed.

It is considered that these increases in setback from the rear elevations of 15, 17 & 25 Alexandra Avenue are ample to address and overcome the Planning Inspector's concerns.

## **2) Character of the Area**

Due to the 14 metre width of the access way, the proposed access road would have generous amounts of landscaping to either sides to enable sufficient adjacent planting. This would ensure that the development presents an acceptable appearance in the streetscene.

The form and massing of the revised development proposes buildings that would relate to the existing two storey houses within the surrounding area. As such the new buildings would not appear incongruous or out of place.

continued/

Sufficient space around the buildings would remain in order to provide a good setting and adequate areas of amenity space would be provided. Likewise as is detailed earlier in the report, in specific response to the comments of the Planning Inspector, the setbacks between the proposed plots 1 & 12 have been increased from the dwellings at 15, 17 & 25 Alexandra Avenue. This is considered to have significantly improved the setting of the proposed scheme.

**3) Residential Amenity**

Buffer zones of between 4 and 5 metres in width are proposed between the access road and the flank boundaries of nos. 17 and 23 Alexandra Avenue that could accommodate generous amounts of planting. It is considered that the limited amount of activity and the landscaping of these areas would combine to preserve the amenity of those neighbours.

The rear elevations of proposed plots 1-7 would be sited between 35m and 46m from the rear elevation of houses on Somervell Road. This is considered to be an ample horizontal separation distance. Likewise the rear gardens of these plots would be between 14m and 17m in depth to provide a positive level of amenity for future occupants.

The rear elevation of proposed plots 8-12 would be sited at a distance of 14m and 15m from the site boundary and would not face any existing houses. The resultant rear gardens again would provide a positive level of amenity for future occupants.

The proposed flanks of the plots 1, 7, 8 & 12 are proposed to reduce in scale to single storey level and set away from the site boundaries. Generally, the two storey flank walls would be between 4m and 8m from the site boundaries. Generally the single storey flank walls would be between 1.5m and 5.5m from the site boundaries.

It is considered that the amenity of neighbours would not be comprised by the proposed development, and the scheme has been revised in line with the previous comments of the Planning Inspectorate.

**4) Highway/Parking**

A satisfactory level of parking is proposed in a form which would not result in an excess of hardsurfacing nor would it impact on the amenity of neighbours. The proposed access to the slip road serving other residential properties is considered safe and would not introduce problems of capacity.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Noise and pollution	)	
Loss of openness	)	
Loss of light	)	
Loss of privacy	)	Addressed above
Increased traffic/ congestion	)	
Lack of parking	)	
Out of character	)	

continued/



Item 1/02 – P/1354/05/CFU continued.....

Pressure on Local Services	- would not, as very limited increase in numbers;
Affect water pressure	- not a material planning consideration;
Flooding	- Thames Water did not object to the scheme;
Impact on wildlife	- ample space is proposed around the buildings;
Will set a precedent	- each application assessed on individual merit;

**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.

---

**BIRO HOUSE, TXU SITE & ARCHES, STANLEY ROAD,  
SOUTH HARROW**

**1/03  
P/1233/05/CFU/TEM  
Ward: ROXBOURNE**

REDEVELOPMENT: 1 BLOCK OF 3/5/6/7 STOREYS, 1  
BLOCK OF 3/4-180 FLATS (51 AFFORDABLE); OFFICES;  
PARKING USE OF 11 ARCHES A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2  
USES (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

REBEKHA JUBB for BARRATT HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04033/12, 14, 35B, 36B, 37B, 38B, 39B, 40B, 41B, 42B, 43B, 44B, 48, 50A,  
51A, 52A, 53A, 54A, 55A, 57, 58, 59, 65, 66, 67, 71, BAR/40852/1A, 2A.

Inform the applicant that:

1. The proposal is acceptable subject to A) the direction of the Greater London Authority, and B) the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:-
  - i) developer shall fund all costs of public consultation, analysis, reporting and implementation of a possible extension to the local controlled parking zone, at any time within 3 years of 75% occupation of the development if, in the Council's opinion, a monitoring period shows unacceptable on-street parking, up to a maximum amount of £30,000 index linked.
  - ii) approval and implementation of a travel plan (to include an annual review) prior to occupation of the development.
  - iii) developer shall complete the approved conversion works to the arches and adjacent access way no later than the occupation of a maximum of 115 residential units on the site
  - iv) developer shall not commence the development or any part thereof unless and until:
    - a) details of off site foul and surface water drainage have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Sewerage Undertaker and
    - b) arrangements have been made to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Sewerage Undertaker for the provision of adequate foul and surface water drainage for the whole of the development. Such drainage should be secured where appropriate by means of a public sewer requisition pursuant to Sections 98 to 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

2. A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued only upon the completion, by the applicant, of the aforementioned legal agreement.

**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 surfacingThe 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 demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (b) the boundaryof the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.

REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 4 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.
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 8 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/

- 9 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, 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.
- 10 Before the development is commenced a detailed site investigation shall be carried out to establish if the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and nature of the contamination present, and to determine its potential for the pollution of the water environment. The method and extent of this site investigation shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) prior to commencement of the work. Details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of groundwater and surface water, including provisions for monitoring, shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before development commences. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved, and shall be fully implemented and completed before occupation of the development.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 11 No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of groundwater.
- 12 The construction of the surface water drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before the development commences.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.
- 13 Surface water source control measures shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before development commences.  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality.
- 14 Development shall not commence until details of on site drainage works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No works which result in the discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be commenced until the on site drainage works referred to above have been completed.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory drainage facilities.

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

- 15 Water Storage Works
- 16 A schedule of improvement works to the appearance of the viaduct and spur, including a timetable for implementation of the works, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council before commencement of the development hereby approved. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.  
REASON: To improve the appearance of the development.
- 17 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory parking facilities.
- 18 The eleven units hereby permitted within the archways shall be restricted to occupation within the Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and D2. Of the eleven units no more than 4 shall be operated as an A1 use and a total of no more than 2 as A3 or A4 uses without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure that there will be no detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of nearby A1, A3 and A4 uses within South Harrow Town Centre.
- 19 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of any external works required for ventilation and fume extraction have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use shall not commence until those external works have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. The works shall thereafter be retained in that form.  
REASON: To safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring residents and the appearance of the building.
- 20 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 21 Insulation of Buildings - 3
- 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 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
  - 6 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld.  
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.

continued/

- 7 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.  
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.
- 8 Culverted watercourses should not be built over, but should ideally be opened up and a feature made of the site. The Agency should be consulted to discuss any such proposals. The applicant should note that under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act (1991) the prior written consent of the Agency is required for certain works which may affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse.  
Contact Development Control Officer, Lydia Bruce-Burgess on 01707 632402 for further details.
- 9 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approximately 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 10 Notwithstanding the granting of planning permission, the applicant is required to gain approval from the Council as Land Drainage Authority under Land Drainage By-laws for any development within 5m of the watercourse which crosses the site, and for any surface water discharges or indirectly into any watercourse in the Borough.
- 11 **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  
ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
SC1 Provision of Community Services  
SEM2 Hierarchy of Town Centres  
EP12 Control of Surface Water Run-Off  
EP14 Development within Areas at risk from Sewerage Flooding  
EP22 Contaminated Land  
EP25 Noise  
EP48 Public Open Space  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

D6	Design in Employment Areas
T13	Parking Standards
T15	Servicing of New Developments
H4	Residential Density
H5	Affordable Housing
H6	Affordable Housing Target
H7	Dwelling Mix
EM5	New Large Scale Retail and Leisure and other Development
	EM11 Regeneration Areas
EM12	Small Industrial Units and Workshops
EM14	Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Designated Areas
EM22	Environmental Impact of New Business Development
C2	Provision of Social and Community Facilities
Proposal Site 19	

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Employment Issues (EM11, EM12, EM14, EM22, Proposal Site 19)
  - 2) Retail/Town Centre/Community Policy Issues (SEM2, EM5, SD3, C2)
  - 3) Affordable Housing (H5, H7)
  - 4) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D6, SH1, H4)
  - 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, EP25, EP48)
  - 6) Access and Parking (ST1, T13, T15)
  - 7) Drainage Issues (EP12, EP14, EP22)
  - 8) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Employment Area:	Industrial & Business Use
Car Parking	Standard: Residential: 242
	B1: 1-2
	A1-D2: 1-16
	Justified: See Report
	Provided: Residential: 152
	B1: 15
	A1-D2: 22
Site Area:	1.1 ha
Floorspace:	B1: 560m <sup>2</sup> : Biro House/TXU Site
	A1-A4/B1/D1/D2: 509m <sup>2</sup> : Railway Arches
Habitable Rooms:	488
No. of Residential Units:	180
Density:	163 dph 444 hrph
Council Interest:	None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- area of industrial land between Roxeth Green Avenue and Stanley Road within Brember Road B1, B2, B8 designated area, comprising:
  - Biro House, a vacant 2/3 storey high factory with ancillary offices at the southern end of the site, partly fronting onto Stanley Road and partly located at the rear of houses on the north side of Stanley Road, with access from Stanley Road
  - currently contains 372m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office accommodation plus 2137m<sup>2</sup> of B2 industrial accommodation
  - TXU site, an area of open undeveloped land to the north of Biro House, previously covered with trees and vegetation which have fairly recently been cleared
  - 11 railway arches beneath the elevated Piccadilly underground line with adjacent access and outbuildings, some in use for car related and storage businesses, others vacant, access from Stanley Road and Roxeth Green Avenue
  - truncated elevated railway spur from Piccadilly line which formerly provided rail access into TXU site projects partly over access land next to arches
  - site bounded by premises within the Brember Road Industrial Estate to the east; Roxeth Green Avenue, electricity sub-station and open land behind the Avenue to the north; housing beyond the railway viaduct to the west; and Stanley Road plus houses fronting onto Stanley Road to the south
- site located about 200m from South Harrow District Centre with access via footpath adjacent to railway line

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on the site
- development of 180 flats, 560m<sup>2</sup> B1 office floorspace, and 509m<sup>2</sup> of optional A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 floorspace in following form:
  - 3/4 storey building rear of 94-108 Stanley Road containing 20 flats with roof terrace and play area
  - 3/5/6/7 main building on remainder of Biro House/TXU site to provide 180 flats plus 560m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office floorspace on ground, first and second floors, mostly in 3-storey arch block over access road into site
  - 5/6/7 storey elevation facing railway arches, roof terraces at fifth and sixth floor levels
  - 6/7 storey rear wing across centre of site linking into 5 and 6 storey component adjacent to industrial estate
  - brick and rendered elevations, membrane roof system
  - insertion of pod into each railway arch with glazed frontage to provide 509m<sup>2</sup> of optional A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 floorspace
  - improvement of access in front of arches to provide a new pedestrian walkway between Stanley Road and Roxeth Green Avenue, while retaining elevated railway spur

continued/



Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

- 126 parking spaces in basement beneath main building, plus 41 spaces at ground level within residential site, all accessed from Stanley Road
- 22 spaces in front of arches, 5 accessed from Stanley Road, 17 from Roxeth Green Avenue
- 51 affordable housing units proposed in form of 46 dwellings for rent and 5 as low cost market housing
- overall mix of units comprises 63 x 1 bed x 2 habitable rooms, 106 x 2 bed x 3 habitable rooms, and 11 x 3 bed x 4 habitable rooms
- 1280m<sup>2</sup> amenity space in centre of main building, plus area behind 3/4 storey block
- most flats with patios/balconies plus additional roof terraces
- scheme 'Resident Permit Restricted'

**d) Relevant History**

Biro House

WEST/557/99/FUL	Two detached 3 storey blocks to provide 24 x 2 bed flats with access and parking	APPEAL LODGED AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION
	APPEAL DISMISSED	10-JAN-2000
WEST/743/99/FUL	Two detached 3 storey blocks to provide 24 x 2 bed flats with access and parking	REFUSED 17-DEC-99

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal would result in the loss of land for employment use contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.
2. The development, by reason of size, siting and bulk of buildings, and siting of the car park represents overdevelopment of the site which would have a prejudicial effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3. The proposal fails to make provision for affordable housing, contrary to the Council’s revised policy in this regard.
4. The proposals would be premature in advance of the findings of the South Harrow Study.
5. The proposals would result in an unsatisfactory relationship to the adjoining commercial development which would be detrimental to the amenities of the future residents.
6. The proposals would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality.”

continued/

TXU & Biro House

P/978/03/COU	Outline: redevelopment to provide units for B1 (business) use and 55 live/work units with parking	GRANTED 11-JUL-03
P2519/03/COU	Outline: 190 residential units in 3-8 storey blocks, commercial units and community facilities (Revised)	CURRENT
P/327/04/COU	Outline: Redevelopment for 2808m <sup>2</sup> B1 (business use) and 100 live/work units (8072m <sup>2</sup> ) with parking (Revised)	REFUSED 26-APR-04

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent an overintensive use of the site detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

APPEAL ALLOWED: 30- NOV-04

Application Site

P/3337/04/CFU	Redevelopment: 1 block of 6/7 storeys, 1 block of 3/4/5 storeys to provide to provide 183 flats (53 affordable) offices and car parking, use of 11 arches for A1/A2/A3/D1 use	WITHDRAWN 07-MAR-05
---------------	---	------------------------

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

- Conclusions of Planning Support Statement
  - proposals represent comprehensive redevelopment of site to provide a sustainable mixed use development offering significant benefits for site and surrounding area
  - site in a highly sustainable location and an appropriate high density use for the site must be found. Proposal satisfies all policy objectives of The London Plan and the Harrow UDP. Principle of it being lost from industrial use is already established by previous consents for the site.
- in considering these proposals request that the Council recognise the full extent of benefits offered:
  - existing application site contains buildings that are unsightly and detract from visual amenity of the area;
  - buildings have been largely vacant for some years and a viable alternative use must be found;
  - proposals involve provision of much needed housing development including mix of affordable housing including low cost market housing and six very generous 3 bed flats, which constitutes 30% of the total units;
  - provision is made for replacement office floorspace to compensate for loss of the existing employment uses on the site;
  - change of use of the arches from uses inappropriate for a residential area to attractive mixed retail uses will provide vibrancy to the area;

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

- proposals are at a high density, which is entirely appropriate for the area and makes efficient use of this previously developed site in a sustainable location;
- opening up of a new wider and well lit walkway from Stanley Road to Roxeth Green Avenue will have numerous benefits for the permeability, safety and sustainability of the and the wider area
- conclusions of Transport Assessment
  - Transport Assessment has demonstrated that development proposals for the Biro House Site are acceptable when considering matters of transportation and accessibility.
  - It has been demonstrated that proposals include suitable means of vehicular access to and from public highway while also providing appropriate facilities for access by non-car modes.
  - Development site layout has been designed to reduce car dominance and provide effective pedestrian linkage throughout the site, including the enhanced pedestrian/cycle route along the Railway Arches retail frontage.
  - Car parking on site provided for all land uses in accordance with appropriate standards as set out in the LBH UDP. Suitable provision made for car parking for disabled persons and these are located strategically on the site.
  - Appropriate consideration has been given to servicing needs of the development including access by refuse collection vehicles.
  - It has been demonstrated that while the development will increase traffic movements on Stanley Road, this will be from a very low base level. A series of junction analyses has been undertaken and it was confirmed that additional traffic could be accommodated within the capacity of the surrounding highway network and would not materially impact upon operation of the wider network.
  - Report has demonstrated that predicted increases in traffic resulting from proposed mixed use development is not so significant when compared against potential industrial development on Biro House. Furthermore, such development would generate HGV traffic that would cause blocking which in turn would raise safety concerns regarding reversing of HGVs. Proposed mixed use development would generate very few HGV movements in Stanley Road and therefore would not create such problems.
  - Report has reviewed the site existing accessibility to sustainable modes of travel. It has been determined that availability of London Underground services and a range of bus routes will promote and sustain the use of non-car modes. Further, it has been shown that proposals are in accordance with national and local sustainable transport policy guidance.
- application also accompanied by Ecological Appraisal including Bat Survey, Environmental Noise Survey, Design Statement, Landscape Design Statement, B2/B8 Business/General Industrial Market Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, Access Statement

continued/

**f) Consultations**

Transport for London:	No objection
BAA:	No objection
EA:	Conditions suggested
TWU:	Conditions suggested

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development		Expiry 30-JUN-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 1302	Replies 603	Expiry 16-JUN-05

**Summary of Responses:** Traffic problems and congestion; inadequate local road system; unsightly; eyesore; inadequate local infrastructure and services; increase in litter; traffic vibration and pollution; inadequate on-site parking; on-street parking; harm to character of area; excessive height; loss of light; overshadowing; overlooking, loss of privacy; overdevelopment; inadequate access; unsatisfactory access for emergency vehicles; based on experience would bring social problems; noise, disruption and congestion during construction; loss of industrial land; would increase rat-running traffic; population density already too high; should be limited to 3/4 storeys; light pollution; conflict with UDP; too much redevelopment in area; precedent; noise and disturbance; loss of trees and open space; unacceptable access from Stanley Road; new office space not required; would create inner city feel to area; road rage; support proposals; traffic impact on Roxeth Green Avenue; skyline would be changed; does not utilise modern technology to make development environment friendly; site not suitable or appropriate for proposed development.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Employment Issues**

The application site is identified for employment purposes in the UDP in the following ways.

It is shown as an Industrial and Business Use Area of the Proposals Map and Policy EM14 confirms that its loss from B1, B2 or B8 uses will be resisted.

The land falls within a Regeneration Area under Policy EM11 where comprehensive regeneration will be pursued and proposals creating new jobs will be encouraged.

Proposal Site 19 covers the Biro House and TXU elements of the site and proposes industrial redevelopment in conjunction with the neighbouring Brember Centre which is in Council ownership. Such redevelopment should not take place until a new access road linking the Brember Road Estate with Northolt Road had been provided (as shown on the Proposals Map) in order to remove industrial traffic from Stanley Road.

continued/

The Inspector in dismissing the appeal in 2000 in relation to application WEST/557/99/FUL for the residential redevelopment of Biro House considered the employment status of the land. He acknowledged that the buildings were last occupied in 1996 and there had been problems in letting the premises since 1994. He considered that the condition of the premises and the potential cost of refurbishment indicated that economic re-use of the buildings was unlikely. Notwithstanding these points, however, he considered 'that both visually and physically, the site forms an integral part of the Brember Road Industrial Estate.'

He concluded that, 'while the Brember Road Estate may not be a prime industrial site ... it has an important role to play in the overall economic health of the borough. In addition, approval of the appeal proposal would seriously hinder the Council's ability to revitalise the Estate... As such, the proposal would conflict with the UDP aims of safeguarding industrial and maintaining a range of employment opportunities.'

Although residential accommodation has been permitted on this site by virtue of permissions P/978/03/CFU and P/327/04/COU, it would be provided in the form of live/work units which would contain B1 floorspace.

In the case of P/978/03, 6,072m<sup>2</sup> of B1/C3 floorspace would be provided together with 2,808m<sup>2</sup> of B1 floorspace.

In the case of P/327/04, 8072m<sup>2</sup> of B1/C3 accommodation would be accompanied by 2,808m<sup>2</sup> of B1 floor area. The Inspector who granted this permission in November 2004 concluded that 'the proposed development would result in new job opportunities and help to regenerate the area, in accordance with strategic London policies and with Policies EM11 and EM12 of the Replacement UDP...'

These decisions support the employment allocation of the land.

In order to obtain a commercial view the applicant has provided an assessment of the employment potential of the site, carried out by a local Estate Agent and Surveyor.

The report states that the demand for B2/B8 accommodation is driven by 3 main factors; accessibility, situation and suitability for purpose. There is demand for sites with good access to the road transport system with easy local access for HGVs, a lack of restrictions in terms of working hours or access resulting from proximity to a residential area, and buildings which are suitable for the purpose.

It states that there are current limitations in the demand for premises within the Borough due to poor local infrastructure.

By way of illustration it confirms that in May 2005 there were 55 vacant B2/B8 units in the Borough totalling 10,200m<sup>2</sup> accommodation. The report compares this figure with 7,762m<sup>2</sup> of vacant floorspace in 2002 as shown in the Employment Land Study carried out for the Council by Chestertons. There has therefore been an increase in vacant accommodation of 30% within the last 3 years.

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

The report further states that the lack of speculative development within the Borough in the last 5 year period reflects the lack of demand due to locational factors – largely infrastructure.

With regard to the application site the report concludes that the Council's proposal for speculative industrial redevelopment is unlikely to come forward given the poor immediate access and generally poor infrastructure in the Borough as a whole, and current availability of superior sites elsewhere in northwest/west London. Because of this it is likely that the accommodation on the site would remain redundant for a significant length of time with redevelopment for an industrial use unlikely, should it remain a designated industrial site.

In terms of the use of the site for B1 offices, the report states that South Harrow is very much a secondary/tertiary location for such use. Of the 361,000m<sup>2</sup> office stock within the Borough, 20,500m<sup>2</sup> (5.7%) is currently vacant, 4,000m<sup>2</sup> of which is in South Harrow.

The lack of demand for offices in South Harrow is reflected by Raebarn House being vacant and Templar House being converted to residential. The report concludes that 'as Harrow benefits from a strong supply pipeline of vacant office buildings and sites, it is unlikely that a developer would consider further speculative B1 office development as it is unlikely that such development would be easily occupied in whole or in part, in either the short or longer term or at an economically viable rent.'

Notwithstanding the above the current application seeks to respect the employment allocation of the Biro House/TXU site by proposing 560m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office floorspace, which the applicant states has a confirmed occupier. Assuming an area per employee of 15.1m<sup>2</sup> (Gerald Eve report 'overcrowded, under-utilised or just right?') some 37 jobs would be created, equating to the applicant's estimate of 35 jobs.

This provision would respect the employment allocation of the site. In addition, broad encouragement to the use of industrial land for housing development is given in a January 2005 addition to PPG3. The provision also within this mixed use scheme of housing accommodation would comply with this guidance and sustainable development principles as set down in policies S1 and SD3.

In the light of these considerations the employment component of the application is supported as part of a mixed use residential/employment development on the Biro House/TXU site.

In terms of the Arches, the proposals would create employment uses on this part of the site albeit that they would be different from the existing activities. The applicant estimates that up to 32 jobs could be provided compared with 10 at the moment. Given also that a major improvement in townscape terms would be provided which would benefit the setting of the development it is suggested that the employment implications for this area of the site be accepted.

continued/

**2) Retail/Town Centre/Community Policy Issues**

These issues relate to the various proposed uses for the railway arches which are intended to support the adjacent development as part of a comprehensive and sustainable scheme for this site.

In retail terms the proposals can be accepted provided that they would not harm the retail integrity of nearby South Harrow District Centre. A condition is therefore suggested to limit the number of arches in A1 use to a maximum of 4 and in A3/A4 uses to a maximum of 2, leaving 5 units available for other community/leisure/employment uses. The proposed community uses can be supported in principle in accordance with Policy C2.

**3) Affordable Housing**

The current proposal offer 51 units of affordable housing, which is 28% of total units and 30% of the total proposed habitable rooms.

The proposals offer the minimum percentage of affordable housing as required by Policy H5. The applicants have presented information to justify this on financial and viability grounds.

Further negotiations are continuing in relation to the proposed tenure mix of the affordable housing. The majority of flats have been offered for social rent to be owned and managed by an RSL. This will meet Policy H5 requirements for the units to be provided in perpetuity. Some of the flats have been offered as low cost market housing. This would provide flats sold at a discounted price equivalent to 80% of the open market value. Officers have calculated that the income level required by potential buyers for these units is around £45k per annum. This is above the maximum income level defined in the Council's key worker housing strategy and is considered unaffordable to those on low to moderate incomes working or living in the borough. No details have been received about how these will be made affordable in perpetuity once the original discounted sale has taken place.

Discussions are still taking place with the applicants to see whether the low cost market housing can be replaced with shared ownership or another form of low cost home ownership promoted by RSLs as this does meet Policy H5 requirement to be in perpetuity. Subject to satisfactory resolution of these issues the current proposal is recommended for approval. If appropriate, the suggested head of term for inclusion in the suggested S106 agreement will be reported at the meeting.

**4) Appearance and Character of Area**

The site is within an area of mixed housing and commercial development. The majority of surrounding development is generally 2-storeys in height, although there is a 3-storey office block on the site, and higher buildings within 300m in Northolt Road. In addition, the railway viaduct is some 3 storeys in height. In the light of this, the Inspector who allowed the appeal in relation to P/327/04/COU concluded that blocks of 3, 4 and 6 storeys as shown on an illustrative drawing for mixed uses would not be out of scale or character with the area.

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

In terms of overall scale, this currently approved scheme allows for a total of 10880m<sup>2</sup> floor gross floorspace for the B1 and live/work units, only 2% less than the 11083m<sup>2</sup> area for the equivalent site proposed in this application.

In terms of density, the Inspector supported the provision of 100 live/work units on the land, within the density range in the London Plan for a suburban site within 10 minutes walking distance of a town centre. That range suggests that upper limits of 120 units per hectare and 350 habitable rooms per hectare would be appropriate. These limits are exceeded by these proposals which comprise 163 units per hectare and 444 habitable rooms per hectare.

Unlike the London Plan, however, UDP Policy H4 does not have a maximum density level but relies on other considerations such as design, character and amenity to ensure that an acceptable form of development is proposed while ensuring that the maximum contribution is made by each site to overall housing provision.

In terms of appearance, on the illustrative drawing which accompanied application P/327/04/COU the 6-storey elements were located some 30m from the Stanley Road frontage, with a 4-storey building in between.

In this application a 7-storey element is shown about 30m from Stanley Road, stepping down to 5 and then 3-storeys where it fronts onto the street.

This is considered to provide a satisfactory transition between the domestic scale of the immediate area and the provision of a higher rise form of development on the site as found acceptable by the Inspector. In addition, the sixth floor element is confined to the central part of the elevation facing the viaduct plus a slight return and has less direct impact on the streetscene. The provision of varied building heights as shown would give rise to a building of more interest and variety.

The 6-storey flank wall of the building would be sited over 40m from Roxeth Green Avenue providing sufficient separation distance to impact satisfactorily on the streetscene.

Views into the site would be largely screened by the arch block which, with frontage planting, would provide a distinctive entrance feature. The proposed pedestrian access alongside the railway arches, together with the proposed improvement of the arch units, would significantly improve the appearance of the area, introduce activity and interest and complement the new residential development.

It is suggested therefore that overall an acceptable impact would be provided on the appearance and character of the area.

continued/



**5) Residential Amenity**

The Inspector who allowed appeal P/327/04/CFU considered that 3-storey dwellings within 23m of the rear walls of houses at 92-108 Stanley Road would not result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy, while the new development would almost certainly lead to an improved outlook for residents compared to the present run-down buildings.

In this application, the element behind these houses is confined to 3-storeys at a greater front to back separation distance than shown in the appeal application, some 26-32m.

A car park containing some 28 spaces is shown behind the houses in Stanley Road. Given that the land has previously been used for parking and also that a high brick wall runs along this boundary the scale of the car park is considered acceptable.

The 6/7 storey rear wing would be located between 60 and 70m from the rear boundaries of houses in Roxeth Green Avenue, sufficient to obviate overlooking and preserve outlook.

The linked component which would be adjacent to the industrial estate would screen the adjacent development and thereby benefit the outlook from the main area of amenity space towards the rear of the site.

Amenity levels within the site would also be aided by the provision of roof terraces and balconies, and the provision of a play area. The outlook from houses on the south side of Stanley Road, although changed, would not be unacceptably harmed by virtue of the provision of a new modern building in contrast to the existing industrial structure, and the gradual increase in storey heights.

Dwellings backing onto the industrial estate would be single aspect, thereby preserving outlook. Noise and insulation would be required to protect amenity from adjacent noise generation and appropriate conditions are suggested.

**6) Access and Parking**

This site has good accessibility to public transport in South Harrow District Centre where there are bus and underground services.

In terms of parking, by virtue of the site's location within a Controlled Parking Zone the scheme can be designated 'Resident Permit Restricted'. In these circumstances no objection is raised to the level of parking provision subject to a contribution of £30,000 for a possible CPZ extension into Roxeth Green Avenue should overspill parking occur in that and neighbouring streets, and the provision of a Travel Plan, both to be secured as part of a S106 agreement.

continued/

In terms of access, Proposal Site 19 confirms that redevelopment of the site should not take place until a new access road between the Brember Road Industrial Estate and Northolt Road has been provided. This road is proposed primarily to accommodate industrial/warehousing traffic accessing the Estate. However, the land required for it is in third party ownership and a timescale for its implementation cannot be given, potentially giving rise to a sterilisation of the application site for redevelopment.

The application proposes primarily residential and B1 office development which would generate significantly lower levels of HGV movements than industrial or warehousing uses. In these circumstances and in order to bring the site forward for redevelopment the use of Stanley Road for vehicular access can be accepted in principle. Access by way of a new link across the Brember Centre as proposed in Proposal Site 19 is not considered necessary or appropriate for the proposed form of development.

In detailed terms the submitted Transport Assessment estimates that the development would give rise to the following increases in traffic movements in Stanley Road between the application site and Sherwood Road, from 85 as existing to 183 in the morning peak hour (08.00-09.00), and from 82 as existing to 162 in the evening peak (17.00-18.00).

It should be borne in mind however that usage of the site has virtually ceased and as a consequence current traffic levels are below their historic levels or what they would be if full usage of the site recommenced. When fully operational the site would generate a modest volume of traffic in the peak hours, including potentially a significant proportion of goods vehicles, so that the existing levels are artificially low.

Because of the residents parking bays on each side, Stanley Road has an effective 'running' road width of approximately 4.1m. DB 32 indicates that this is just adequate for 2 private vehicles to pass each other, although it is accepted that some congestion may result.

However, this and the impact of the additional traffic on residential amenity, are not considered sufficient to justify recommending the application for refusal.

**7) Drainage Issues**

The recommendation includes a head of agreement, conditions and informatives suggested by the Environment Agency, Thames Water and the Council's Drainage Services Division.

continued/

**8) Consultation Responses**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| Inadequate local infrastructure and services                                | - | no objection have been received from appropriate statutory and non-statutory consultees |
| Increase in litter  | - | covered by other legislation  |
| Based on experience would bring social problems, road rage                  | - | would not necessarily result from proposals   |
| Noise, disruption and congestion during construction, precedent             | - | not material planning considerations  |
| Does not utilise modern technology to make development environment friendly | - |   |

**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.

---

**205-209 NORTHOLT ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**1/04**

**P/1353/05/CFU/RJS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REDEVELOPMENT: PART SINGLE/PART FOUR STOREY BUILDING, DRINKING ESTABLISHMENT (A4) USE AT BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR, 9 FLATS ON UPPER FLOORS WITH ROOF TERRACE AT REAR (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

MGM ASSOCIATES for MR A SHAH

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS; 9925/P01 Rev A; P02 Rev.A; P03 Rev.A; P04 Rev.A; P05 Rev.A

**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 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 Levels to be Approved
- 5 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.
- 6 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 7 Highway - Approval of Access(es)
- 8 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 9 Contaminated Land - Commencement of Works
- 10 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4

continued/

Item 1/04 – P/1353/05/CFU continued.....

- 11 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 before the buildings 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.

- 12 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.

13 Water - Disposal of Sewage

14 Water Storage Works

15 Restrict Hours on A4 Uses

16 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound

17 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery

- 18 The roof area behind the roof terrace at first floor level shall only be used as a means of escape and not as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 21 – Bottle Recycling  
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 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits

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:

- 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  
D6 Design in Employment Areas  
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-usable Materials in New Development

continued/

T13	Parking Standards
H7	Dwelling Mix
EM13	Land and Buildings in Business Use - Designated Areas
EM25	Food, Drink and Late Night Uses
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Principle of Development (EM13, H7)
  - 2) Character of Area (SD1, SH1, SH2, D4, D5, D6)
  - 3) Mixed Use and Site Layout (D4, D5, D8, C16)
  - 4) Amenity of Neighbours (EP25, EM25)
  - 5) Parking/Highway Safety (T13, D8)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Employment Area:	Business Use Area	
Town Centre		
Car Parking	Standard:	12 for residential dwellings, commercial units to be assessed on merit
	Justified:	4
	Provided:	4
Site Area:	0.07ha	
Habitable Rooms:	23	
No. of Residential Units:	9	
Density:	200 units per ha; 328 rooms per ha.	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- site is located on the east side of Northolt Road between its junctions with South Hill Avenue and Brook Avenue
- the site accommodates 3 derelict 2 storey attached properties and the building formerly accommodated retail at ground floor and residential above
- the overall site extends behind the adjacent buildings on Northolt Road and has a narrow frontage to Brooke Avenue
- a number of derelict outbuildings are located to the southern corner of the site
- all buildings and the overall site is clearly in a state of dereliction, and has been for many years
- site inspections revealed that the site has suffered from incidents of fly tipping in the recent past

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on site
- construction of a 4 storey contemporary styled flat roofed building, with basement to the Northolt frontage of the site, scaling down to a single storey building to the rear of the site

continued/

Item 1/04 – P/1353/05/CFU continued.....

- the uses within the building would accommodate:-
  - an A4 unit at basement level (310m<sup>2</sup> of gross floorspace)
  - an A4 unit at ground floor (334m<sup>2</sup> of gross floorspace)
  - 3 residential dwellings at first floor
  - 3 residential dwellings at second floor
  - 3 residential dwellings at third floor
- vehicular access from Brooke Road to a service area accommodating, 4 on site carspaces (1 disabled bay), refuse store and rear access to the A4 units

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/10632	Outline: Demolition of existing building & erection of 3- storey block of offices with 4 flats over on Northolt Road frontage and 9 flats in Brooke Avenue with parking area	REFUSED 25-FEB-75
LBH/29211	Outline: Three storey bank and office building with car parking	REFUSED 20-FEB-86
P/2461/04/CFU	Redevelopment: detached 2/4 storey building with basement fronting Northolt Road with A3 use and B1 office at basement and ground floors and 11 flats over and detached 2 storey building fronting Brooke Avenue with 2 flats	REFUSED 13-JAN-05

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development fronting Northolt Road by reason of the design, height and general bulk of the front façade and south facing flank elevation, would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with the immediately adjacent neighbouring buildings, and would not respect the scale, massing and form of those properties, to the detriment of the character of the area.
2. The proposed development fronting Brooke Avenue by reason of inadequate design would be out of character with the design and rhythm of the adjoining dwellings in Brooke Avenue and would not respect the scale, massing and form of those properties, to the detriment of the character of the area.
3. The proposed development is representative of an unacceptable overdevelopment as it does not provide for adequate refuse storage for on site uses, and does not provide rear access to allow servicing of the commercial uses, which would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and future residential occupants of the premises.
4. The proposed siting, location and access to the two residential units located to the rear of the main building would result in a poor level of residential amenity for future occupants.
5. Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's requirements in respect 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)."

continued/

**e) Consultations**

EA: No comment  
TWU: No objection

**Advertisement** Major Development Expiry  
21-JUL-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
163 3 06-JUL-05

**Summary of Response:** No need for another drinking establishment; building out of scale with existing buildings, lack of parking, loss of trees, overdevelopment of site.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Principle of Development**

The concept of the redevelopment of the site is one that is specifically encouraged given that a development brief for the entire site of 201-209 Northolt Road was adopted by the Council on 9th September, 2003. Within the document it states: *“The intention of the brief is to guide future redevelopment of the site, providing further guidance on the type and mix of uses, design of building, and standards to be adopted within any redevelopment”*.

**2) Character of Area**

The design brief nominates that with regard to building height that the *“design should relate sympathetically to the surrounding established residential two-storey buildings. A building height of between 2 and 3 and a half stories, with the higher element towards South Hill Avenue is likely to be appropriate”*.

With this statement of the Development Brief, clearly the building fits in with the suggested scale. The main section of the building is three stories, with the parapet height aligning with the height of the ridge of the adjacent building. The fourth level has then been designed in the form of a low scale flat roofed penthouse that has been setback from the main façade of the building and set away from the party wall line to the north east. The vertical height of the building is then one that steps up and provides a positive transition in height from 203 Northolt Road. Furthermore the façade to the south west boundary has been finished as a blank elevation so as it maximise the potential for a future redevelopment of the Fornax and Firkin Public House as a key corner site.

This proposed flank elevation when viewed from South Harrow Station, although prominent, is not considered to be an unduly overbearing element within the street scene, particularly as the building to which it relates is a flat roof building amounting to a height of 12.0 metres. Furthermore the wall will be visually broken up by brickwork with two bandings of contrasting colour.

continued/



Additionally the overall front façade of the building has responded to the adjoining buildings immediately to the north east. Essentially the proposed shop has taken its reference points from the neighbouring building given the fascia sign/ cornice, windows etc and an emphasis on uniform vertical breaks in the façade all mirror the rhythm of the existing shop fronts.

For the above reasons it is considered that the proposed building would comfortably fit into the context and overall character of the streetscape along Northolt Road.

**3) Mixed Use and Site Layout**

Whilst the Development Brief identifies: *“a mix of uses would be appropriate for the site, because of its very good public transport links”*. Therefore the principle of the mixed use as proposed is not being questioned. The combination of 2 large A4 units at ground and basement levels, with 9 residential flats at the 3 levels above is considered to be a reasonable mixture for the size of the site. The commercial units have rear service access to eliminate concerns regarding deliveries, whilst is provided access to the limited amount of on site parking provided. Refuse storage is likewise provided to this rear service area and is sited away from the proposed residential flats and adjoining residential properties to limit off site impacts.

The commercial units have clear and defined entrances that are separate from the residential entrance to the building to ensure a positive sense of address of all occupants and patrons of the site.

With regard to the proposed rear rooftop courtyard, this is considered to be a positive solution to provide outdoor amenity space for the residential units, whilst being clearly separated from the rear commercial service yard. All flats would have easy access to this area, whilst the flat which directly abuts this area would be ensured privacy by the installation of a screen wall.

The loss of trees is considered acceptable to allow access for the proposed development.

**4) Amenity of Neighbours**

The proposed layout in effect has somewhat turned its back on adjoining residential properties located to the south east.

Primarily the windows in the rear elevation of the proposed building face towards the rear service yard of The Fornax and Firkin Public House, however there would be general views out towards the rear gardens of residential properties to the east. With respect of these adjoining residential properties, it is highlighted that there is a horizontal separation distance of approximately 20 metres, which is considered ample distance to alleviate concerns of overlooking.

continued/

Item 1/04 – P/1353/05/CFU continued.....

With respect of potential overlooking from the roof terrace area over of the rear area of the Fornax and Firkin Public House and the rear gardens of residential properties to the east, this would be specifically prevented by the installation of a screen wall. Likewise this screen wall has been sited back from the boundary edge to avoid visual bulk impacts if it were part of a high boundary wall. As such the resultant rear boundary wall would accommodate a height which is considered to be reasonable and would not pose detrimental visual bulk or overshadowing impacts for adjoining properties.

Lastly, to avoid issues with potential amenity impacts of the two A4 Units appropriate conditions relating to hours of operation and noise are proposed.

**5) Parking/ Highway Safety**

Four on site spaces are proposed as part of the scheme, to be accessed via Brooke Avenue. These spaces are proposed to be allocated to the commercial uses on site, which is considered a reasonable solution. With respect of the sites proximity to South Harrow Station and the bus routes along Northolt Road, it has excellent access various modes of public transport. Therefore this is a major factor in favour of the limited amount of parking proposed.

Furthermore it is highlighted that parking restrictions apply within the locality, therefore to prevent further demand for on-street parking, an informative to be included on the planning permit will advise that residential occupiers of the building will be ineligible for residential parking permits. This will then specifically discourage those residents who are not allocated an on site parking space from owning a vehicle. The flow on effect is that whilst 9 flats may be proposed on site, that future residents are ineligible for parking permits, therefore no objection to the application on grounds of insufficient parking provision.

**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.

---

**HARROW VIEW SERVICE STATION, HARROW  
VIEW/VICTOR ROAD, HARROW**

**1/05  
P/1391/05/CFU/RJS  
Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH**

REDEVELOPMENT: 3 STOREY BLOCK TO PROVIDE 14  
FLATS, CAR PARKING AND ACCESS

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for LONDON & REGIONAL PROPERTIES

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1406:100; 130; 131; 132; 140; 141

**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 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 Levels to be Approved
- 5 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.
- 6 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 7 Highway - Approval of Access(es)
- 8 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 9 Before the development is commenced a detailed site investigation shall be carried out to establish if the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and nature of the contamination present, and to determine its potential for the pollution of the water environment. The method and extent of the site investigation shall be agreed with the Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) prior to the commencement of the work. Details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of groundwater and surface water, including provisions for monitoring, shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority before development commences. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

continued/

Item 1/05 – P/1391/05/CFU continued.....

- 10 No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of groundwater.
- 11 The construction of the site foundations shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before the development commences.  
REASON: To prevent the pollution of groundwater.
- 12 The construction of the foul and surface water discharge drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 13 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 14 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:  
a: before the use hereby permitted is commenced  
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied  
c: in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority  
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.
- 15 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.
- 16 Water - Disposal of Sewage
- 17 Water Storage Works
- 18 Landscaping to be Approved
- 19 Landscaping to be Implemented
- INFORMATIVES:
- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 26 - Environment Agency 3
- 4 Standard Informative 24 - Environment Agency 1
- 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:  
D1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

continued/

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
T13	Parking Standards
H7	Dwelling Mix
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

### **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Site Layout (D4, D5, D8, C16)
  - 3) Amenity of Neighbours (EP25)
  - 4) Parking/Highway Safety (T13, D8)
  - 5) Housing Provision and Need (SH1, SH2)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

### **INFORMATION**

#### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	20 max.
	Justified:	14
	Provided:	16
Site Area:	1670m <sup>2</sup>	
Floorspace:	1255m <sup>2</sup>	
Dwellings per hectare:	85	
Habitable Rooms per hectare:	251	

#### **b) Site Description**

- the site is located on the prominent corner of Victor Road and Harrow View
- the site is currently occupied by a petrol station, consisting of a single storey shop building, car wash facility and associated forecourt canopy and hardsurfacing
- surrounding buildings include:
  - to the north & north west: 2 storey, pitched roof terrace dwellings
  - to the south: 3/ 4 storey, flat roof block of flats
  - to the east: 5 storey flat roofed factory buildings as part of the Waverley Industrial Estate
  - to the south west & west: 2 storey pitched roof terrace dwellings

#### **c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on site
- construction of a 3/4 storey flat roofed 'L' shaped building orientated towards the road frontages of the site. The building would accommodate 14 residential flats (all 2 bedroom flats)

continued/

Item 1/05 – P/1391/05/CFU continued.....

- the building would be 2 storey in scale adjacent to 1 Victor Road, and would step up to 4 storeys to the main corner of the site
- the proposed elevation to Victor Road would present a façade with 2, 3 and 4 storey sections
- the proposed elevation to Harrow View would present a façade of 3 and 4 storeys in height
- external materials would incorporate painted render with doors/ windows/ balconies in powder-coated metal
- the existing vehicular access points located to the road frontages would be removed and a new crossover would be constructed to the Victor Road frontage and an 'archway' design would provide access through the building to the proposed 14 on site carspaces orientated along the southern boundary of the site
- landscaped gardens would be located around the building

**d) Relevant History**

The site has a long planning history establishing the petrol station use, however there is only one application specifically relevant to this residential redevelopment.

P/283/05/CFU	Redevelopment:3 storey block to provide 14 flats, car parking	WITHDRAWN 18-MAR-05
--------------	---	------------------------

**e) Consultations**

EA:	No objection subject to conditions
TWU:	Awaited

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 21-JUL-05
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 97	Replies 1	Expiry 11-JUL-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** Increased traffic and lack of parking, overshadowing and loss of privacy

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

The character of the locality surrounding the subject site is clearly mixed, however generally speaking the built form of building is towards a larger scale. Buildings range in height from 2 storey pitched roofed terraces (at the smaller end of the scale of buildings) and up to 4 storey apartment blocks or 5-6 storey factory buildings. It is highlighted that the large scale buildings in the immediate locality feature tall prominent facades with flat roof designs.

continued/

The proposed building would be contemporary in design, and would generally draw from and reflect the scale and character of the large buildings in the vicinity. Nevertheless the siting of the proposed building would ensure that the predominant building lines of the 2 storey terraces along Victor Road and Harrow View would be respected and maintained. Furthermore ample space is proposed along the street frontages to allow a landscaped setting to be provided for the development. It is considered that this proposed landscaped setting would represent a marked improvement to the visual amenity of the locality. Specifically it is considered that the proposed development has been designed in such a manner so as to reflect the prevalent built form of the locality, and that the removal of the existing petrol station and its replacement with the proposed scheme would amount to an improvement to the character of the area.

**2) Site Layout**

The site layout of the property would maintain the established building lines of the locality, whilst providing ample space around the building. Although parking is provided to the rear of the building, the existing 2.0 metre brick boundary walls would be retained whilst there would be provision for landscaping buffers. Ground floor flats would have direct access to the garden areas to the front of the building, whilst a large landscaped communal garden would be provided to the rear of the building. The proposal is considered to represent a positive site layout with respect of both the interface with adjoining properties and providing a positive level of amenity for future occupants.

**3) Amenity of Neighbours**

With a proposed building that would continue to the prevalent building lines within the locality, the proposal would minimise impacts over the adjoining properties. Furthermore by stepping the height of the building in context of the neighbouring sites (particularly with respect of the Victor Road façade) would ensure that there would be no detrimental impacts of visual bulk, loss of light, overshadowing etc.

Although the proposed layout would mean that balconies on the south facing rear elevation would have general views out towards the neighbouring residential property, it is noted that there are no windows in the facing flank elevation of this adjacent apartment block. Additionally the open space area to the front of this adjacently building is a passive grassed area, therefore there are limited concerns regarding this area being overlooked. Additionally the closest flank elevation to this adjoining open space area is set back 12.5m from the common boundary with the only window openings servicing bathrooms at ground, first and second floors.

Likewise, although the balconies on the west facing elevation would have a views towards the rear garden of 1 Victor Road, there is a horizontal separation distance of 22 metres. This is considered ample distance to negate any concerns of overlooking of this adjoining property.

continued/

**4) Parking/Highway Safety**

Fourteen on site spaces are proposed as part of the scheme, to be accessed via Victor Road. Firstly, it is highlighted that the principle of having all traffic entering and exiting the site is specifically encouraged. This is in order to minimise potential for accidents if the main access point were located on the busy roadway of Harrow View. Of the fourteen spaces proposed, this is considered ample to service the parking requirements of the proposed apartments. Furthermore the site has good access to local bus networks and is likewise located a short distance from Harrow on the Hill bus/train transport interchange. On this basis no objections to the application are raised on grounds of insufficient parking provision.

**5) Housing Provision and Need**

Broad policies within the adopted 2004 UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. The proposed scheme is considered to achieve this.

**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.



---

**50-54 NORTHOLT ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**1/06**

**P/1307/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

PART 3/5/6 STOREY BUILDING TO  
PROVIDE 29 FLATS, ACCESS AND  
PARKING

BENNETT URBAN PLANNING for GREENDEV (HARROW) LLP

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: A9161 D 001, 0099,0100, 0101, 0102, 0103, 0104, 0105, 0106, 0200, 0201

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of excessive size, bulk and site coverage by buildings, would not respect the scale and massing of the neighbouring properties on Shaftesbury Avenue, would amount to an overdevelopment of the site, and would be overbearing, to the detriment of the neighbouring residents at 3/5 Shaftesbury Avenue and the character of the locality.
- 2 The proposed development would not provide an acceptable relationship with the highway on Shaftesbury Avenue and would result in an unsocial open space, to the detriment of the amenity of the future occupiers of the proposed development and the character of the locality.
- 3 The proposed roof amenity area over the second floor adjacent to 3/5 Shaftesbury Avenue and the rear windows of the upper levels would result in unacceptable direct and perceived overlooking to the rear of that building, to the detriment of the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring residents.
- 4 The proposed layout at ground floor level would result in bedrooms in close proximity to the pavement and adjacent to the access ramp for the underground parking, which would result in disturbance and a poor living environment for the future occupiers of the proposed units, to the detriment of their amenity.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, SH1, D4, D5, D10, T13, H4, H5, EM13, EP22

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Loss of Employment (EM13)
- 2) Contaminated Land (EP22)
- 3) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D10)
- 4) Density and Affordable Housing Provision (SH1, H4, H5)
- 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 6) Parking and Highway Considerations (T13)
- 7) Consultation Responses

---

continued/

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Employment Area: Business Use Area  
Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- vacant site currently used as car park for adjoining office building at Scanmoor House
- site previously occupied by Texaco Filling Station
- located on corner of Northolt Road and Shaftesbury Avenue, South Harrow
- close proximity to South Harrow District Centre and Underground Station and local bus routes
- high buildings of commercial appearance along Northolt Road to south, with drop to 3 storey building at opposite corner for Roxeth House to northeast
- permission for extra floor on Scanmoor House (adjacent)
- two-storey semi-detached and detached buildings (including block of 2 maisonettes at 3/5 Shaftesbury Avenue) on Shaftesbury Avenue to the northwest
- wide pavement around site, with slip road on Northolt Road to front of Scanmoor House to south
- access road to the rear to Osmond Close, where ground levels fall away

**c) Proposal Details**

- development of 3/5/6 storey block to provide 29 flats
- highest point adjacent to Scanmoor House with drop to five storeys at the corner, where sharp angle would return to Shaftesbury Avenue building line, drop to three storeys to rear adjacent to access road for Osmond Close
- basement car parking providing 20 spaces (2 for disabled users), 2 motorcycle spaces and 30 bicycle spaces
- affordable Housing provision: 9 flats out of total 29 (31%)
- modern design with small private balconies at upper levels, enclosed private buffer space at ground floor level, roof amenity areas over third floor and fifth floor

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

A lengthy statement has been submitted which concludes as follows:-

**f) Consultations**

EA:  
TWU:

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development		Expiry 14-JUL-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 233	Replies 0	Expiry 01-JUL-05 continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Loss of Employment**

The site is located in the Northolt Road Business Use Area, thus Policy EM13 applies when considering a change of use. However, the site is currently vacant and when used as a petrol station it was not in B1 use. Thus it is not considered that the proposed use of the site for residential purposes would be unacceptable, in particular given the presence of other residential schemes and commercial buildings converted to dwellings such as Templar House nearby.

### **2) Contaminated Land**

As the site has been previously used for a petrol filling station, precautionary measures must be taken. An environmental assessment has been submitted with the application, and was the proposal to be acceptable in other respects it is considered that, subject to consultation with the Environment Agency, conditions could be attached that would deal sufficiently with such issues.

### **3) Character of the Area**

The proposed building would reach six storeys on the Northolt Road frontage, it would drop to five storeys at the corner for a small section of roof amenity space, and would drop to three storeys to the rear of the site adjacent to the access road for Osmond Close.

The site is particularly prominent given its corner location, and as ground levels rise from the south along Northolt Road and fall slightly again along Shaftesbury Avenue to the northwest. Thus the assumption would be that development should step up slightly towards the corner, in order to address this prominent gateway site. Permission was granted on 08<sup>th</sup> July 2004 under planning application reference P/1369/04/CFU for an additional floor within a mansard roof to provide 2 flats over the adjacent office building Scanmoor House. The existing building at Scanmoor House is five storeys in height and has a relatively unattractive exposed flank elevation facing northeast. The proposal would obscure this flank elevation from view and would step up only slightly from the building height at Scanmoor House, before stepping down again at the corner. While the bulk and height would not appear undue when viewed from the south along the commercial Northolt Road frontage, the new building would be unduly bulky when viewed in conjunction with the two-storey residential properties on Shaftesbury Avenue, and thus would not provide satisfactory transition between the character of the two streets.

continued/

Along that frontage the proposal involves a set-in from the jagged corner element towards the pedestrian entrance to the block. While the submitted plans suggest that the space outside the bedroom windows for the flats would be private amenity space, it appears that the result would be a dead urban space with little relationship to the street. The two-storey properties further along Shaftesbury Avenue benefit from a private front garden area which act as a buffer from the highway, however the new building would appear commercial in contrast, to the detriment of the character of the area. The pedestrian access to the block would also be lost in the bulk of the upper floors over the set-in at ground floor level, and would detract from the residential character of the street. The quality of this space needs to be addressed, in conjunction with the issue of the building line on this frontage. While the street trees on both frontages would be retained, it is considered that the ground floor layout would have a poor relationship with the trees on Shaftesbury Avenue.

**4) Density and Affordable Housing Provision**

Policy H4 of the HUDP states that residential densities in new developments should not be less than 150 habitable rooms per hectare. The proposal equates to 927 habitable rooms per hectare, which appears to make an effective use of the land and a contribution to housing provision. However, the policy also states that proposals should be consistent with design and amenity considerations and other policies in the Plan.

The scheme would meet the minimum requirements of Policy H5 in that 31% of the new units would be given over to affordable housing, however were all aspects of the proposal to be considered acceptable it may be judged suitable to require a higher percentage of units, following analysis of the size and layout of units.

**5) Residential Amenity**

As mentioned previously, the Council should only seek to support high-density schemes on sites where design and amenity considerations are acceptable. It is considered that in this case the proposed bulk; height and siting of buildings would be excessive and thus would be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. There are also some concerns in respect of overlooking and privacy for the neighbouring and future occupiers of the new units.

The proposed new building would have a particularly negative impact on the amenity of the neighbouring block of 2 maisonettes at 3/5 Shaftesbury Avenue to the northwest of the site. While the applicant has submitted daylight assessments to support the proposal, the building would nonetheless have an overbearing impact in terms of bulk and height, in particular when compared to the existing and previous bulk of buildings on the site. The separation distance across Osmond Close is not considered to be sufficient to allow such scale and massing, and the result would be obtrusive and overbearing.

continued/

Item 1/06 – P/1307/05/CFU continued.....

Furthermore, the proposal would result in some direct and perceived overlooking from the roof terrace over the second floor and the rear windows at the upper floors looking towards the rear gardens at 3/5 Shaftesbury Avenue. It is considered that the proposed 1.8m screen for the amenity area would not sufficiently negate the issues of perceived overlooking and any amenity space should be set well away from the edges of the rooftop.

In respect of the amenity of the future occupiers of the new units, concerns have been raised about the proximity of bedroom windows to the highway on both frontages. While the plans indicate a private amenity space in the indent along the Shaftesbury Avenue frontage, further details and information is required in order to satisfy the Council that this will not be a 'dead' space and landscaping etc should be proposed to show how it could work as an appropriate 'buffer' space to offer some privacy. On the Northolt Road frontage, it is considered that the layout of the unit adjacent to the access to the underground parking and refuse store should be altered to provide bedrooms at the rear in the interests of privacy and amenity.

**6) Parking and Highway Considerations**

The proposal involves underground parking providing 20 car spaces (2 for disabled users), 2 motorcycle spaces and 30 bicycle spaces, with access from Northolt Road. The site currently has three accesses, one on each road and one on the corner. The proposal would represent an improvement by reducing the number of accesses to one. The proposed shortfall in the car parking provision is considered to be acceptable given the proximity to South Harrow District Centre, Underground Station and local bus routes.

**7) 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 refusal.

---

**85 & 87 LONDON ROAD, STANMORE**

**1/07**  
**P/996/05/CFU/DT2**  
Ward: CANONS

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A  
DETACHED 2/3 STOREY BLOCK OF  
10 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING

MR RICHARD HENLEY MRTPI for PRESTON BENNETT DEVELOPMENTS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5223/01A; /002; /003B; /004A; /005; /006B

Had the applicant not appealed against non-determination, the application would have been **REFUSED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, bulk and massing would be visually obtrusive, out of keeping with the character of neighbouring properties which comprise mainly two storey detached properties, and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of excessive site coverage by building and hardsurfaced vehicular access and parking areas, and inadequate amenity space, would represent overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character of the area.

### **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  
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery  
D10 Trees and New Development  
H4 Residential Density

---

### **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Residential Character (SD1, D4, D9, D10)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	
Site Area:	0,14ha.	
No of residential units:	10	
Habitable Rooms	38	
Density	272hrh 72 dph	
Council Interest	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- site is on the south side of London Road (A410), adjacent to Stanmore Tube Station (LUL) and public car park
- comprises a pair of semi detached flat fronted gable ended red brick houses with shallow pitched roof and windows with vertical emphasis
- properties have long rear gardens
- built in the 1960's.
- to the east of the site and on the opposite side of the road to the north of the site, are sequences of detached properties
- site is bounded to the rear by a row of lock up garages serving smaller semi detached houses on Westbere Drive, extending southwards
- west of the site, beyond Stanmore Underground Station, two-storey housing continues but gives way to purpose built blocks of flats on either side of London Road. They range from three-storeys in height to five storeys and more

### **c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on the site
- development of a detached two and three storey block of 10 x 2 bedroom flats
- rear communal garden area of 136 sqm along with terraces/balconies to each unit.
- provision of new vehicular access and pedestrian footpath
- provision of 11 parking spaces including one disabled space, two spaces at the front of the site, nine at the rear
- lift access to all floors
- flats, rear access ramp, lift and communal areas all designed to 'Lifetime Home' standards
- provision of cycle storage bay with space for 12 bicycles
- provision of hard and soft landscaping
- provision of bin stores
- retention of existing trees on site

### **d) Relevant History**

None

continued/

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Site is in a good location; close to Stanmore District Centre that has good public transport and road accessibility
- Existing buildings are a separate entity in the streetscene. They are sited forward of the established building line and have no architectural coherence with the rest of the properties on that side of the road that have a homogenous appearance and layout.
- Proposal would complement the scale, appearance and character of existing development in the locality.
- Proposal accords with national and regional guidance, the London Plan that encourage high density, sustainable development and LBH policies on housing need.
- Siting of the building allows for maximum amount of sunlight and solar gain and ensures that neighbouring residential amenity would be maintained, particularly the existing, sunlight and daylighting conditions for No 83 London Road. Building lines have been sited within forward and rear 45° lines of habitable rooms of that property.
- Maintenance of existing 2.3m separation on the boundaries of the two sites and the design of the roof, in which a half hipped Dutch Style barn roof is proposed, would mitigate against any overbearing effects that could otherwise result.
- Increased height of the proposed development relative to adjoining house (No 83 London Road) is acceptable, as it would have less width than the existing development.
- Relationship between the two houses will be improved due to demolition of existing garage on frontage of No 85, the re-landscaping of that area on the boundary and the separation between the two site of 4.1m (at rear) and 5.3m(at front) of the respective 1<sup>st</sup> floor levels of each building.
- Proposed development has been designed to minimise its impact on the local townscape. Differential roof heights and styles (e.g. a crown roof), elevational treatment (e.g. dropped eaves heights) and contrasts in materials and relief break up the overall height, bulk and massing of the building.

**f) Consultations**

London Underground Ltd. The application site is adjacent to LUL owned land forming the approach to the station car park at Stanmore Station. The applicant proposes to position the building against the property boundary on the west side of the site. Any new development should be designed so that it can be maintained without the need to enter LUL land or property, as construction/repair or maintenance work can cause costly delays to the service. Consequently, no development should be closer to 3m from the railway boundary. Additionally, LUL engineers would wish to satisfy themselves that foundational works will not have harmful effects on LUL land.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development		Expiry 30-MAY-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 30	Replies 3	Expiry 30-MAY-05 continued/



**Summary of Responses:** Overlooking and loss of privacy would result; loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring house; block of flats would be out of keeping with character of the area; undue noise and disturbance from parking at the rear of the block and during building phase, adding to the noise caused by the improvements to Stanmore Underground Station; harm to foundations through vibrations from construction machinery; increase in traffic congestion at a busy junction of London Road

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Character**

#### **Siting and setting**

The proposed development would occupy a larger footprint than the existing buildings, having much greater depth, particularly on the western side of the site, alongside the boundary with Stanmore LUL Station. However, the development would be set back nearer to the established front building line on London Road and it would have a narrower plot width than the existing pair of semi detached houses. The separation of 2m on the eastern boundary with the adjoining house, No 83 London Road, is also adequate.

Notwithstanding that, the overall bulk, scale and massing of the proposal is considered to be unacceptable and would result in an unsatisfactory, disproportionate relationship between buildings and spaces. The proposed depth of the building, particularly on the western side of the site, is excessive. As such, the proposal is contrary to the advice in UDP Policy D4. It says that development should take into account the character and landscape of the locality within which it is to be built. The immediate locality is characterised by detached houses with long, spacious gardens. The siting and setting of the proposal development fails to achieve such a relationship and would be an over development of the site.

The lack of garden space that is proposed would also be contrary to the advice in Policy D5. It advises that proposals should provide space around buildings that reflects the setting of neighbouring buildings. The proportion of communal garden space that is provided is sparse and unacceptable, a contrast to neighbouring housing.

In response to this shortcoming the applicants submitted amended plans. The secondary windows serving living rooms to units two and three on the western side of the site have been removed to minimise noise and disturbance to future occupiers from the adjacent vehicular access to the proposed parking area at the rear of the site. The proposed cycle store has been re-sited to the far south eastern corner of the site, adjacent to the car parking bays. This is so that additional amenity space can be provided. Finally, a strip of block paving that is parallel to the parking area has been replaced by 'grasscrete' surfacing. These two latter amendments were made in response to concerns for the lack of amenity space that has been provided in the proposal.

continued/

### **Design and external appearance**

The proposed development is an attempt to design a block of flats that in form and appearance seeks to respect the architectural vernacular of the area, but has a much bigger footprint and a much greater solid mass than existing residential development in the immediate locality. Consequently, the overall effect of the proposal is of a building that would be a visually obtrusive, incongruous incident in the streetscene.

The design of the building attempts to understate its massiveness by having what is a complicated Crown roof design, in which half hips are introduced over blank flank walls that would face the neighbouring houses. The treatment of the frontage appears rather disjointed. The positioning of the projecting front gable and the rather diminutive front entrance gives the frontage an asymmetrical appearance, whereas a centrally positioned front gable with a bolder front entrance, having more vertical emphasis, would give the building unity, stronger definition and symmetry. In this respect, the proposal does not comply with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for development to have a high standard of layout and design.

In the treatment of the exterior of the proposed development, the contrasts in textures and colours of materials, in which a mixture of brickwork, render and weather boarding appear to be proposed, is an unnecessarily fussy mishmash. Moreover it is not in keeping with what is referred to in UDP Policy D4 as “The Urban Grain” of the area, where development is expected to reflect the predominant form, composition and characteristic building materials of the locality in its design.

### **2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

Of most concern is the effect that the proposal would have on the neighbouring house on the western boundary of the site, 83 London Road, a two-storey detached property. In particular, the first floor rear bedroom in the proposed development would cause overlooking and loss of privacy for the neighbouring house, this would be contrary to the advice in Policy D5. It says that new residential development should ensure that the amenity and privacy of existing and proposed development is safeguarded.

In response to this concern the applicants submitted revised plans in which a balcony to the window has been removed and the aperture itself is increased in width. Several other amendments have also been made, as referred to above.

It is concluded however, that the amendments that have been made would not overcome the specific concern for overlooking and loss of privacy for the adjoining house that would result from the first floor rear window. Conflict with Policy D5 would still arise. Furthermore, the amendments do not overcome the concern for the inadequate ratio of amenity space to built form that is proposed. In this respect the amended proposal also remains contrary to Policy D5.

continued/

Item 1/07 – P/996/05/CFU continued.....

Finally, and as a corollary of the excessive bulk, massing and depth of the proposal referred to above, it is considered that the neighbouring house to the east would suffer from a generally over dominant effect, having so much mass of built form extending virtually the entire length of the rear garden, in sharp contrast to the lavishness of its own garden and that of the neighbouring houses.

**3) 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.

## SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**ROXETH FIRST & MIDDLE SCHOOL, 1 BRICKFIELDS**      **2/01**  
**P/1512/05/CFU/CM**  
Ward    HARROW ON THE HILL  
:  
ERECTION OF SIX SHADE CANOPIES  
  
ROXETH 1ST & MIDDLE SCHOOL

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos:    School Premises; Site Plan; Untitled Plans of No.2, Nos. 5 & 6, Nos.3 & 4, No.1;  
Elevation: Shade No. 1, Shade No. 2

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

1            Time Limit - Full Permission

INFORMATIVE:

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  
C6        First and Middle School  
D4        Standard of Design and Layout  
D11      Statutorily Listed Buildings  
D14      Conservation Areas  
D15      Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
D16      Conservation Area Priority  
EP31     Areas of Special Character

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1)          Education Policy (C6)
  - 2)          Visual and Residential Amenity (D4, SD1)
  - 3)          Impact on Listed Building, Conservation Area and Area of Special Character (D11, D14, D15, D16, EP31)
  - 4)          Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area:

Roxeth Hill

Council Interest:

Council owned

### b) Site Description

- Roxeth First and Middle School; pedestrian access to Grade II Listed Building (currently used as school office) on Roxeth Hill; vehicular access at end of Brickfields
- within Roxeth Hill Conservation Area and Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character
- main classroom buildings located to the rear of listed building, with single storey flat roofed building attached to rear of listed building and detached two-storey pitch roof building to north
- fall in ground level from east to west and from north to south
- hardsurfaced area for playing courts on west section of site adjacent to boundary with Hamson Court, Glasfryn Court and Glasfryn House;
- play area and parking area to north of site inside entrance from Brickfields

### c) Proposal Details

- 6 shade sails/canopies to provide shelter from sun in play areas
- galvanised steel poles with bitumen roof lining; marine grade stainless steel fixings to walls where required
- Coolaroo 95% UV Shade Fabric in green

### d) Relevant History

P/1179/05/DCP Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development:  
Erection of 6 shade sails

### e) Advertisement

Character of Conservation Area/  
Setting of Listed Building

Expiry  
21-JUL-05

#### Notifications

Sent  
41

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
12-JUL-05

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Education Policy

Policy C6 of the Harrow UDP, in relation to First and Middle Schools, states that the provision of good quality school buildings, with appropriate facilities, is important. In considering any future proposal to locate or expand existing schools, the Council must be satisfied that the sites and buildings are appropriate to meet the needs of the users and the community in general. It is considered that the proposed canopies would provide a much needed facility for the schoolchildren at Roxeth School.

continued/

**2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The proposed structures would be formed of galvanised steel poles to support sail-shaped green fabric at various heights, from 2.5m to 4m. The proposed green fabric would be in keeping with the appearance of trees around the site and the colours would be appropriate for a school building. The majority of the proposed canopies would not be visible from outside the site given the fall in ground levels, the siting of existing buildings at the edges of the site, and the high trees on the southern and eastern boundaries, and the most prominent structure No. 2 to the north would blend in with the existing climbing frames and other colourful play equipment inside the Brickfields entrance. In general the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual impact.

Similarly the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity. Canopies 3 and 4 would be sited in the centre of the site, well away from the boundaries. Canopy 2 would be sited south of the boundary with No. 3 Clonmel Close and No. 7 Chartwell Place, but would be approximately 40m from the closest house at those properties, and furthermore the existing climbing frames are located in the intervening space. The proposed canopy 1 would be relatively close (15m) to the boundary with No. 5 Chartwell Place but almost 35m from the house at that property and thus would not be overbearing. Canopies 5 and 6 would be immediately adjacent to the boundary with Hamson Court and Glasfryn Court, however the apartments at those properties are sited at a higher ground level than the playing court and there are dense mature deciduous trees along the boundary.

Furthermore, the proposed siting of the canopies west of the gap between the two flat blocks means that the impact will be negligible and there is an existing temporary/mobile classroom unit adjacent to the boundary with Hamson Court that is no lower than the proposed canopy.

The sails would be taken down in winter months when not required. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is not considered to result in harm to visual or residential amenity.

**3) Impact on Listed Building, Conservation Area and Area of Special Character**

The proposed canopies would be sited to the rear of the modern school block, which is attached to the rear of the listed building. The listed building is located in the narrow front section of the site where ground levels rise sharply to the east and there are high mature trees around the raised playing courts and to the west. Thus the building is quite contained on the Roxeth Hill frontage, and the newer school buildings as well as the proposed canopies would not be perceived. Thus the proposal would not affect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

Similarly, the proposal would have minimal impact on the local character and would not detract from the appearance or character of Roxeth Hill Conservation Area or the Area of Special Character.

continued/

**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.

DETACHED 3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 6  
FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING,  
INCLUDING PROVISION FOR EXISTING FLATS

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for W E BLACK LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Red line site plan; 01/2120/5, 6

Inform the applicant that:

- 1) The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on the application relating to:-
  - (i) the developer shall fund all costs of public consultation, analysis, reporting and implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone in the immediate surroundings, at any time within 3 years of first occupation of the development, if in the Council's opinion, a monitoring period shows unacceptable on-street parking, up to a maximum of £7,500 index linked
  - (ii) the parking spaces in the courtyard parking area be made freely available to occupiers of Laburnum Court and Acacia Court and their visitors and to include 2 disabled persons bays
- 2) A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued upon completion, by the applicant, of the aforementioned legal agreement.

**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 demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (b) the boundary  
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.

continued/



Item 2/02 – P/1292/05/CFU continued.....

4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected, to include a minimum 600mm high wall or fence adjacent to the planted frontage of the site and parking space Number 22, 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.

5 Landscaping to be Approved

6 Landscaping to be Implemented

7 Levels to be Approved

8 Insulation of Buildings – 3

9 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number 01/2120/5 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.

10 Refuse Arrangements – Buildings

11 Water Storage Works

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

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Mix

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

EP25 Noise

T13 Parking Standards

---

continued/

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, EP25)
  - 3) Parking and Highway Issues (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	8
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	“ “
Site Area:	1050m <sup>2</sup>	
Habitable Rooms:	15	
No. of Residential Units:	6	
Density:	57 dph 143 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- roughly rectangular site on south side of Collapit Close, a cul-de-sac leading to Pinner Road
- occupied by 26 lock-up garages together with a sub-station and 10 additional parking spaces which are part of Laburnam Court/Alicia Court development
- metropolitan railway line abuts southern boundary
- 2 x 3-storey blocks of flats, Laburnam and Alicia Courts, to west
- detached 2-storey dwelling house with attached garage (No.2 Collapit Close) and Meeting Hall beyond to east, current permission for 3-storey building with 12 flats on this site
- rear gardens of houses fronting onto Pinner Road on opposite side of Collapit Close

### c) Proposal Details

- removal of all lock-up garages
- provision of 3 storey block of flats on eastern side of site to provide 3 x 1-bed x 2 habitable room units and 3 x 2-bed x 3 habitable room units
- 3-storey height to eaves level with crown hipped, pitched roof
- projecting single storey entrance feature, bay windows up to first floor level, recessed element in centre of building
- brick and rendered elevations, tiled roof
- provision of car park containing 18 spaces to west of proposed building
- 2 pairs of 2 spaces in front of building
- cycle store shown in south-west corner of site
- sub-station retained in situ
- contribution of £7,500 for extension of local Controlled Parking Zone, if appropriate

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

Application Site

WEST/295/01/FUL	Detached 3 storey block to provide 6 x 2 bed flats with access and parking	APPEAL LODGED AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION
-----------------	--	---

Council resolved had appeal not been lodged that application would have been refused for the following reasons:-

- “1. Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council’s requirements to serve both the new development and the adjacent flats. The likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the neighbouring highway.
2. The proposed development would result in the overlooking of the rear gardens of the dwellings fronting Pinner Road to the detriment of the privacy of the occupiers of those dwellings.
3. The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site by reason of insufficient usable amenity space to the rear, insufficient landscaped setting space at the front and the loss of the garages which were originally provided to serve the adjacent flats.
4. The proposed layout by reason of inadequate visibility at the car park access and excessive width of the vehicular crossover fronting Collapit Close would be detrimental to pedestrian safety.
5. The applicant has provided insufficient information relating to existing noise and vibration levels resulting from the adjacent railway to establish whether residential development of the site is acceptable in principle in accordance with PPG29.”

Appeal dismissed 28-AUG-02

P/122/03/CFU	Detached 2-storey building to provide 4 flats with access and parking including provision for existing flats	GRANTED 09-FEB-04
--------------	--	-------------------

With accompanying legal agreement relating to i) contribution towards CPZ extension, and ii) availability to neighbouring occupiers of main car park.

2 Collapit Close and Meeting Hall

P/2914/04/CFU	Redevelopment: Detached 3-storey building to provide 12 flats with access and parking	GRANTED 19-MAY-05
---------------	---	-------------------

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

- application follows granting of consent for 4 flats on this site, and in particular, recent grant for 3 storey block of 12 flats on adjacent site
- follows pattern of development already established, key difference is that 3-storeys now proposed with 2 additional parking spaces

continued/

Item 2/02 – P/1292/05/CFU continued.....

- Inspector accepted principle of 3-storey development but refused due to proximity of adjacent 2 storey house
- grant of permission for 3-storey building on adjacent site means that Inspectors concerns have been addressed
- proposal has much smaller footprint, is lower in overall height and set back further from rear of houses in Pinner Road than adjacent approved scheme

**f) Consultations**

EA: Unable to respond  
TWU: No objections

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	61	5	30-JUN-05

**Response:** Applicant evading requirement for affordable housing in conjunction with adjacent site, disruption and inconvenience during construction, inadequate parking for local residents, breach of original planning permission, scheme should provide garages, would devalue existing properties, noise pollution, inadequate dustbin area, loss of privacy, inadequate access

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Appearance and Character of Area**

In dismissing the appeal in relation to application WEST/295/01/FUL for a 3-storey building on this site, the Inspector drew attention to the following deficiencies:

- a) The provision of a row of 6 parking spaces in front of the building.  
This application shows 2 pairs of 2 spaces previously found acceptable in planning permission P/122/03/CFU for 4 flats on the site.
- b) An under provision of amenity space.  
This scheme shows some 160m<sup>2</sup> to serve 6 flats. This equates pro rata to the 330m<sup>2</sup> which would serve the 12 flats recently approved on the Meeting Room/2 Collapit Road site, and is considered to be adequate in these circumstances.
- c) Failure to respect character and intensity of surrounding area.  
In this respect attention is drawn to the greater bulk of the building approved on the adjacent site, and also to the existing 3-storey buildings to the west viz. Laburnam Court and Acacia Court which are significantly larger than this proposal.  
The height of the proposed building has been reduced by about 1m in comparison with the rejected scheme by the provision of a crown roof so that it would not appear overbearing or incongruous in relation to No.2, given also that the garage attached to No. 2 provides additional space at upper levels. In addition the building has been reduced in width by some 1.7m thereby further reducing bulk.  
The provision of a car park next to the building has already been approved in permission P/122/03/CFU. continued/

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

**2) Residential Amenity**

The proposed building would more or less line up with the front and rear walls of No. 2 so that the 45° horizontal code would not be infringed. Some 30m would be provided between the flank wall and Laburnam Court which is sited sideways on to the proposed block, sufficient to preserve light and outlook.

Small single kitchen windows in the flank walls would face towards an obscure window in the flank wall of No. 2 and Laburnam Court at a distance of 30m, so that neighbouring privacy would not be harmed. A similar relationship would be provided between the proposed front wall and the rear garden boundaries of houses in Pinner Road as with the approved adjacent development. In addition, clear windows in Laburnam and Alicia Courts are located some 8m closer to those rear boundaries than in this proposal.

No greater harm would be caused therefore in terms of overlooking than already exists and is approved on adjacent sites.

**3) Parking and Highway Issues**

Planning permission P/122/03/CFU allows the provision of 21 parking spaces to serve 34 flats (4 on the application site plus 30 in Laburnam and Acacia Courts).

This application shows 22 spaces to serve 36 flats, representing a minor change only in the level of overall deficiency.

As with the above permission a contribution towards CPZ funding is proposed. Given also the historical low level of occupancy of the existing garages it is suggested that the proposals would effectively improve the availability of off-street parking facilities for local residents.

The provision of a 5.5m wide access road is suitable to serve this and adjacent developments.

**4) Consultation Responses**

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Applicant evading requirement for affordable housing in conjunction with adjacent site | - | the sites are capable of being satisfactorily redeveloped independently so that the requirement for affordable housing would not arise |
| Disruption and inconvenience during construction, would devalue existing properties    | - | not relevant planning considerations   |
| Breach of original planning permission   | - | this is a separate application from the approved scheme  |

continued/

Item 2/02 – P/1292/05/CFU continued.....

- |                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Scheme should provide garages    | - | there is no reason why garages should be provided given the history of under use |
| Noise pollution                  | - | this need be no greater than existing permission for this site                   |
| Inadequate dustbin area          | - | can be dealt with by condition   |
| 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.

ALTERATIONS TO ENTRANCE FEATURE, NEW  
FRONT PORCH

SIMPSON MCHUGH for MR & MRS SPENCER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2432/1 Rev.A

**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

### 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:

2004 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
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
  - EP32 Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses
  - EP33 Development in the Green Belt
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D14 Conservation Areas
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - D16 Conservation Area Priority
- 

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP31, EP32, EP33, D4)
  - 2) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D14, D15, D16)
  - 3) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character  
Conservation Area: Pinner Hill  
Green Belt  
TPO  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- L-shaped detached property with garage approved in 1978, extension to form new garage approved in 1983
- wall (3m) with arches surrounding entrance area within L-shape to front

### c) Proposal Details

- removal of wall around entrance area, new porch and widened doorway with new door

### d) Relevant History

LBH/12442/1	Outline: erection of detached house and garage	GRANTED 12-JAN-78
LBH/23378	Use of garage for games room and extension to form new garage	GRANTED 14-JUN-83

### e) Consultations

CAAC: No objection to principle of development, but the design should be in keeping with the existing property. The porch eaves should be no lower than the existing eaves of the roof which runs around the front of the property. Objection to the proposed design of the new door. A mock-Georgian door would not be appropriate for this property. The new door should be in keeping with the property, such as a vertically boarded design.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 23-JUN-05	
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 2	Replies 0	Expiry 15-JUN-05

continued/



## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Green Belt and 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. The proposed new porch would occupy a smaller footprint than the wall to be removed, with only 0.65m<sup>2</sup> of additional footprint to be created forward of the existing wrap-around lean-to roof at the front of the property. The dwelling has previously been extended in the form of an extension for a new garage in the early 1980s, which increased the footprint from 72.54m<sup>2</sup> to 84.43m<sup>2</sup> (increase of 16.4%. This figure includes the area enclosed by the wall to be removed, which involves a footprint of 9.88m<sup>2</sup>. Thus the proposal would involve a net decrease in footprint of 9.23m<sup>2</sup>. The new porch would be modest and well contained within the building footprint on the site and thus although it would be visible from the front given the open nature of the site, it would not compromise the sense of openness or character of the Green Belt or Area of Special Character. There is a TPO for the site, however the proposal is sited away from all trees on site thus no impact would occur.

### **2) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area**

The proposed development would alter the appearance of the property quite considerably by removing an interesting architectural feature in the form of the arched wall. However, the property is a modern development that makes a neutral contribution at best to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There are no objections to the size and siting of the proposed porch. The materials and design should be in keeping with the existing property.

### **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 dwelling styles in the surrounding area, no impact on residential amenity is envisaged.

### **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.

---

**UNIT 10 CRYSTAL WAY, ELMGROVE ROAD, HARROW**

**2/04**

**P/1127/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: GREENHILL

CHANGE OF USE FROM LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (CLASS B1)  
TO BUSINESS OR STORAGE OR DISTRIBUTION (CLASS  
B1 OR B8)

KING STURGE for INDESIT COMPANY UK LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: KS1

**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 uses hereby permitted shall not operate outside the following times:-
  - a) 07:00 hours to 22:00 hours Monday to Friday
  - b) 07:00 hours to 13:00 hours, Saturdayswithout the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 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:

- EM14 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Designated Areas
- SD1 Quality of Design
- T13 Parking Standards

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Employment Policy (EM14)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (EM14, SD1)
  - 3) Parking and Highway Considerations (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Employment Area: Industrial & Business Use

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- unit in terrace of five industrial units within Crystal Centre off Elmgrove Road, in Wealdstone Preferred Industrial Location

continued/

Item 2/04 – P/1127/05/CFU continued.....

- parking area to front on Crystal Way with space for 6 vehicles
- unit vacant since 2003, previously occupied by General Domestic Appliances Ltd.

**c) Proposal Details**

- speculative change of use application to broaden the potential use of the unit from light industrial (B1) to business or storage or distribution (B1 or B8)

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/19302/W	Outline: erection of 45,800 sq.ft. light industrial buildings; 23,000 sq.ft. warehousing; 12,000 sq.ft. offices, associated parking areas and access road & sheltered housing	GRANTED 20-APR-82
LBH/22262	Details pursuant to planning permission LBH/19302/W dated 20/4/82, light industrial, warehousing and ancillary office buildings, parking and access road	ALLOWED 04-NOV-82
LBH/22334	Outline: Industrial, Warehousing and Housing Development (Variation of Condition 14 of outline permission LBH/19302W)	GRANTED 10-NOV-82
LBH/25490	Variation of Condition 29 OF P/P LBH/22334 dated 10/11/82 to allow additional 3 hrs. (7pm – 10pm) Mondays-Fridays for loading/unloading on site	GRANTED 18-JUL-84
LBH/25491	Variation of Condition 30 of P/P LBH/22334 dated 10/11/82 to allow additional 3 hrs. (7pm - 10pm) Mondays-Fridays for access/egress of goods vehicles	GRANTED 18-JUL-84

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The unit has been vacant since November 2003 and has been marketed as an industrial building but has received limited interest from light industrial occupiers; proposal is acceptable in policy terms and would have no negative impacts given the mixed industrial character of the surrounding area; range of uses would provide flexibility and will ensure that employment opportunities will not decline; any noise is restricted to the front of the buildings where the forecourts and loading bays lead onto Crystal Way and units themselves provide a shield from the residential properties to the south.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 15	Replies 0	Expiry 16-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Employment Policy**

Policy EM14 relates directly to such sites in designated areas for industry and business use. In order to provide flexibility in future employment generating developments, on these sites, any B Class use, or combination of these uses, would normally be acceptable, except where the amenity of neighbouring residents or highway considerations would dictate a restriction of use.

It has been indicated that the site has been vacant since November 2003. Notwithstanding this, the current use class relating to the site is for B1 light industry. The property was previously used as a service centre for domestic appliances. In terms of policy EM14 the proposal to broaden the use to include business use and storage or warehousing is acceptable, given the existence of other B1 and B8 units in the industrial estate, some of which formed part of the original approved scheme in 1982. Furthermore, the neighbouring property Unit 11, was the subject of a successful application for change of use to B8 in 1993 (EAST/561/FUL).

### **2) Neighbouring Amenity**

The original proposal to broaden the use class, including B2 general industry, has been amended in response to concerns about the potential negative impact on residential amenity. Given its location in a designated business, industrial and warehousing use location, the proposed scale of use is not considered to be excessive or dissimilar to the existing use relating to the site or the neighbouring units in this industrial estate. While the rear of the unit is visible from the nearby residential properties on Elmgrove Road, the entrance to the site is off Crystal Way. Thus the proposal would not result in undue noise and disturbance when accessing the building. A condition has been attached to restrict the hours of operation, in the interests of neighbouring amenity.

### **3) Parking and Highway Safety**

Parking standards are the same for all B class uses. Therefore there is no additional requirement for parking spaces than exists at present. The parking area currently indicated relates to the forecourt area on Crystal Way with 6 parking spaces.

### **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.

---

**THE PAVILION AT WHITCHURCH PLAYING, FIELDS,  
WEMBOROUGH ROAD, STANMORE**

**2/05  
P/1136/05/CFU/CM  
Ward: BELMONT**

CHANGE OF USE OF PART OF GROUND FLOOR TO  
USE AS DAY NURSERY AND AFTER SCHOOL CLUB  
FOR UP TO 70 CHILDREN

POTTERS HOUSE NURSERY

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 05/YB/01

**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 All of the windows and doors on the building shall be repaired and/or replaced where necessary, and the materials to be used for the new windows and doors in the building shall match those on the existing building, and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the character of the area.
- 3 Disabled Access – Use
- 4 The dropping off of children shall not take place outside the hours of 8am and 9am, and the picking up of children shall not take place outside the hours of 3.30pm to 6.00pm, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety.
- 5 The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued within 2 years of the date of this permission, in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: In the interests of highway safety and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

### **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:

#### **SD1 Quality of Design**

- C4 Nursery Provision in other Premises
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - C17 Access to Leisure, Recreation, Community and Retail Facilities
- 

continued/

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Nursery Provision (C4, C17)
  - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (D4, SD1)
  - 3) Parking and Access (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: Council owned

**b) Site Description**

- pavilion building at Whitchurch Playing Fields, adjacent to Whitchurch First and Middle School
- building vacant since burst water main in 2000 and has fallen into disrepair and suffered from vandalism
- part of building used by playgroup previous to 2000, with remainder used for changing facilities related to playing fields
- lease particulars for repair and refurbishment scheme released by Harrow Council in January 2004, to include refurbishment of entire building with part to be kept for changing facilities for playing fields
- car park adjacent to building used for school and playing fields
- access from Wemborough Road to drop-off/pick-up area for schools

**c) Proposal Details**

- refurbishment of building
- use of part of ground floor of pavilion building for nursery and after school club
- part of ground floor (120m<sup>2</sup>) to be used for changing facilities (no change of use required)
- first floor not subject of this application, to be left vacant at this stage
- car park and access adjacent to be shared with schools

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/9712	Use of part of pavilion for playgroup	GRANTED 11-DEC-73
LBH/9712/3	Continued use of part of pavilion for playgroup	GRANTED 25-MAR-77

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
8

Replies  
0

Expiry  
10-JUN-05

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Nursery Provision**

Policy C4 of Harrow's UDP states that the Council will consider favourably proposals for the use of a church hall, community hall or other non-residential premises as a nursery or playgroup provided that (a) there is no adverse environmental effect on the locality, and (b) it does not constitute a traffic hazard.

The pavilion building is a non-residential property in close proximity to other community uses (Whitchurch First and Middle Schools and Whitchurch Playing Fields) off Wemborough Road. It has previously been used for a combination of a playgroup and changing facilities for the playing fields, until 2000 when a burst water main damaged the building. Given this planning history and the suitability of the proposed use in relation to the nearby schools, it is considered to be a positive location for a nursery. The proposed floorspace would be acceptable for the number of children, as it would meet Ofsted's standards. Details of disabled access have been required by condition, in accordance with Policy C17.

### **2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

the proposal involves the refurbishment of the building, to be guaranteed by the terms of the lease signed by the Council. This would improve immensely the physical appearance of the building, which is currently in a poor state of repair following vandalism since the burst water main forced the closure of the building in 2000. New windows and doors to the entirety of the property should be provided and should match those on the original building, as required by condition. Thus the proposal would result in improved visual amenity for the neighbouring residents and users of the school/playing fields.

The proposal would bring the building back into use and thus would raise vigilance and security of this part of the extended school property. This would have a positive effect for the users of the school and the nearby residential properties.

Given the distance (over 70m) to the nearest residential properties opposite on Wemborough Road, it is not considered that the proposal would impact on residential amenity.

### **3) Parking and Access**

The proposal involves shared use of the adjacent access and car park with Whitchurch schools. Conditions to control the dropping off and picking up times have been attached, in the interests of highway safety.

### **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.

---

**NORPAP HOUSE, 35 PINNER ROAD, HARROW**

**2/06**

**P/1001/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE (CLASS B1) TO  
OFFICE AT GROUND FLOOR AND EDUCATION AT  
FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR (CLASS B1 AND D1)

THACKRAY WILLIAMS SOLICITORS for MR R RANGER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: SK1; Site 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 use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the land restored to its former condition within one year(s) of the date of this permission, in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.
- 3 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:-  
(a) 08:00 hours to 20:00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive, without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 The premises shall be used for the purpose specified on the application and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification).  
REASON: (a) To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.  
(b) To safeguard the character and viability of the shopping parade.  
(c) In the interests of highway safety.
- 5 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 6 Disabled Access - Use
- 7 The use hereby permitted shall not commence until a formal forecourt parking layout has been laid out in accordance with details that shall have first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure satisfactory parking facilities within the site, in the interests of pedestrian safety and the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.

continued/



INFORMATIVE:

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
- SD3 Mixed-Use Development
- ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
- EP25 Noise
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas
- EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses
- C7 New Educational Facilities
- C11 Ethnic Communities
- C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
- T13 Parking Standards

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Loss of Amenity (EM15)
  - 2) Education and Parking (C7, T13)
  - 3) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers/Users (D4, D7)
  - 4) Disabled Persons Access (C17)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- three storey 1960s building fronting south side of Pinner Road; has hardsurfaced forecourt used informally for parking with crossover onto carriageway
- adjacent building to west, Belmont Hall, is single storey place of worship with no on-site parking
- adjacent building to east, no. 33, a two storey Victorian building (Ocella records show vacant but last used as printers)
- Pinner Road designated as a London Distributor Road; parking controlled (prohibited) Mon-Sat 8am-6.30pm and loading Mon-Fri 8-9.30am and 4.30-6.30pm
- surrounding development comprises commercial uses to east (hire shop/yard and offices), hotel and residential opposite and residential to west
- site to rear on lower level and forms part of warehousing/industrial estate

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- permission is sought for the conversion of the premises, in use wholly as offices (Class B1) to educational use on the first and second floors (Class D1) with office use retained on the ground floor

**d) Relevant History**

P/2807/04/CFU	Change of use: dual/alternative Class B1 (offices) or Class D1 (medical services)	GRANTED 14-JAN-05
---------------	---	----------------------

Subject to conditions, inter alia:

“1. The use hereby permitted shall not commence until the car parking spaces shown on the approved plans are 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.

2. The use hereby permitted shall not open to patients outside the following times:-

a) Monday-Saturday 8:00am to 8:00pm

b) not after 9:30pm on any two nights between Monday-Friday

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

3. The premises shall be used as drug and alcohol counselling and treatment centre and for no other purpose in Class D1 of the schedule to the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification).

REASON: a) To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality and

b) to permit reconsideration in the light of the circumstances then prevailing and to safeguard the amenities of adjoining properties.”

P/1558/04/CFU	Redevelopment: 34 flats in 3/4 storey building with basement car parking (Resident Permit Restricted)	GRANTED 11-MAY-05
---------------	---	----------------------

continued/

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Khalsa College London (KCL) is a prospective lessee of the above property. KCL is a registered charity and was established in November 1985. KCL is recognised by Department of Education and Skills and is also an approved centre of Edexcel, AQA and OCR Examination Boards. This is the twentieth year of the College serving various communities in Harrow. The College specialises in teaching Mother-tongue languages including, Punjabi, Hindi, Marathi, Urdu and Gujarati. In addition it also teaches a wide spectrum of subjects, where local students need special attention. The College is a pioneer in teaching Mother-tongue education in Harrow. The College also specialises in oriental music, both vocal and instrumental. The College has also prepared tailor-made language courses for hospitals, police force and schools. At present the College is housed at 10 College Road, from where it has been operating for the last ten years. The present lease will expire in June 2005, and the landlord intends to convert the offices into residential flats. The building at 35 Pinner Road will be used for Education and administration purposes only. The College classes are held both during the day and in the evening. The students' ages range from 5 years to adulthood. Though College's student population changes from year to year, but, on average, about 200 students join and attend different classes every year. Most of the College students are part time and attend College only once or twice a week. At any one time about 30 students attend the College during weekdays, as classes and courses are scattered over 7 days a week. Saturday classes have most students i.e., about 50 -60 attending languages, religious studies, music, computers, ESOL, and other short term and vocational courses. Classes are held during School terms only.

We desperately need premises to move in so that academic standards of our students are not disturbed. We will be grateful if a favourable decision is taken by the first/second week of June so that we can plan our classes for the next academic year.

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
34

Replies  
16

Expiry  
07-JUN-05

**Summary of Responses:** Noise, traffic/parking, use may be substantial and clash with own long established services at Belmont Hall, no existing problems parking/unloading outside the church, wish to make an application for a dropped kerb, previous owners of the application building allowed church users to park on for forecourt - additional on-street pressure, also pending redevelopment of 23-33 Pinner Road into flats, worshipers arrive Sundays 9.45am and services continue to 12.30pm, also Sunday evening 5.45-9.15pm, and Sunday school 2.45-4.15pm, further services Monday and Wednesday evenings, children's club Thursday evenings, other events/services at times throughout the year; parents ignore all parking restrictions and stopping unsafe on this part of Pinner Road, will affect parking for neighbouring businesses, see future of church in jeopardy, Sundays should be respected, no objection to people of different faith, application made for provision of windows on boundary with 29-33 contrary to guidelines for housing developments, full planning permission to build up to boundary with no. 35 (P/1558/04/CFU), owner of 35 should obtain formal agreement from adjoining owners of work on an existing shared wall, church services should not be spoiled by music tuition next-door, church has elderly and disabled members who need ease of access

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Loss of Employment**

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. However, the principle of the loss of the existing employment use has already been established by planning permission P/2807/04/CFU and in employment policy terms, the subject proposal can be considered favourably in relation to the following points:

- the retention of the ground floor in B1 office use;
- the potential for the employment of professional and administrative staff associated with the educational use; and
- the provision and development of skills amongst the local population that would contribute to their employability and, potentially therefore, the strength of the local economy.

In relation to Khalsa College's prospective occupation of the premises, if this application is granted, it can be further noted that the proposal would allow the retention of this existing facility within the Borough. The College's specialism in Mother-tongue language tuition would also be consistent with Policy C11 of the replacement UDP, which seeks to address the diverse planning requirements of ethnic communities within the Borough, and the Council's strategic corporate priorities of community strengthening and learning.

### **2) Education and Parking**

Policy C7 of the replacement UDP supports the provision of educational facilities subject to criteria taking account of the need for new facilities, the accessibility of the site and the availability of setting-down and picking-up points.

There is no evidence to suggest that the provision of educational facilities within the Borough has reached saturation point and, if occupied by the Khalsa College, it is clear that the premises would continue to meet a need within the local population. Whilst the location of the site is more peripheral to the town centre than Khalsa College's existing College Road site, it is nonetheless within a reasonable walking distance from Harrow-on-the-Hill station and Harrow bus station. Pinner Road is served by local bus services between Harrow and North Harrow/Pinner and the stops in both directions are within the vicinity of the site.

A formal parking layout has not been provided with this proposal, but the previous application (P/2807/04/CFU) indicates that four spaces (two pairs of tandem spaces) could be provided whilst retaining adequate pedestrian access over the forecourt. The UDP parking schedule for D1 uses stipulates a maximum range of one space per 300-600m<sup>2</sup> of the site area; this equates to 1-2 spaces. Although the proposed level of provision would exceed this, such a situation is not considered to be unacceptable having regard to the retention of the ground floor office element and the existing use of the forecourt for informal parking.

continued/

It is considered that the spaces would be more likely to be used by staff than students, by reason of the tandem arrangement of parking on the forecourt (i.e. the risk of being blocked-in) and the difficulties of access to/egress from Pinner Road due to heavy traffic flows, particularly at peak times. In this way it is considered that the formal use of the forecourt for parking would be 'self-regulating' and limited to those users of the premises whose movements to and from the site are likely to be less frequent throughout the day. It is considered that a formal parking layout could be satisfactorily secured by condition.

It remains, therefore, to consider the availability of safe setting-down and picking up points. Such activity would be unlikely to take place within the site, for the reasons outlined above. Given the difficulties of parking on-street within the vicinity of the site it is considered likely that older students would arrive by public transport and/or on foot and in this sense the site represents a highly sustainable location for the use proposed. However a D1 use would also allow for the education of younger children or a nursery and, in respect of the Khalsa College, it can be noted that the age of students begins at five years. The existing on-street parking controls should be sufficient to curtail setting-down/picking up activity on Pinner Road during hours of high traffic flow (i.e. the hours of control); at these times parents/guardians will have to make alternative arrangements for parking and accessing the premises. However, it is recommended that permission be granted initially on a temporary basis of one year to review this aspect of the proposed use, as injudicial stopping on the highway during the controlled hours could give rise to conditions detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on Pinner Road (which is a London distributor road).

**3) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers/Users**

The proposed use would be likely to increase general activity associated with the site, both in terms of external access/egress and within the building, than the building's existing office use. However the application must also be considered in relation to the potential effects of the approved use as a drug and alcohol counselling and treatment centre. This approved use was intended to allow flexibility with an existing facility at Bessborough Road and consequently there could be fluctuations, should that use be implemented, in terms of the degree office vs. rehabilitation use. Nevertheless, within the confines of condition 3, the scope of planning permission P/2807/04/CFU would permit full use as a treatment centre with potentially significant levels of activity both outside and within the building. It is not considered that the proposed use would lead to levels of activity substantially beyond the approved situation and taking into account ambient levels of disturbance in this locality, as a result of traffic and neighbouring commercial uses, neither is it considered that the use per-se would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers. Conditional controls of hours of use and noise associated with the use would provide safeguards to surrounding residential occupiers at times when ambient levels can be expected to be lower – i.e. evenings and weekends.

continued/

Item 2/06 – P/1001/05/DFU continued.....

As above, on the basis of the locational advantages of the site and existing on-street parking controls, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to such a degree of vehicular parking/activity within the vicinity of the site as to be of detriment to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the convenience of surrounding users' access to their sites. However, a review of the situation in one year's time would permit a re-assessment in the event of evidence of any problems arising from injudicial parking or inconsiderate behaviour associated with the use.

**4) Disabled Persons' Access**

A condition is suggested to ensure the approval and implementation of satisfactory details prior to the commencement of the use.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Use may be substantial and clash with own long established services at Belmont Hall: temporary permission will allow review of material planning matters in one year's time

Wish to make an application for a dropped curb: such an application would be determined on its own merits

Previous owners of the application building allowed church users to park on the forecourt – additional on-street pressure/ church has elderly and disabled members who need ease of access: refusal to maintain preserve informal agreement between neighbours would not be reasonable

Worshippers arrive Sundays 9.45am and services continue to 12.30pm, also Sunday evening 5.45-9.15pm, and Sunday school 2.45-4.15pm, further services Monday and Wednesday evenings, children's club Thursday evenings, other events/services at times throughout the year: information noted

Parents ignore all parking restrictions and stopping unsafe on this part of Pinner Road: highways behaviour can be reviewed in one year's time

See future of church in jeopardy: subject to review in one year's time proposal should not affect future use of the neighbouring church

Sundays should be respected: opinion noted

No objection to people of different faith: noted

Application made for provision of windows on boundary with 29-33 contrary to guidelines for housing developments/full planning permission to build up to boundary with no. 35 (P/1558/04/CFU)/also pending redevelopment of 23-33 Pinner Road into flats: proposal is for use only

Owner of 35 should obtain formal agreement from adjoining owners of work on an existing shared wall: party wall act a separate matter

Church services should not be spoiled by music tuition next-door: impact of proposed use on surrounding land uses can be reviewed after one year

**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.

---

**R/O 26-28 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE**

**2/07**

**P/3104/04/COU/RJS**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

OUTLINE:REDEVELOPMENT: PART 2/3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE SHOP (A1) AND WORKSHOP AT GROUND FLOOR AND 3 FLATS ABOVE (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

MAHMUT HILMI - ARCHITECTS for MR & MRS KOTAK, PJ CAR AUDIO

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 166/01B, 166/02C, 166/03B, 166/04D, 166/05E

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
  - (c) external appearance of the building(s)
  - (e) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 Completed Development - Buildings
- 4 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.
- 5 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 6 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 7 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 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:

SD1 Quality of Design

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

SEM1 Development of the Boroughs Regeneration Strategy

SEM2 Hierarchy of Town Centres

continued/

SEM3	Proposals for New Employment-Generating Development
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
T13	Parking Standards

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Character of Area and Housing Policy (SD1, SH1, SEM1, SEM2, SEM3, D4, D5, T13)
  - 2) Neighbouring and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Town Centre	Wealdstone	
Car Parking	Standard:	4
	Justified:	0
	Provided:	0
Habitable Rooms:	7	
No. of Residential Units:	3	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- the property is a corner plot with the main frontage to High Street and a secondary frontage to Palmerston Road
- the proposed application relates to the rear section of this property, with sole frontage to Palmerston Road
- the existing building on this parcel of land is a single storey commercial property with a footprint that covers its entire allocated plot
- the existing building directly abuts:
  - the boundary wall of the adjoining commercial building to the north
  - a laneway and adjacent car park to the east
  - the rear extension/outbuilding of the commercial building to the west
  - the blank side elevation of the commercial building located to the opposite side of Palmerston Road

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application with details of siting, means of access and design to be determined, for redevelopment to provide a part 2/3 storey building to provide shop (A1) and workshop at ground floor and 3 flats above
- existing building would be demolished as part of the proposal
- the proposed building would be 3 storey in scale, via a two storey design with a third level within a mansard styled roof; the building would accommodate a maximum overall height of 8.4m
- at ground floor the building would accommodate a shop and associated workshop
- 2 x 1 bedroom flats are proposed at first floor level

continued/



Item 2/07 – P/3104/04/COU continued.....

- 1 x 2 bedroom flat is proposed at first roof level
- all flats would be accessed via the centrally sited entrance lobby
- small terraces are proposed for the two flats at first floor level
- external refuse storage would be provided off the laneway located adjacent to the building

**d) Relevant History**

None

**f) Consultations**

TWU: No objection  
EA: No comment

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	19	0	21-DEC-04

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Locality**

The residential character of the locality is predominantly commercial with scale ranging up to 3-4 stories in scale. The design of the building is considered to be appropriate for the context of the locality as it picks up on the prevailing scale of the commercial buildings within the locality. The proposed development plans indicate a proposal that has been designed having regard to the prevalent scale, massing and bulk of buildings adjoining the site and within the vicinity. The building would respect that form and height of the buildings along the High Street and would be subservient in scale to these. Accordingly it is deemed that the proposed development has been designed in such a manner so as to avoid any detrimental impact on the character of the locality.

**2) Neighbouring and Residential Amenity**

The proposed building has retained an identical footprint of the building it is to replace, whilst raising the building in height to a scale that is complimentary to the locality. Due to the commercial nature of the locality it is deemed that the proposed development would not pose any significant detrimental impact for adjoining properties.

With regard to the residential amenity of future occupants, the main living spaces have been orientated to the front of the building where they will have ample access to daylight/sunlight. Although no private or communal gardens are proposed, this is considered reasonable given the commercial nature of surrounding property. Furthermore Byron Recreation Ground is located a short walk away to the east.

continued/

**3) Parking/Highway Safety**

The proposal does not contain any provision for car parking, however the site has excellent access to services and public transport. On a related matter it is highlighted that parking restrictions apply within the locality, thus to prevent further demand for on-street parking, an informative to be included on the planning permission will advise that residential occupiers of the building will be ineligible for residential parking permits. Therefore on the basis of access to public transport and that future residents would be ineligible for parking permits, there is no objection to the application on grounds of insufficient parking provision.

**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.

---

**14 STATION PARADE, KENTON LANE, HARROW**

**2/08**

**P/1153/05/CVA/TEM**

Ward: KENTON WEST

VARIATION OF CONDITION 4 OF PERMISSION EAST/613/94/FUL TO ALLOW OPENING UNTIL 1.00AM FRIDAYS & SATURDAYS AND MIDNIGHT MONDAYS TO THURSDAYS

MR TONY COVEY for MR MARTIN FORRISTAL

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 050413/01

**GRANT** variation(s) of Condition 4 of planning permission EAST/613/94/FUL follows:-

- 1 The premises shall not used except between 10.30 hours and midnight on Mondays to Thursdays and between 10.30 hours and 01.00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays, except for the outdoor beer gardens which shall be used no later than 23.00 hours, seven days per week.

**INFORMATIVE:**

- 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:

- EP25 Noise
  - EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses
- 

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Residential Amenity (EP25, EM25)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Town Centre	Belmont
C.C.A.	47m <sup>2</sup>
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- south side of Kenton Lane at western end of Belmont Local Centre
- occupied by Public House on ground floor with basement storage/office and 2 floors of residential accommodation over, small beer gardens at front and side
- former Belmont line open space to west, commercial premises with flats above to east, houses in Kenmore Avenue to south, public car park on opposite side of Kenton Lane

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition 4 of planning permission EAST/613/94/FUL to allow opening from 10.30 hours until 01.00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays, and from 10.30 hours until midnight on Mondays to Thursdays

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/613/94/FUL Change of use: Class A1 to A3 (retail to food & drink) & ground & basement extension at side & rear (revised) GRANTED 28-NOV-94

Condition 4 reads as follows:

“The premises shall not be used except between 10.30 hours and 23.00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive, and between 10.30 hours and 22.30 hours on Sundays, without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.”

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- maisonette directly above application premises is owned by applicant and occupied by manager of public house
- residential properties at rear sited beyond rear service yard with deep rear gardens
- public house small in size (50-60 people maximum)
- existing closing times can lead to customers leaving at once, leading to more noise and disturbance, hence relaxation in licensing laws by Government
- most patrons are immediately local residents who would not wish to disturb neighbours
- 12/13 Station Parade open after 11pm
- Spanish Arch and Chinese takeaway at No. 6 Station Parade have no restrictions
- Chinese restaurant at 498 Kenton Lane, open until 23.30 on Mondays to Saturdays by virtue of condition
- Rambling Inn at 410 Kenton Lane open until midnight
- use of planning system to impose stricter controls than licensing laws would be anomalous
- Environmental Health Department able to impose instant restrictions if problems occur
- regular late night traffic movements along Station Parade as well as pedestrians from other late night uses

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
50

Replies  
2

Expiry  
11-JUL-05

**Summary of Responses:** Noise and disturbance; traffic disturbance

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Amenity**

Planning permission EAST/613/94/FUL which allowed the A3 (now A4) use of these premises contains conditions which prevent the transmission of noise caused by music or other amplified sound and plant and machinery to neighbouring premises.

These provide remedies against noise generation from within the building. The Environmental Health Division also has powers under the Environmental Protection Act to take action to abate such nuisance.

The main issue therefore in considering the proposed increased hours of use is the possible intensity of noise and disturbance from outside the building and the impact on nearby residences.

In this case Angies is a pub of modest size with a capacity (according to the landlord) of 50-60 people. This is considered to be realistic given the customer circulation area of less than 50m<sup>2</sup>.

Whereas flats are located at first and second floor levels above the parade to the east of the site, no residential premises are located immediately adjacent to the west.

It is therefore quite possible that the impact of customers leaving the premises would be dispersed in terms of residential impact.

It is not anticipated, given the size of the premises, that traffic generation would give rise to excessive levels of noise and disturbance.

Environmental Health Services confirm that no noise complaints have been received in the last 2 years or so.

Other premises in Belmont Circle which open to similar times to those sought for these premises comprise:-

The Rambling Inn, 410 Kenton Lane, open until midnight 7 days a week

The Spanish Arch, no planning restrictions, open until early hours.

These establishments and Angies are located in different parts of the Centre and would not result in a concentration of late night uses.

The adjacent premises, Magnum Club, which is a much larger A3/A4 use on 2 floors, has permitted hours of use up to 23.00 hours on Mondays to Saturdays inclusive, and 22.30 hours on Sundays. Closing times of these neighbouring uses would therefore be staggered if the application is granted.

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/1153/05/CVA continued.....

One area of concern is the impact of use of the outdoor beer garden areas up to the hours specified.

It is therefore suggested that use of these areas be restricted as part of a grant of planning permission.

The Committee will be aware that the extended hours sought in this application have also to be agreed by the Licensing Panel. Should subsequent nuisance result to neighbouring residences then any responsible authority may call for a review of the license at which time the terms of the license can be reconsidered.

**2) Consultation Responses**

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.

---

**258 KENTON RD, KENTON**

**2/09**

**P/2969/04/DFU/AMH**

Ward: KENTON WEST

SINGLE & TWO STOREY SIDE & REAR EXTENSION, REAR DORMER & CONVERSION TO 3 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

CAROLYN SQUIRE for MR RAITHATHA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 0453/1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7a; 8; 9a; 10a; 11b; 12a.

**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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 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
- 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

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

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

Cont...

## INFORMATION

This application is reported to the Committee at the request of a nominated member. The application was deferred at the 15th June meeting to seek amendments to the scheme.

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	3
	Justified:	1
	Provided:	1
No. of Residential Units:	3	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- Site to northern side of Kenton Road occupied by semi-detached dwelling.
- Existing hard-standing in front garden.
- Single storey garage abutting single storey garage to number 256.

### c) Proposal Details

- Single and two storey side and rear extension and rear dormer to semi-detached dwelling house.
- The ground floor element of the extension would run from level with the main front wall, along the boundary with the adjacent 256 (forming new party wall), to 3m beyond the main rear building line, and across the rear elevation to the boundary with 260.
- The first floor element would be set back from the main front wall by 1m, set 300mm in from the flank boundary with 256, project 2m beyond the main rear wall of the building and wrap around the rear elevation, terminating 3.35m from the boundary with 260.
- The roof above the extension would be subordinate and hipped.
- The rear dormer would be contained within the original roof slope sited 500mm from the boundary with 260, 1000mm above the eaves, and below existing ridge level.
- Conversion of extended dwelling house into two 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom self contained flats.

### d) Relevant History

None.

### e) Consultations: Brent Council - No Objection

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	4	2	08-DEC-2004

**Summary of Response:** provision of sufficient off-street parking; Kenton Rd is one of the most dangerous traffic spots in the Borough; new door closer to that of number 256; increased noise from door slamming car starting/parking and people shouting; front garden will become a car park.

Cont...



## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Conversion Policy**

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

The proposed new units are considered to be adequate in terms of size, circulation and layout. The vertical stacking of the different rooms between the units would be appropriate, with bedrooms above bedrooms, bathrooms above bathrooms and living rooms above living rooms and the first floor kitchen above main entrance to the ground floor. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units.

- **The standard of sound insulation measures between the units**

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to secure optimum living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed flats it is further recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

- **The level of useable amenity space**

The proposed ground floor flat would be provided adequate private amenity space, immediately adjacent to the building. The two first floor units would be provided communal garden space, beyond that proposed for the ground floor unit. This arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

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

One car parking space is proposed to the front of the building, on an existing paved forecourt, to be accessed via a new vehicular crossover.

The provision of one off-road space would be less than that stipulated by the UDP, however given the sustainable location of the application site in terms of the close proximity to public transport services and local amenities, it is considered that a provision below the prescribed standards can be reasonably justified. A further consideration is the positive contribution to the character of the area that would be secured through the proposed increased soft landscaping of the front garden.

It is considered that the size of forecourt is such that adequate refuse storage arrangements, parking, pedestrian access could be facilitated.

Cont...

- **Traffic and highway safety**

It is not considered that the scheme would be in any way prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicular safety in the locality.

**2. Character of area**

The proposed conversion would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the streetscene, by the retention of a single door to the front (relocated towards western boundary). Although activity associated with the property at the front would be likely to intensify, and be closer to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling house, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Kenton Road.

The proposed two-storey extension to the side with a 1m set back and subordinate hipped roof would satisfy the adopted Householder SPG, and would have an acceptable appearance in the streetscene. The single storey elements would also satisfy the adopted Householder SPG, and would have a negligible impact on the character of the area.

**3. Residential amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the building would be likely to increase as a result of the proposal, and that the relocated front door would be closer to the adjacent dwelling to the west, however it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed extensions would have an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties. The two storey elements would satisfy both horizontal and vertical elements of the Council's 45° code as defined by the adopted Householder SPG. The single storey element, projecting only 3m beyond the main rear wall of the adjacent dwelling would again satisfy the adopted Householder SPG.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would have an acceptable relationship with the adjoining and adjacent dwellings and would not have any significantly adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent units.

**4. Consultation Responses**

Planning considerations have been addressed 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.

---

**53 WOLSELEY ROAD, WEALDSTONE**

**2/10**

**P/901/05/DCO/JP2**

Ward: WEALDSTONE

CONTINUED USE OF PROPERTY AS  
TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS  
(RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

BROWN & CO for MR ALAN DONAHUE

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: PL0007 - 05

**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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced 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.

### INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 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:

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| D4   | Standard of Design and Layout                           |
| D5   | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| SD1  | Quality of Design                                       |
| H9   | Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats      |
| T13  | Parking   |
| EP25 | Noise   |

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Conversion Policy (H9, T13, EP25)
- 2) Character of Area (SD1, D4)
- 3) Residential Amenity (D5)
- 4) Consultation Responses

---

continued/

## INFORMATION

This application is reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	0
	Provided:	0
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- mid terrace dwelling on site to western side of Wolseley Road
- converted into two flats
- terrace has paired two storey rear extensions covering c66% of rear elevation of each dwelling
- recessed element has protected window at ground and first floor level

### c) Proposal Details

- retention of two existing flats in terraced residential building
- applicant proposes to alter the internal layout of the first floor flat so as to improve the stacking of rooms between the units. At present the first floor flat kitchen is above a ground floor bedroom. The rearrangement of first floor rooms will include the placement of a first floor flat bedroom above the ground floor flat rear bedroom
- all outdoor amenity area on site (being the rear and front gardens) is to be for the use of the ground floor flat
- no parking is provided on site
- no external alterations are proposed

### d) Relevant History

P/160/05/DFU	Continued use of property as two self-contained flats with addition of external staircase	REFUSED 24-MAR-05
--------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

“1. The conversion of the property and use as two self-contained flats, by reason of inappropriate internal design and layout and inappropriate vertical stacking between the units, does not provide a satisfactory form of accommodation, to the detriment of the residential amenities of the occupiers of the units, and contrary to adopted Policy H9 of the Borough UDP.

2. The proposed external rear staircase, by reason of prominent siting, would be unduly obtrusive when viewed from the neighbouring properties and give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking in this residential locality, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.”

continued/

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 9	Replies 0	Expiry 06-JUN-05
----	----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Conversion Policy**

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

The proposed new units are considered to be adequate in terms of size, circulation and layout. The vertical stacking of the different rooms between the units would be appropriate, with bedrooms above bedrooms, bathrooms above bathrooms, kitchens above kitchens, living rooms above living rooms. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units.

#### **The standard of sound insulation measures between the units**

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above. The plans for the application indicate that sound insulation between the units will be improved by fitting an acoustic underlay with chipboard and carpet overlain. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to secure optimum living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed flats it is further recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

#### **The level of useable amenity space**

The provision of no private amenity space for the first floor flat is considered to be acceptable in this case. The unit is mid-terraced and as such first floor access to the rear garden cannot be reasonably provided, and the site is within walking distance of Byron Recreation Ground. The reasoned justification to Policy H9 recognises the difficulty in providing access to rear amenity space in terraced properties and previous appeal decisions have accepted this deficiency.

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

No car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the site, with a front yard area to be maintained for the use of the ground floor flat.

It is considered that the size of forecourt is such that adequate refuse storage arrangements and pedestrian access could be facilitated.

#### **Traffic and highway safety**

It is considered that the scheme would not be in any way prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicular safety in the locality. There are no parking spaces proposed on site. However, due to the site's proximity to public transport on Wealdstone High Road, it is considered that the lack of on site parking will not result in detrimental impacts to parking in the area. Further to the above, the application has been reviewed by the Council's Transportation Engineer, who has stated that there are no objections with regard to transportation matters.

continued/

Item 2/10 – P/901/05/DCO continued.....

Subject to the addition of the Resident Permit Restricted Informative the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

**2) Character of Area**

The proposed conversion would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the streetscene, by the retention of a single door to the front elevation. Although activity associated with the property would be likely to intensify, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Wolseley Road. Wolseley Road is considered to have a high level of activity due to its proximity to the Wealdstone High Street.

**3) Residential Amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the building would be likely to increase as a result of the proposal. However, it is considered that this would not be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

**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.

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS

E HANNIGAN for MR & MRS TOBIN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 272B and Site 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 Materials to Match
- 3 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) 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.
- 4 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony

## **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
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

1. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

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

### a) Summary

Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- Two storey, detached property on the southern side of Monro Gardens
- Varying building line at front and rear of all properties
- Seven other two-storey side extensions in Monro Gardens
- East-westerly, approx. 1/6 slope in this section of road
- Dwelling is set back approximately 10m from roadside and 1m behind adjacent dwelling on the side of the would be continued; setting the proposed first-floor element back 1.7m from the dwelling's gabled frontage.

### c) Proposal Details

- The proposed roof would be to the same design and height of the original crowned roof.
- The extension would run down the boundary line to terminate 0.7m short of the dwellings main rear wall.
- The proposed rear extension on the westerly side would be to a depth of 3m and on the easterly side to a depth of 2.4m, with a flat roof over.
- The rear extension would span from the flank boundary with No.20 to terminate 0.9m short of the flank boundary with No.22.

### d) Relevant History

P/2804/04/DFU	Two storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions	REFUSED 30-DEC-2004
---------------	--	------------------------

### e) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
6	6	08-APR-05

**Summary of Responses:** Blocking of light to flank hallway window, concern regarding appearance and design of proposal, overall scale of development, loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking, potential felling of trees, proposed scheme out of character, extension overbearing on boundary line, sewage for proposed front toilet.

Cont...



## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Visual and Residential Amenity**

#### Two-Storey Side Extension

With regards to the proposed two-storey side extension the main issues to consider are potential impact on the adjacent property on this side, at No.20, and any impact on the character of the street scene.

The original flank wall of No.20 is spaced 0.8m from the flank boundary to which the proposed side extension will abut. The extension would form a continuation of the original side element which is set back 1.3m behind the dwellings main gabled frontage. With the frontage of No.20 being set approximately 1m in front of the applicant's, it is considered that a sufficient visual break between the dwellings would be provided without the requirement of a further 1m set back at first-floor. The continuation of the low sloping roof pitching back from the frontage also serves to reduce any potential for being overbearing in the street scene. This design is also in keeping with the character of the property, which if a standard 1m set back was provided would be difficult to achieve. The style of the dwelling's frontage and its relationship to no. 20 therefore negates the requirement of a 1m set back.

The street is made up of detached 1930's dwellings. Each dwelling is spaced approximately 1m from the flank boundary on one side and 2m from the other at first floor, with an attached garage extending to the boundary at ground level. The void above the garage at first-floor provides the spatial setting between dwellings. By proposing to infill this space, a significant degree of the spatial setting between dwellings would be lost. It is however considered that by being set back behind the two dwellings main frontages to the depth that is proposed, a sufficient break would be retained between the main frontages of the two adjacent dwellings, with No.20's side access serving to separate the dwellings completely. Several other two-storey side extensions have been constructed in the road of less sympathetic design.

The flank wall of No.20 has a hallway/landing window at first-floor. For the purposes of SPG it is deemed that this window should not be protected by way of the 45° guideline as it serves a stair and hallway.

The side extension would run to a depth 0.7m short of the main rear wall of the dwelling. At this depth the extension would fall within a 45° splay taken from the first-floor rear corner on this side. Accordingly it is not considered that there would be any effect on light to, or outlook from, the rear habitable room windows of this neighbouring property. It is also considered that there would be no unreasonable overshadowing of the neighbouring garden, nor that the proposal would appear unduly bulky or obtrusive when viewed from this neighbours rear amenity space.

Cont...

### Single Storey Rear Extension

The proposed rear extension would span from the flank boundary with No.20 across the entire rear of the dwelling to the level of the opposite flank wall to a width of 8.65m. On the side of No.20 the extension would have a rearward projection of 2.4m beyond the dwellings main rear wall. An extension currently exists on this boundary line (to be demolished) to the same height as proposed and to a greater depth than proposed. It is therefore considered that by proposing a new rear element with decreased bulk no adverse impact would be imposed on the amenity of No.20. Also, No.20 has an adjacent rear extension to the same depth as proposed.

On the other side the flank wall of the extension would be spaced 0.8m from the flank boundary with No.22. At a height of 3m to a flat roof and a depth of 3m beyond the dwelling's recessed section of rear wall and due to its spacing from the boundary, it is considered that the no detrimental impact would occur on the amenity of the adjacent occupiers.

## **2. Consultation Responses**

- out of character - two storey side extensions have been constructed in Monro Gardens. It is considered that the essential character of the road would be retained.
- impact on No. 20 flank windows - the proposed development would impose a significant degree of overshadowing to this window, causing loss of natural light to the stair and first floor hall of the property. This space is not however considered to be a habitable room, for the purposes of SPG, and would still receive a degree of light being set 0.8m away from the boundary line. The impact on this window, and hence on the living amenity of the dwelling's occupiers on the whole, is not considered to be significant enough to warrant the refusal of the application.
- overlooking - it was considered that no unreasonable levels of overlooking would occur from any additional proposed windows. The potential for this impact is reduced considerably by the rear of the two-storey side extension being recessed behind the dwellings main rear wall.
- overbearing on boundary line - by only extending to a depth 0.7m short of the dwellings main rear wall, it was not considered that the extension would appear unduly bulky when viewed from this neighbours rear amenity space. As regards to the visual impact, as viewed from the streetscene, this was not considered to be unreasonable, as addressed in the above 'appraisal'.

## **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.

---

**WARREN HOUSE, WOOD LANE, STANMORE**

**2/12**  
**P/1137/05/CFU/CM**  
Ward: CANONS

CANOPY ROOF EXTENSIONS TO MAIN  
BUILDING AND TO OUTBUILDING

LINE DESIGN for ISLAMIC CENTRE

---

**WARREN HOUSE, WOOD LANE, STANMORE**

**2/13**  
**P/1138/05/CLB/CKJ**  
Ward: CANONS

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CANOPY  
ROOF EXTENSIONS TO MAIN HOUSE  
AND OUTBUILDING

LINE DESIGN for ISLAMIC CENTRE

---

P/1137/05/CFU

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: LD3564/1, /2, /3, Site 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

**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:

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

SD1 Quality of Design

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

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings

D14 Conservation Areas

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

D16 Conservation Area Priority

---

continued/

P/1138/05/CLB

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: LD3564/1; /2; /3; site plan; photographs

**GRANT** Listed Building Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Listed Bldg./Cons. Area Consent
- 2 Listed Building - Making Good

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 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:

- D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
- D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings
- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens

---

### **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, EP32, EP33, EP34)
  - 2) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D14, D15, D16)
  - 3) Character of Listed Building (D11, D13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: Little Common Stanmore

Green Belt

TPO

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- Grade II Listed Building Warren House (formerly called Springbok House) in Wood Lane
- property in use as Islamic religious centre
- high curved Grade II Listed boundary wall fronting on Wood Lane with paved access for parking to front of main building

continued/

Items 2/12 & 2/13 – P/1137/05/CFU & P/1138/05/CLB continued.....

- low 'Clock Tower' building to north east of main building, with dormers in front roof plane; low building along front boundary to west

**bb) Listed Building Description**

wall to west and north of Springbok House: mid C19, yellow stock brick, 11ft. high with stone copings, recessed in centre to pass through porte-cochere, forming a curved forecourt and screening the house

- Warren House, formerly Springbok House, C.18, rambling house, neo-Jacobean revival style
- wings to left and right of elaborate porte-cochere, right hand wing asymmetrical, stuccoed of 2 storeys
- left hand, mid C.19 of 3 storeys and 7 bays (2 + 3 + 2) with further extension left of 2 storeys and 2 bays
- yellow stock brick
- sash windows under flat gauged arches
- interior of interest, it was the home of architect Sir Robert Smirke from 1813 to circa 1860

**c) Proposal Details**

- 2 glazed canopies to form porches, one to main building (between building and front boundary wall); one to front of 'Clock Tower' building
- roofs to be formed of clear twin wall polycarbonate sheet with proprietary white finish aluminium glazing bars and sections
- canopy A to be attached to the front boundary wall and main building, spanning a width of 3.3m at the widest point where the boundary wall curves outwards; height 2.97m agl
- canopy B to be attached to the front of the 'Clock Tower' building and supported by 4 no. timber posts, with decorative capital brackets on front elevation to match existing features; projecting a depth of 3.375m from the eaves

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/31986/87/FUL	Change of use to community/religious centre including welfare, study, overnight accommodation, single storey extension	GRANTED 04-DEC-92
P/1138/05/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Canopy roof extensions to main house and outbuilding	CURRENT

P/1137/05/CFU

**e) Consultations**

CAAC:

No objections to Canopy A, but object to Canopy B. The glazing should not obscure the existing prominent gable. An alternative solution could involve extending the gable forwards to retain its prominence, with a glazed canopy roof either side of the gable. The plans are poor. It would be beneficial to stress the need to upgrade the existing listed building, which has been allowed to deteriorate.

continued/

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 23-JUN-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notification</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 15-JUN-05
---------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

P/1138/05/CLB

<b>Advertisement</b>	Extension/Alteration of Listed Building	Expiry 04-JUL-05
----------------------	---	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 24-JUN-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character**

Policies within the adopted UDP seek to, among other things, retain the openness and character of the Green Belt. According to Policy EP34, proposals to extend buildings should minimise adverse environmental impact on the green belt character and be appropriate in terms of bulk, height and site coverage in relation to total site area.

It is considered that the proposed canopy extensions would comply with this policy as no adverse impact on the green belt character would result. The proposed canopy A would be obscured from view on the frontage of the property by the high (3.1m) front boundary wall and the structure would be modest in comparison to the main building and single storey element to the front. The proposed canopy B would be visible within the site as it would occupy a significant area to the front of the 'Clock Tower' building. However in terms of overall bulk and site coverage the proposed structures are considered to be acceptable, given their relatively transparent nature and their subordinate relationship to the two buildings which they would serve.

Given the above considerations, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would be harmful to the openness or character of this part of the Green Belt and the Area of Special Character. There is a TPO for the site, however no trees are sited in close proximity to the proposed canopies.

**2) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area**

The site is located in the Stanmore: Little Common Conservation Area. The canopies as proposed would be relatively modest and transparent, thus the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

**3) Character of Listed Building**

This application involves two canopies being constructed. Canopy A would be constructed to the west of the main entrance, between the Grade II listed wall and the Grade II Listed Warren House. The location and minimal design of the canopy does not have a sufficient effect on the character of the listed building as it does not obscure any historic features and will be read as a sympathetic but obvious modern intervention.

continued/

Canopy B is proposed on an outbuilding, listed by the nature of it being within the curtilage of Warren House. The outbuilding is subservient to the main house and currently has a cluttered and somewhat run down appearance. The canopy is simply designed and again will have a minimal effect on the character of the listed building.

**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, these applications are recommended for grant.

---

**387 TORBAY ROAD, HARROW**

**2/14**

**P/11110/05/DCO/PDB**

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

CONTINUED USE AS CARE HOME FOR UP  
TO SIX PEOPLE WITH SOCIAL SUPPORT

HEPHER DIXON LTD for HARROW CHURCHES HOUSING ASSOC

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 11058/07

**GRANT** permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans

## **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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD3 Mixed-Use Development
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix
- EP25 Noise
- H14 Residential Institutions
- T13 Parking Standards

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) UDP Policy H14 (Residential Institutions)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as a petition has been received and the recommendation is for grant.

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- two storey semi-detached dwelling with two storey side and single storey side and rear extensions; used by Harrow Churches Housing Association as shared home for six persons leaving care with some supervision
- accommodation currently comprises six lockable bedrooms with kitchenette facilities, bed, chair and TV; communal kitchen, two communal bathrooms and an office (two desks and ancillary equipment)

continued/



Item 2/14 – P/1110/05/DCO continued...

- forecourt hardsurfaced with access providing two parking spaces; rear garden part hardsurfaced/part soft landscaped providing approx 220m<sup>2</sup> amenity space
- adjoining semi to north-east, no. 389, also has two storey and single storey side extensions, and rear conservatory adjacent to the boundary
- neighbouring semi to south-west, no. 385, sited 1m approx. off common boundary and has two storey side/single storey side to rear extension
- levels fall towards rear; raised patios with steps down to garden level common to this and neighbouring properties
- Torbay Road residential in character; parking restrictions apply Monday-Friday 10am to 11am

**c) Proposal Details**

- continued use of property as care home for up to six people, with social support

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/760/01/CLP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: Use of property as shared home for 6 people with office	REFUSED 10-JAN-02
-----------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

1. The application relates to the proposed use of the property as a use within Use Class C3 of the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order 1987, by six persons, not related, living together as a single household, (including a household where care is provided for the residents).
2. As staff (up to three) are not to be resident within the household they do not need to be included within the number of occupants.
3. It appears from the letter submitted with the application that the intention is to equip the residents with the skills for independent living and the plans submitted with the application indicate that each bedroom is to be fitted with a mini kitchen. Although there is also a kitchen, which could accommodate some shared use by all the residents, there is no shared living room for communal use.
4. It is apparent therefore that this proposal will result in a change in the character of the use of property amounting to a material change of use that would not fall within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. Planning permission is therefore required.”

WEST/894/02/CLE	Certificate of Lawful Existing Development: Use of a dwelling house by up to 6 persons with social support	REFUSED 18-MAR-04
-----------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

1. The property was originally in use as a single family dwellinghouse. (Class C3).

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/1110/05/DCO continued...

2. The current use of the property as a housing project provides six bedrooms and an office, but no communal area for residents. An element of care is provided but the residents of the property have locks on their bedroom doors, pay bills separately and have no responsibility for filling vacancies that arise. Residents at the property arrive in small groups, rather than as a large group on a group tenancy basis. It appears that the residents have no clear reason for living together as a household and that they do not live together as a family. The current use of the property in this way falls within Class C2 and as such a change of use has taken place.
3. On the basis of the information provided the change of use of the building from a single family dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a housing project used by up to six persons with some support (Class C2) constitutes development in accordance with S55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”

P/2167/04/CFU	Use as care home for up to 6 people with social support and single storey rear extension	WITHDRAWN 02-NOV-04
P/1119/05/DCP	Certificate of Lawful Existing Development: Lawful proposed use of the dwelling-house by six residents	UNDETERMINED
P/1109/05/DFU	Single storey rear extension	GRANTED 01-JUL-05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

387 Torbay Road functions as a house providing accommodation for six single homeless young people aged 16-25 years, with a key focus on 16-17 year old care leavers. It is our belief that the with proposed changes to remove the individual kitchenettes from each bedroom and the proposed extension to provide a new communal lounge would result in the property falling within Use Class C3. The planning application is therefore 'without prejudice' - should the Council disagree with our view on the certificate of lawfulness this application will allow the Council to regularise the situation and therefore bring the matter to a conclusion.

Harrow Churches Housing Association is an established local provider and worked in conjunction with Harrow Leaving Care Team to open the project in 2000. The objective of the project is to provide temporary supported accommodation for single homeless people aged 16-17 years old (care leavers). This has been identified as a regional priority by the Housing Corporation in line with the national strategy of prevention of rough sleeping for young people where care leavers are grossly over-represented. The project aims to provide occupants with sustainable life skills in terms of accessing permanent housing, budgeting, training and employment.

The project aims to fulfil its purpose by providing accommodation with intensive housing management for young people, which includes the following:

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/1110/05/DCO continued...

- Support and guidance for practical daily living
- Access to health, education, and employment services
- Access to professional services such as social work, counselling and therapy
- Support planning and keywork provision
- Assisting in obtaining benefits
- Facilitating residents meetings
- Enforcement of house rules/user agreements
- Repair and maintenance
- Dealing with resident disputes

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 10	Replies 3 + petition of 36 signatures	Expiry 01-JUN-05
----	----------------------	------------	---	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** Conversion to six bedsits took place in 2001 in breach of usual regulations and contrary to Harrow UDP; residents were advised by HCHA that conversion was exempted and assurances given that would be well managed to minimise impacts; continued use condones breach of planning controls; client group a constant nuisance and source/magnet for antisocial behaviour; the need for the facility does not outweigh its negative impact; approval will allow unrestrained expansion of the project and climate of stress/disruption; needs of/risks to vulnerable nearby residents ignored; approval would amount to retrospective agreement through process of attrition; HCHA negligent in embarking on development without research or regard to local impact; house is one of four similar facilities within 500m; Harrow UDP policy supported; wish community to continue as vibrant, welcoming and diverse home for families and communities, not a dormitory district for transients; location next to residential care home has unpleasant flavour of disinterest; five neighbours have fallen ill since facility established; noise and disturbance during daytime and night time hours; police and emergency services frequently called to the property; Association should prove its ability to manage the property during a probationary period; planning application not part of agreed plans to solve on-going problems; ill relative needs re-assurance, stability, peace and quiet.

## APPRAISAL

### 1) **UDP Policy H14 (Residential Institutions)**

Policy H14 of the replacement UDP undertakes to permit the conversion of dwellings to residential institutional uses subject to criteria relating to the impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and character, public transport accessibility, the availability of other facilities and off-street parking.

continued/

In terms of amenity and character, accommodation for six individuals need not give rise to a level of occupation that would otherwise be permitted, without planning permission, under Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987; e.g. a household of six, sharing professionals or students. In this regard it is not considered that the continued use would intrinsically generate a level of noise or disturbance that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, or the residential character of the locality. Any more specific consideration of the use must guard against moral judgement, which is not material to the planning decision, or matters of the behaviour of occupiers that is matter for the management of the facility and, ultimately, the police. It is, however, recognised that the use leads to a permanent transiency of occupation of this property. Over the periods involved, of 12-18 months however, neither is it considered that this effect would so significantly affect the character of the locality as to be detrimental.

The site is considered to be very well located for access to local shops and services within the Rayners Lane district centre. Harrow town centre is accessible on the Metropolitan line from Rayners Lane Underground station and local bus services also stop within the district centre. Although Rayners Lane district centre is itself about a 10-15 minute walk from the site this is considered to be acceptable, having regard to the age group of the occupiers.

It is considered unlikely that existing and future occupiers have a high propensity towards car ownership. The forecourt is sufficient to accommodate two cars – most likely to be used by the managers/supervisors (staff are present in two overlapping shifts). In these circumstances it is not considered that there would be detriment to highway safety or local parking conditions.

## **2) Consultation Responses**

- conversion to six bedsits took place in 2001: noted
- residents were advised by HCHA that conversion was exempted and assurances given that would be well managed to minimise impacts: noted
- continued use condones breach of planning controls: proposal would regularise lawful planning use
- the need for the facility does not outweigh its negative impact: application considered to be acceptable on its own merits
- approval will allow unrestrained expansion of the project and climate of stress/disruption: future expansion can be considered on its own merits
- approval would amount to retrospective agreement through process of attrition: application considered to be acceptable on its own merits
- HCHA negligent in embarking on development without research or regard to local impact: not relevant to planning application
- house is one of four similar facilities within 500m: locations of these not known and application considered on its own merits
- location next to residential care home has unpleasant flavour of disinterest: opinion noted

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/1110/05/DCO continued...

- five neighbours have fallen ill since facility established: noted
- Association should prove its ability to manage the property during a probationary period: application considered to be acceptable for permanent approval
- planning application not part of agreed plans to solve on-going problems: not relevant to application

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.

---

**GARAGE ADJ TO 2 WHITEFRIARS DRIVE, HARROW**

2/15

P/1335/05/COU/CM

Ward: WEALDSTONE

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A TERRACE OF 4 TWO STOREY HOUSES AND PARKING

ROBIN BRETHERICK ASSOCIATES for D PARMAR

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: RAB/05/120; /123A; /127A; /128A; /129A

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
  - (e) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 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 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (a) the frontage.
  - (b) the boundary.of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 5 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:
  - a: before the use hereby permitted is commenced
  - b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
  - c: in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authorityThe 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.

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/1335/05/COU continued.....

- 6 Highway - Approval of Construction  
7 PD Restriction - Classes A to E  
8 Landscaping to be Implemented  
9 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.

**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  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
T13 Parking Standards  
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces  
EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Loss of Garage (EM15)  
2) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, C16)  
3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)  
4) Access and Parking (T13)  
5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	6
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	4
Council Interest:	None	

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- single storey garage to rear of small commercial parade and adjacent to residential properties on Whitefriars Drive
- garage vacant for approximately one year, previously used for car repairs
- neighbouring property at 2 Whitefriars Drive with two-storey side extension up to boundary
- commercial units fronting High Road to west with flats overhead, single family dwelling at 199 High Road
- rear section of garden at 199 High Road unused
- residential properties opposite, with access road to rear of shopping parade

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application for the redevelopment of the garage to provide 4 terraced houses with rear gardens and parking at the front
- two central units with rear dormers, serving third bedrooms
- landscaping to be considered as a reserved matter

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Front part of the site was formerly used as a car repair garage, which caused some local difficulties in terms of vehicle movement and disturbance; the end of the rear garden of 199 High Road was separated from this property some years ago and is now rubbish strewn and overgrown; the proposed design details appear on nearby older houses; one parking space per house is sufficient given the central location of the site and good level of accessibility; small infill sites such as this are seen as making a potentially significant contribution to housing provision; the proposal accords with the related policy requirements and makes a useful, if modest, contribution to meeting local housing needs

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
29

Replies  
1

Expiry  
30-JUN-05

**Summary of Response:** Reduces light to windows at 2 Whitefriars Drive; invades privacy; style of development is not in keeping with existing houses; height is in excess of neighbouring properties; parking allocation is inadequate and puts further pressure on lack of available parking

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Loss of Garage**

Policies within the adopted UDP seek to resist the loss of employment generating uses across the borough. The site falls outside the designated areas of the HUDP so Policy EM15 applies, which states that the loss of these uses will be resisted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable or required for employment use. In this case it is considered that as the property is vacant and it would be potentially detrimental to neighbouring amenity to continue the established use, it is acceptable to allow redevelopment.

continued/



**2) Character of the Area**

The proposed small terrace of houses is considered to provide a significant improvement over the existing garage, in an area predominantly characterised by traditional inter-war dwellings. In terms of the use of the site for domestic purposes, it would be more in keeping with the character of Whitefriars Drive than the established business use. The proposal would follow the building line of the dwellings on Whitefriars Drive. While the majority of dwellings along the road are semi-detached or detached, it is not considered that the small terrace would be out of character. The neighbouring properties are closely spaced and traditional in appearance, and the hipped roofs at either end of the terrace would be in keeping with the suburban area. The slight additional height over that at No. 2 Whitefriars Drive is not considered to be undue. Furthermore the proposed design details would pick up on features of the neighbouring properties, such as the flat and pitch roof porches, small projecting bay windows at the end units and the central gable. The proposal includes red brick at ground floor level and self-coloured render at the upper level, separated by a projecting brick stringcourse.

With a distance of 1m to either side of the terrace, access to the rear gardens at the end units is facilitated. This gap also provides some separation from the neighbouring dwelling at No.2 Whitefriars Drive and the single storey outbuildings to the rear of the commercial units at Nos. 203-205 High Road. Overall it is considered that the proposed use of the site and appearance of the buildings would represent an improvement over the existing situation and would offer a positive contribution to the streetscene on Whitefriars Drive. The landscaping of the site would be approved as a reserved matter, and particular attention would be drawn to minimising the visual impact of the parking to the front of the site.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The proposed terrace would be adjacent to the dwelling at 2 Whitefriars Drive and to the rear of the flats over the shops fronting High Road. The terrace would follow the building line of the neighbouring property and would be shorter in depth than No.2, and although there are windows in the flank wall in the ground floor of that property, they are high-level and obscure-glazed and thus are not protected. To the other side the terrace would be approximately 11m from the closest windows of the flats over the commercial properties at High Road. Given the existing poor outlook over the garage building and the improvement proposed, this is not considered to represent an unacceptable relationship. The scheme includes part of the rear garden at 199 High Road. That property would have sufficient amenity space remaining, and while some oblique overlooking to that space may occur from the new units, it is not considered to be detrimental to amenity given the 13m rear garden depth at No. 199. There is also considered to be adequate separation between the proposed first floor and dormer windows, with a distance of at least 11m to the long rear garden at 197 High Road.

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/1335/05/COU continued.....

In respect of the amenity of the new units, the rear gardens would be of sufficient size for single family dwellings. Boundary treatments have been required by condition to ensure privacy between the rear gardens. The new terrace would follow the building line on Whitefriars Drive but would be behind the outbuildings/storage buildings at No.205 High Road, which are approximately 3m in height. Those buildings would be sited approximately 3.5m forward of the kitchen window in the front wall of the nearest new dwelling, which is considered to be acceptable given the distance of 1m from the flank wall to the boundary.

Thus the amenity of neighbouring and future occupiers would be safeguarded.

**4) Access and Parking**

The proposed new dwellings would have one space each to the front of the site, with dropped kerbs off Whitefriars Drive. The provision of one space per unit is considered to be acceptable in this location given the proximity to convenience shops and local bus routes on High Road, and the relatively close proximity to Wealdstone District Centre and mainline station. No objections have been raised in respect of highway safety.

**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 grant.

---

**HIGHLANDS, 9 PARK VIEW ROAD, PINNER**

**2/16**

**P/952/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: PINNER

REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY HOUSE

SIMON MCHUGH for MR & MRS DAS

---

**HIGHLANDS, 9 PARK VIEW ROAD, PINNER**

**2/17**

**P/1530/05/CCA/CM**

Ward: PINNER

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT:  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND  
GARAGE

SIMPSON MCHUGH for MR & MR DAS

---

P/952/05/CFU

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2230/3C; /4 Rev.E; /D1

**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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Trees - Protective Fencing
- 6 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 7 Levels to be Approved
- 8 Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building
- 9 PD Restriction - Classes A to D

### **INFORMATIVES:**

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

continued/

- 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:
- SD1        Quality of Design
  - SEP5       Structural Features
  - SEP6       Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
  - EP31       Areas of Special Character
  - 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
  - D5         New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D14        Conservation Areas
  - T13        Parking Standards

---

P/1530/05/CCA

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos:    2230/1; /3C; /4 Rev.E; /D1

**GRANT** Conservation Area Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):-

- 1        Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2        The demolition hereby permitted shall not commence before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and all the approvals required by the conditions attached to planning permission reference P/952/05/CFU have been obtained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

**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:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1        Quality of Design
- SEP5       Structural Features

continued/

Items 2/16 & 2/17 – P/952/05/CFU & P/1530/05/CCA continued.....

SEP6	Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
EP31	Areas of Special Character
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
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D14	Conservation Areas
T13	Parking Standards

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Green Belt Land & Area of Special Character (SD1, SEP5, SEP6, EP31, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4, D5)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area (D14)
  - 3) Neighbouring Amenity (D4)
  - 4) Parking and Access (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Conservation Area:	Pinner Hill
Green Belt	
Council Interest:	None

**a) Site Description**

- site occupied by a 2-storey detached dwelling on the northern side of Park View Road
- the site lies within Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area, the Metropolitan Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character
- the existing house is plain when compared to other houses on the estate

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of existing house and replacement with a two-storey dwelling including recently approved extensions with additional floorspace in the basement

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/15260/A	Erect detached house and garage	GRANTED 01-MAR-60
WEST/697/96/FUL	Ground floor side and two storey rear extensions	GRANTED 15-JAN-97

continued/

Items 2/16 & 2/17 – P/952/05/CFU & P/1530/05/CCA continued.....

WEST/815/02/FUL	Single and two storey front and side extensions	GRANTED 30-APR-2003
P/2471/03/CFU	Single and two storey front and side extensions, rear bay, crown roof over garage, new basement	GRANTED 22-MAR-04
P/1478/04/CFU	Replacement two storey house	GRANTED 11-NOV-04

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The revised design is largely based on the approved scheme (P/1478/04/CFU) but incorporates changes to the external appearance following feedback from the Council's Conservation Panel and our own reservations about the approved design, which originated from an earlier approved extension scheme for this property
- The gable feature on the street elevation has been made symmetrical and the single storey roof to the side has been enlarged to omit all visible flat top areas, with the roof brought across the front of the property to provide a cohesive element to the various parts of the property
- In planning terms it is very similar to the approved scheme; the footprint of the building itself is identical and the proposed enlargement to the first floor represents a total increase in floor area of 16sqm over the approved design; the new proposal is 12% bigger in terms of overall volume, primarily due to the larger roof to the side

**f) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections

<b>Advertisement</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	4	0	24-MAY-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Green Belt Land & Area of Special Character**

Plan policy requires that proposals 'retain the openness and character of the Green Belt' and in the case of extensions to dwellings, 'not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling'. An application for extensions to this property was recently approved by the Council, and the proposed new house must be assessed in terms of Policy EP33, which states that in the case of replacement dwellings there should not be any material increase in site coverage, bulk and height of buildings.

	Original	Existing	Approved % increase over original (P/2471/03)	Approved % increase over original (P/1478/04)	Proposed % increase
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	103	167	45%	45%	62%
Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	182	340	78%	108%	117%
Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	582	1036	66%	66%	78%

continued/

The proposed replacement house would have the same general appearance as the approved house under P/1478/04/CFU, with changes to the front elevation involving a larger roof over the single storey element to the side and the slight widening of the main front gable to offer a balanced appearance. The approved extensions to the existing house under P/2471/04/CFU would have resulted in an increased footprint of 45% over the existing/original dwelling, with additional floorspace of 78% (mainly comprising of the basement) and further volume of 66%. The recently approved replacement house under P/1478/04/CFU would have had roughly the same dimensions, save for some additional floorspace in the basement. The current proposal involves additional 12% volume, due mainly to the larger roof over the single storey side element and some additional floorspace at first floor level. This is considered to be acceptable given the setback of the dwelling from the highway; the high mature trees along the boundary with Sunder Nivas and more to the front of the site; and the relatively modest appearance of the property in comparison to other neighbouring dwellings. Thus the proposed replacement dwelling would not affect the sense of openness or character of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

**2) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area**

The conservation area consent is to demolish a rather plain 1960s house that is considered to have a neutral affect on the character of the conservation area. The HUDP states that” *There will be a presumption against the demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area. If a building makes a neutral contribution, its value will be assessed against any proposed redevelopment*”. PPG15 also echoes this view. As it is considered that Highlands makes a neutral contribution to the character of the conservation area, the redevelopment proposal needs to either preserve or enhance this character.

It is considered that the proposed dwelling (P/952/05/CFU) would also have a neutral impact on the character of the conservation area. It is of a more interesting design and has a number of potentially enhancing features, such as a timber veranda and light well to the stairs on the ground floor. Thus the proposed demolition and replacement is considered to be acceptable. The proposal involves more hard-surfacing to the front than the existing, however it is considered to be acceptable, subject to approval of materials, given the significant area given over to parking at the front of the neighbouring properties and the mature trees on the front and side boundaries.

**3) Neighbouring Amenity**

The existing property is adjacent to the boundaries with Sunder Nivas to the west and Old Gates to the east. The house is currently set behind the building lines of the neighbouring properties, in particular that at Old Gates. The new house would be sited slightly forward of the building line at Sunder Nivas but would remain behind that at Old Gates.

continued/

The neighbouring property Sunder Nivas has been extended in the form of single storey front, side and rear extensions, with a garage adjacent to the boundary with Highlands. There are no windows in the flank wall of this garage and any openings in the rear elevation would be protected by the siting of the new house, as the single storey side element would have the same depth as the garage. The two-storey element would be sited a distance of between 6m and 6.5m from the common boundary, and would project further into the rear garden than Sunder Nivas. However, the high level flank windows at Sunder Nivas serve the landing and a secondary window to a bedroom and thus are not protected. The rear projection would comply with the 45° code from that property. At Old Gates, a double garage is sited adjacent to the boundary and the house is well away from the application property, thus no loss of light or overshadowing would occur. In general the siting and bulk of buildings proposed is similar to that previously approved, and the additional height for the roof over the side element would be acceptable in relation to Sunder Nivas. There are no habitable room windows in the flank walls and no overlooking would result.

Overall, no impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents is envisaged.

**3) Parking and Access**

The proposed replacement dwelling would use the existing access to Park View Road, though it would be widened to 4.4m. The parking area to the front would be extended, which is considered to be acceptable subject to conditions relating to the materials to be used in order to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

**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, these applications are recommended for grant.



---

**8 LANGLAND CRESCENT, STANMORE**

**2/18**  
**P/949/05/DFU/AMH**  
Ward: QUEENSBURY

CONVERSION OF HOUSE INTO TWO  
SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; SINGLE  
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

K H HIRANI for N H H HIRANI

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 8LLC/APR/05/002; 003; 004

**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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony

**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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - T13 Parking Standards
- 

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Conversion Policy (H9)
  - 2) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## INFORMATION

This application is reported to Committee as a petition objecting to the scheme has been received and the application is recommended for grant.

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	2
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- site to southern side of Langland Crescent, on outer side of the ring development of semi-detached houses, nearly adjacent to entrance spur road
- site occupied by semi-detached dwelling
- application property has existing end gable and large rear dormer window, constructed after a Certificate of Lawfulness was obtained
- adjacent No.6 is on a corner plot and has no extension
- No.10, adjacent to the west has a single storey rear extension
- pair of semi-detached dwellings to south sited at 90° to application dwelling, fronting entrance spur road

### c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension 3m deep, with a flat roof 3m high, spanning full width of property
- conversion of extended house into 2 two-bedroomed self-contained flats

### d) Relevant History

P/3038/04/DFU	First floor and 2 storey side and rear extensions; front porch; conversion to 6 flats with parking at front	WITHDRAWN 11-JAN-05
P/128/05/DFU	First floor, single and 2 storey side and rear extensions; front porch; rear dormer; conversion to 5 flats with parking at front	REFUSED 15-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. Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council’s requirements in respect 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) and the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3. The proposed development, by reason of inappropriate internal design and layout and inappropriate vertical stacking between the units, would not provide a satisfactory form of accommodation, to the detriment of the residential amenities of the future occupiers of the proposed units.

continued/

Item 2/18 – P/949/05/DFU continued.....

4. The proposed rear dormer window by reason of its size, siting and design would have an unsatisfactory relationship with the existing dormer window and the proposed two-storey rear extension, resulting in an unacceptably cluttered appearance, to the detriment of the character of the application properties and the established character of the locality.
5. The proposed communal garden does not provide an adequate form of amenity space taking into account the nature of the development and the established character of the locality.
6. The proposal does not make adequate provision for disabled access to the ground floor units.
7. The proposal does not adequately provide for the storage of waste for the proposed development.

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 7	Replies 7 + petition of 243 signatures	Expiry 31-MAY-05
----	----------------------	-----------	--	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Look of entrance to crescent will deteriorate; change character; congestion; detrimental to general appearance of area; not in keeping with existing format of housing; environment permanently damaged; increase risk of fire; potential for 3 flats; potential for 10 people to live on site; over-intensive use; unacceptable increase in activity; extra movement of cars will cause problems for children and the elderly trying to cross the road; inconvenience for emergency vehicles; area reached saturation point; over-development; noise pollution; transient population; general deterioration; set precedent for commercial development; increase need for wheelie bins

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Conversion Policy**

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

The proposed new units are considered to be adequate in terms of size, circulation and layout. The vertical stacking of the different rooms between the units would be appropriate, with bedrooms above bedrooms, bathrooms above bathrooms and living rooms above living rooms. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units.

#### **The standard of sound insulation measures between the units**

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledge above. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to secure optimum living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed flats it is further recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

continued/

**The level of usable amenity space**

The proposed ground floor flat would be provided with adequate private amenity space, immediately adjacent to the rear elevation of the building. The first floor unit would also be provided with private garden space, beyond that proposed for the ground floor unit. This arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

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

Two car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the building, on an existing paved forecourt, to be accessed via an existing vehicular crossover. The provision of two off-road parking spaces is a common feature within the locality.

Such a provision would be consistent with the requirements of the 2004 UDP. Furthermore, the site is within a sustainable location, sited close to a local bus route and to local amenities. A further consideration is the positive contribution to the character of the area that would be secured through increased soft landscaping of the front garden. A condition is recommended requiring the approval and implementation of a soft landscaping scheme.

It is considered that the size of forecourt is such that adequate refuse storage arrangements, parking and pedestrian access could be facilitated.

**Traffic and highway Safety**

It is not considered that the scheme would, in any way, be prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicular safety in the locality. The existing vehicular crossover would be used.

**2) Character of Area**

The proposed conversion would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the streetscene, by the retention of a single door to the front. Although activity associated with the property at the front would be likely to intensify, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of the area.

The proposed single storey rear extension is typical of many extensions that are evident in the immediate locality. It is not considered that this would have any detrimental impact upon the character of the area.

**3) Residential Amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the building would be likely to increase as a result of the proposal, however it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

continued/

Item 2/18 – P/949/05/DFU continued.....

The proposed single storey rear extension is fully consistent with the adopted Householder SPG, and it is not considered that it would have any unreasonable impact on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers. The extension would have a flat roof, and as such it is recommended that a condition preventing the use of that roof as a balcony is attached to any permission granted.

**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 grant.

---

**GREENWAYS, 633 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH END**

2/19

P/1336/05/CFU/RJS

Ward: PINNER

REDEVELOPMENT: PART 2/3 STOREY RESIDENTIAL  
CARE HOME WITH STAFF ACCOMMODATION AND  
FORECOURT PARKING (REVISED DESIGN)

OUND WEBBER ARCHITECTS for SIMNER LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/971/PL.01, 04/971/PL.05, 04/971/PL.06, 04/971/PL.07

**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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Levels to be Approved
- 6 Water Storage Works

**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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- |     |                               |
|-----|-------------------------------|
| SD1 | Quality of Design             |
| D4  | Standard of Design and Layout |
| T13 | Parking Standards             |

---

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Character of the Area
- 2) Amenity of Neighbours
- 3) Parking/Highway Safety
- 4) Removal of Trees
- 5) Consultation Response

---

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking Standard: )  
Justified: ) Assessed on merit  
Provided: )  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- detached two storey building with accommodation in the roof, previously used as a nursing home
- the entire frontage of the site is hardsurfaced

### c) Proposal Details

- redevelopment to provide a 2/3 storey building for residential care
- four car parking spaces plus one disabled are proposed on the forecourt with the remainder of the area landscaped

### d) Applicant's Statement

- P/61/05/CFU/TW was refused consent, as the committee were opposed to the modern design;
- In response to that refusal we submit a new application for a building of traditional design;
- In all other respects the proposed development is unchanged i.e. its position and footprint on the site, the scope of accommodation, the overall height and massing, car park and access

### e) Relevant History

#### Relating to the larger site of 633, 635 and 138 Waxwell Lane

WEST/550/02/FUL	Redevelopment: detached 3 storey building with rooms in the roofspace, to provide 18 x 2 bed and 6 x 3 bed flats with basement parking and access	RESOLVED TO REFUSE 12-AUG-02 APPEAL DISMISSED 05-MAR-03
WEST/848/02/FUL	Redevelopment: detached 3 storey building with rooms in roofspace, to provide 18 x 2 & 6 x 3 bed flats with parking and access (duplicate)	REFUSED 14-OCT-02
P/1514/03/CFU	Redevelopment: detached 3 storey building with rooms in roofspace to provide 22 flats with basement parking and access (revised)	REFUSED 12-SEP-03

continued/

Item 2/19 - P/1336/05/CFU continued.....

Relating to 633 Uxbridge Road

P/69/04/CFU	Redevelopment: detached three storey building to provide 8 flats with new access.	APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION OUTSTANDING
-------------	---	--

The Committee resolved that it would have refused permission for the following reasons:

1. The proposal, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, would give rise to problems of overlooking and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of Cherry Court.
2. The proposed hardsurfaced car parking area, together with the proposed bin store and cycle stores in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene."

P/1405/04/CFU	Re-development: detached 3 storey building to provide 8 flats with new access	WITHDRAWN
---------------	---	-----------

P/61/05/CFU	Redevelopment: part 2/3 storey residential care home with staff accommodation and forecourt parking (revised design)	REFUSED 22-APR-03
-------------	--	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposal would be visually obtrusive and out of character in the streetscene and will be incongruous and at odds with its surrounds.
2. The modern design would be out of place in an area which is characterised by conventional style development and would result in a loss of visual amenity to the neighbouring residents and surrounding area.

**e) Consultations**

EA: no comments

TWU: no objection.

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 118	Replies 2	Expiry 06-JUL-05
----------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** overlooking and loss of privacy; inadequate parking; removal of trees; business of a residential home is not in keeping with the immediate locality.

continued/



## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Character of the Area**

This part of Uxbridge Road contains a variety of residential buildings including large detached houses and substantial flatted developments. With respect to the effects on the streetscene, the proposal would have an almost identical width to the existing building. The main ridge of the proposed building would be only 400mm taller than the main ridge of the existing building.

The adjacent development at Cherry Court comprises two buildings of substantial proportions. This adjoining building is sited 12 m from the street frontage and has a depth of 36 m. The proposed building would likewise be sited 12 m from the street frontage, but would only have a depth of 24m along the common boundary with Cherry Court. In these circumstances it is considered that the proposed building would not appear out of character.

The existing hardsurfaced forecourt is extensive and visually obtrusive with some limited planting at the periphery. The proposal represents a considerable improvement and would provide a suitably landscaped area to provide a setting for the development.

Although the prior proposal was refused on ground that the modern design would be out of character of the locality, it is highlighted that this revised scheme has proposed the same building, except that it would be finished in a traditional design, with a pitched roof, gables eaves, bay window etc. Therefore it is considered that the traditional form of the proposal would be of good quality and contribute positively to the area.

### **2) Amenity of Neighbours**

Firstly it is highlighted that the main part of the proposed building represents roughly the same bulk as the existing property, except for a rear two storey projection along the eastern side boundary. However this rear two storey element has been reduced in length by 3m compared to an earlier development (P/69/04/CFU). Likewise it is highlighted that the neighbouring flats at Cherry Court are sited approximately 20m from the common boundary, therefore negating concerns of visual bulk, overlooking or loss of light.

With respect of the adjoining dwelling to the west, again it is highlighted that the proposed building represents roughly the same bulk as the existing property. Furthermore the flank elevation would have only 3 windows (servicing 2 x utility rooms & 1 x hall), which is drastically reduced from the number of doors and windows of the existing building that currently face the neighbouring dwelling to the west. Furthermore there are limited windows in the upper floor of the rear projection (hall and corner feature), that alleviates any concerns of detrimental overlooking impacts of the rear garden areas of the adjoining properties to the west.

continued/

**3) Parking/Highway Safety**

It is considered that the proposed number of spaces would be sufficient for the use. The proposed single access to the site would be an improvement to the existing double access.

**4) Removal of Trees**

The removal of trees are limited to a small number within the rear garden area, with the majority towards the rear boundary area to be retained. This is considered to be acceptable.

**5) Consultation Response**

- overlooking and loss of privacy: addressed above;
- inadequate parking: addressed above;
- removal of trees: only a limited number of trees are proposed to be removed;
- business of a residential home is not in keeping with the immediate locality: as a residential care home it is specifically appropriate to be located on a residential area;

**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.

---

12 WARHAM RD, HARROW

2/20

P/634/05/DFU/AMH

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CONVERSION TO TWO FLATS; SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; NEW EXTERNAL STAIRCASE; PARKING AT FRONT AND REAR; END GABLE AND REAR DORMER

DAVID R YEAMAN & ASSOCIATES for MR J COOPER

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 001B

**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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced 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.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 The area indicated to the east of the site as being separated from the area subject to this application is only able to be used in a manner ancillary to a dwelling use (Use Class C3). Any use proposed that is not ancillary to a Class C3 use would require prior planning permission from Council.
- 2 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 36 - Measurement from Submitted Plans
- 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:  
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
SD1 Quality of Design  
H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats  
T13 Parking Standards  
EP25 Noise

Cont...

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

1. Conversion Policy (H9)
  2. Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as a petition in opposition to the development has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	1
	Provided:	1
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Semi Detached dwelling on corner site located at the intersection of Talbot and Warham Roads. The rear yard of the property extends alongside Talbot Road.
- The rear yard has been shown as divided in half on plans provided, with the rear part (including an old garage structure) being separated from the area of the site subject to this application.
- The house has a two storied side extension with hipped roof above, established by way of an approved planning application from December 1991.
- The adjoining property to the south (10 Warham Rd) has a single storey rear extension projecting approximately 4.0m from the rear of the dwelling which, according to Council Building Control records, was established in around 1987.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Rear extension projecting 3.7m from the rear of the existing dwelling across a width of 5.8m. The height is proposed to be 2.9m with exterior cladding and rendering to match the existing.
- Conversion of dwelling to two flats with the ground floor flat utilising the existing front entrance, and a rear entrance at ground floor level from Talbot Road, allowing access to the first floor flat.
- Both flats are to have two bedrooms, a bathroom, and open plan kitchen and lounge.

Cont...

- A single parking space is to be established in the front yard.
- The outdoor amenity area within the rear yard is to be split between the two flats. The ground floor flat would have access off the lounge room, with the first floor flat having access off Talbot Road and the rear access door to the unit.
- The internal layouts will correspond with each other, with bedrooms being located above bedrooms, and living areas above living areas.
- *Note: The application has been amended twice since its initial validation by Council. Originally, the access to the first floor flat was by way of an external rear staircase up to the roof of the proposed ground floor extension and slightly different internal layout. Further, a second parking space was located to the rear of the first floor flats outdoor amenity area, with access off Talbot Road. The first revision added a loft conversion with dormer window and gabled roof to the original plans. The second (current) amendment has removed the dormer and gable end, and the external stairs.*

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/43936	Two storey side extension	GRANTED 19-DEC-91
-----------	---------------------------	----------------------

**e) Notifications**

Sent 8	Replies Petition with 19 Signatures	Expiry 09-MAY-05
-----------	---	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Concern with additional parking on site removing on street parking. Parking shortage on the street as a result of commuters parking and other using the road to sell cars. Concern with roof alteration and resultant noise and nuisance from tenants. Applicant owns nos. 2-8 Warham Road, which has been converted into a builders yard, impacting on surrounding residential neighbours. Large vehicles visiting builders yard, resulting in litter, air and noise pollution.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Conversion Policy**

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

The proposed new units are considered to be adequate in terms of size, circulation and layout. The vertical stacking of the different rooms between the units would be appropriate, with bedrooms above bedrooms, bathrooms above bathrooms, kitchens above kitchens, and living rooms above living rooms. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units.

Cont...

### **The standard of sound insulation measures between the units**

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to secure optimum living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed flats it is further recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

### **The level of useable amenity space**

Both units have unimpeded access to the rear yard area which has been divided between the flats. Although small, the areas have sufficient space for both flats. Further to this, the site is located in very close proximity to the Byron Recreation Ground.

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

The applicant proposes to establish a single parking space in the front yard with the remainder of this area to be soft-landscaped. The car parking space will not reduce the amenity of the streetscape. The parking space originally proposed behind the dwelling off Talbot Road has been removed from the application leaving only one space proposed on site.

The provision of one parking space on site is considered to be acceptable due to the sites close proximity to public transport on Locket Road and Wealdstone High Road, and in general close proximity to local amenities. It is considered that the reduced level of on site parking will not result in detrimental impacts to parking in the area.

It is considered that the flats will have adequate refuse storage arrangements and pedestrian access, as indicated on plans.

### **Traffic and highway safety**

It is not considered that the scheme would be in any way prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicular safety in the locality.

## **2. Character of Area**

The proposed conversion would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the streetscene, by the retention of a single door to the front elevation. The rear entrance will slightly alter the character of the use of the site, however this will not reduce the amenity or quality of the character of the area.

Although activity associated with the property would be likely to intensify, it is not considered that the effect of this would be to the detriment of the character of this part of Warham and Talbot Roads.

Cont...

**3. Residential Amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the building would be likely to increase as a result of the proposal, however it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

**4. Consultation Responses**

The matters raised within the petition concerning the nearby builders yard are not able to be considered within this application as the developments are unrelated despite both properties being owned by the applicant. An informative is recommended that advises the applicant that the subject application site (including the area split off from the part of the site subject to the application) is only able to be used for a Class C3 use, or uses ancillary to a C3 use.

**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 KING HENRY MEWS, BYRON HILL ROAD,  
HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/21**

**P/717/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

MR G ARDEN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 62.16.02 Rev.D rec'd 29-JUN-05; AMH62/15.11F Rev.C; Site 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 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) shall be installed in the east 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.

### **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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D12 Locally Listed Buildings
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Area
- D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- EP25 Noise
- EP31 Areas of Special Character

continued/

---



**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers (SD1, D4, D5, EP25)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area; Setting of Locally Listed Buildings; Area of Special Character, Archaeology (SD2, EP31, D12, D15, D20)
  - 3) Effect on Television Reception
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to Committee on 6th July at the request of a Nominated Member. The application was deferred for a Members site visit; this took place at 6.15pm on Monday 18th July.

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: Harrow on the Hill Village

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- new end-of-terrace dwelling part of former King's Head Hotel redevelopment; part of two storey terrace of three with front dormers
- plot 27 located to south western corner of site with access from Byron Hill Road via King Henry Mews
- attached mid-terrace dwelling, plot 28, on same level and unextended at rear
- adjoining site to north-west occupied by Leigh Court; three storey block of terraced flats on lower site level (-4m approx.) with rear elevation facing common (flank) boundary at 15m distance
- adjoining site to south-west occupied by two storey terrace 12-22 (evens) Byron Hill Road also on lower site level with rear elevations facing common (rear) boundary at 10-12m distance
- outer flank and rear boundaries of site delineated by 1.8m high close-boarded timber fence; common boundary with plot 28 delineated by 1.5m fence and trellis; two newly painted trees at rear of site
- site within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; nos. 12-22 (evens) Byron Hill Road locally listed
- site within archaeological priority area

**c) Proposal Details**

- rear conservatory
- as amended, 2.4m deep across half the width of the dwelling

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

2A & 2B Byron Hill Road

WEST/858/98/FUL      Conservatory at rear      REFUSED  
29-JAN-99

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality and the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/41/99/FUL      Conservatory at rear      REFUSED  
15-MAR-99

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate rear garden depth, amenity space and would be unduly obtrusive in relation to the rear garden of No. 4 Byron Hill Road by reason of its height and bulk, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality and the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/143/02/FUL      Change of use: Hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking      APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

WEST/144/02/LBC      Listed Building Consent: Part demolition and works associated with conversion to residential and A3 use      APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

A condition on the appeal decision removed Permitted Development Rights

**e) Applicant's Statement**

I am interested in purchasing the property but would like to erect a conservatory; the purchase is dependant upon permission being granted. It is understood that there are no permitted development rights. The application is made on the basis that similar conservatories have already been consented on the development. In order to simplify this application and to avoid any contentious or policy issues we have based the design on the already approved conservatories to other properties.

continued/

<b>f)</b>	<b>Consultations</b>			
	CAAC:	Objection: Too little garden left. It would be unneighbourly.		
	<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area		Expiry 26-MAY-05
	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 12	Replies 6	Expiry 20-MAY-05

**Summary of Responses:** On-going dispute about loss of TV reception, proposal would exacerbate unresolved problem; at appeal developer emphasised no flank windows, glazed structure now proposed will directly overlook causing loss of privacy; Inspector allowed development below garden depth/area standards, no further concession should be granted; would set a precedent at odds with development allowed by Inspector; garden on lower levels, new houses large and already close to boundary; permission sought to increase beyond what is normally permissible; applicant not a real person; detract from character and appearance of Byron Hill Road terrace; loss of garden space will increase noise/loss of peaceful enjoyment; site over-developed; will increase house size - appealing to families - creating further parking problems and noise; the Inspector should be informed of modified plans

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

As amended, to a depth of 2.4m with solid panels adjacent to the boundary and with a height of 3m to the mid-point of the pitch, the proposal would accord in its relationship with the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling (plot 28) with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for such developments. It can be noted that plot 28 is on the same level and is sited to the south-east of the application property. In all of these circumstances it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of the occupiers of plot 28 in terms of light, outlook, overlooking and visual impact.

A distance of 5.5m would be maintained between the outer-flank elevation and the common boundary with Leigh Court. This exceeds the 3m distance set down in the Council's supplementary planning guidelines and is acceptable having regard to the circumstances of the site. as the acceptable distance between large side windows and residential boundaries.

continued/

Item 2/21 – P/717/05/DFU continued.....

A distance of some 20-21m would be maintained between the flank elevation of the conservatory and the rear elevation of Leigh Court. The difference in levels between the application site and Leigh Court is such that the level of the conservatory is akin to the level of second floor flats in that block; consequently the top floor flats in the nearest adjacent block – nos. 4 & 5 – would have a direct line of view, where vegetation thins and particularly during the winter months of the conservatory. At the distance involved it is not considered that there would be any overshadowing, loss of light or material loss of outlook to these and other flats in the block. It is acknowledged that the degree of direct view between the conservatory and the adjacent second floor flats would result in a privacy relationship that did not exist prior to the King's Head Hotel redevelopment and, as noted by some objectors, which was not put before the original inquiry Inspector. However the proposal has to be considered on its own merits and a determination made on the basis of replacement UDP policies that have been adopted subsequent to the original inquiry and appeal decision. Policy D5 requires adequate separation between buildings, inter alia, to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers; using existing development on the slopes of Harrow Hill as a reference point it is considered that the distance of 17-18m between the conservatory and the rear elevation of Leigh Court would be adequate to reasonably protect the privacy amenity of the occupiers.

A distance of 6.5m would be maintained between the rear of the conservatory and the boundary with property in Byron Hill Road. Again there is a close-boarded fence to the rear boundary and levels fall beyond; the adjacent terrace is only two storey and there is also some planting at the rear. A back-to-back distance of some 19m would be maintained between the conservatory and the (lower) main rear elevation of nos. 18 & 20 Byron Hill Road – the nearest adjacent dwellings at the rear. This distance is also considered to be adequate, in the circumstances described and in the context of surrounding development, to reasonably protect the privacy amenity of the occupiers at the rear.

Some objectors have opined that the conservatory would concentrate outdoor activity associated with this dwelling into a smaller, remaining area. It is calculated that an area of some 75m<sup>2</sup> useable amenity space would be maintained to the rear and side of the dwelling. This is considered to be adequate without concentrating outdoor activity associated with this four habitable room dwelling to a degree that would materially increase noise and disturbance.

The proposal has been further amended to reduce its width.

continued/

**2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area; Setting of Listed Buildings; Area of Special Character**

The proposed conservatory has a simple, lean-to design that is considered to be appropriate to this Conservation Area and is consistent with others approved, as part of the original redevelopment scheme, at plots 15, 18 and 19. Whilst the remaining garden areas of these plots are larger than that of the proposal, the retention of 75m<sup>2</sup> around the rear and side of the dwelling together with the reduction in the width of the conservatory by amendment is considered to amount to a sufficient spatial setting for the building having regard to the generally constrained spatial setting of buildings throughout this and surrounding conservation areas on Harrow Hill. The refusal decisions in respect of conservatories at 2A and 2B Byron Hill Road pre-date the adoption of the replacement UDP and are not considered to set a precedent for the site.

Subject to the use of timber it is therefore concluded that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is not considered that the conservatory would adversely affect the setting of the locally listed terrace of dwellings in Byron Hill Road at the rear nor that there would be any affect on archaeology beyond that dealt with as part of the original redevelopment of the site.

Glimpses of the conservatory may be visible from the junction of Byron Hill Road with Leigh Court, but these are unlikely to be significant and not unacceptable. In all other respects it is not considered that the development would have any adverse effect on any feature that contributes to this part of the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character.

**3) Effect upon Television Reception**

Some occupiers from Leigh Court have raised concern about the potential impact of the conservatory on television reception, claiming to have already been affected by the redevelopment of the King's Head Hotel site.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (Telecommunications) provides some advice on interference from proposed developments. It recognises that large prominent structure can cause widespread disruption to analogue television reception due to obstruction or reflection of signals, and that factors such as the height/width of each face of the structure, the materials used and the orientation of the structure in relation to local transmitter may be taken into account at the application stage.

The proposal is not a large structure as envisaged in the guidance, though it could be argued that its prominence is heightened by the difference in site levels. Nonetheless, as a lightweight conservatory structure of relatively modest size it is considered unlikely that the proposal would represent a significant problem to TV reception at Leigh Court.

continued/

**4) Consultation Responses**

Applicant not a real person

- application made by Mr. Arden, no reason to believe he doesn't exist

Site over-developed

- it is not considered that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable over-development of the site

Will increase house size, appealing to families creating further parking problems and noise

- not considered to be significant given size of conservatory

Inspector should be informed of modified plans

- application to be determined by Local Planning Authority

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.

---

**25 KING HENRY MEWS, BYRON HILL ROAD,  
HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/22**

**P/598/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS AND REVISED BOUNDARY  
TREATMENT TO FLAT ROOF ADJOINING FLAT 6 TO  
PROVIDE TERRACE WITH RAILINGS

MACLEOD & FAIRBRIAR

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: C99 Rev.C, site 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 approved shall not commence until details, samples and/or specifications of the railings and privacy screen have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The balcony shall not be first used until the railings and screen have been installed in accordance with the details so approved and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of the surrounding occupiers, the setting of the Listed Buildings and the character of the Conservation Area.

### 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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - EP25 Noise
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
- 

continued/

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers (SD1, D4, D5, EP25)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area, Setting of Listed Buildings, Area of Special Character (SD2, EP31, D11, D15)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to Committee on 6th July at the request of a Nominated Member. The application was deferred for a Members' site visit, this took place at 6.15pm on Monday 18th July.

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area:

Harrow on the Hill Village

Council Interest:

None

### **b) Site Description**

- site to rear of former King's Head Hotel building adjacent to boundary with no. 86
- approved conversion of former hotel building to comprise two ground and first floor maisonettes (plots 1 & 2), one ground floor flat (plot 3), two first floor flats (plots 4 & 5) and three second floor flats (plots 6, 7 & 8); main room windows predominantly face front (south-east) and rear (north-west)
- plot 6 has approved fire escape route over roof of two storey projection (above plot 2) at rear
- approved two storey dwelling projects beyond former hotel building at rear (plot 14) with main windows and entrance facing south-west (into site) but with single storey (glazed roof) projection to north-east side; two-and-a-half storey terraced dwellings beyond
- adjoining property no. 86 used as restaurant on ground floor with basement kitchen and rooms above; adjacent upper room has windows to front and rear; owner has advised that upper rooms form a manager's flat (no kitchen or independent access) but currently used as ancillary office' listed building consent granted and renewal planning permission sought for rear conservatory extension to restaurant
- site within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; nos. 82-86 and former King's Head Hotel listed (grade II)

### **c) Proposal Details**

- use of roof over two storey projection at rear, above plot 2 and adjacent plot 14/86 High Street as terrace
- 1.1m high railings to enclose terrace and a privacy screen to north-east side (adjacent to 86)

continued/



**d) Relevant History**

86 High Street

WEST/223/99/FUL Conservatory at rear

REFUSED  
12-MAY-99  
APPEAL ALLOWED

Reason for refusal:

“Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council’s minimum requirements in respect 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).

P/951/03/CLB Listed Building Consent: Conservatory and stairs at rear, internal alterations

GRANTED  
24-MAY-04

P/2727/04/DFU Conservatory at rear

(DECISION  
AWAITED  
COM. 15-JUN-05)

Kingsgate, former King’s Head Hotel

WEST/143/02/FUL Change of use: Hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking

APPEAL AGAINST  
NON  
DETERMINATION  
ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

WEST/144/02/LBC Listed Building Consent: Part demolition and works associated with conversion to residential and A3 use

APPEAL AGAINST  
NON  
DETERMINATION  
ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

A condition on the Appeal Decision removed Permitted Development Rights.

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

The flat roof area has been identified as a ‘means of escape’ and ‘place of refuge in the event of fire’. The area for escape will be clearly defined as required by the building regulations; it will be lit, paved and appropriate balustrade will be provided in keeping with the design of the building. This application is for the use of the whole area as a terrace.

continued/

Although we appreciate the concerns that terraces can cause we feel that this location is suitably screened by the structure such that here is very little overlooking and specifically as it is already established for a means of escape. The boundary to the adjoining property will be constructed so that here is no overlooking and as such will make this solid construction 1.8m high.

**f) Consultations**

CAAC: Objection to the glazed privacy screen. The development should be restricted to its previous extent.

**Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
26-MAY-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
5 0 20-MAY-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

The privacy screens would add 1.8m, and the railings 1.1m, to the height of the flank wall of the development adjacent to the boundary with no. 86. This would increase the height of the development, taken from the external ground level at the rear of no. 86, from 6.9m to 8.7m/8m respectively. As the rear yard to a commercially used property it is not considered that the increased height created by the screen/railings would be detrimental to the setting or conditions of the rear of no. 86. The approved conservatory to the rear of no. 86 would not rise above the parapet upon which the screen/railings would be sited and it is not considered that the terrace would lead to any unacceptable relationship in the event of the implementation of that extension.

In relation to no. 86 it remains, therefore, to consider the impact on the rear upper level window. The rearward extent of the privacy screen has been amended, at officers' request, to reduce its depth from 6m to 2.8m in the interests of the setting/appearance of the listed building (see below). It is calculated that the window is 1.4m from the balcony edge and, as noted above, it serves a room currently used as an ancillary office that is also served by a window to the front. Taking all of these matters into account and subject to the use of a translucent material, it is not considered that the privacy screen would curtail light to, or outlook from, the window to an extent that would be unacceptable in the event of its re-use as a manager's flat. The depth of the terrace adjacent to no. 86 has been limited to 2.8m; this is considered to be sufficient to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking of the adjoining property, taking into account prevailing privacy levels in this locality.

continued/

It is considered that overlooking of other surrounding property from this side of the balcony, including the ground floor glazed roof to the rear of plot 14, garden spaces and Waldron Cottage would be at sufficient distances and/or oblique angles, notwithstanding falling levels, as to be of no significant detriment to privacy amenity. In relation to flats and dwellings within the development site, overlooking from the south-west facing side of the balcony would be confined at closest vantage points to the rear living room windows of plot 6 itself and no worse than the fire escape route already approved (by reason of amendment). Standing at the edge of the terrace on this side, users could look down to the ground/first floor rear windows and outdoor terrace of plot 2, and over the forecourt of plot 14. In these regards it is considered that the angle of view and likelihood of users spending prolonged periods at the balcony edge are such as to cause no significant actual or perceived overlooking problems to these, whilst plot 2's terrace and plot 14's forecourt are already open to view from the surrounding King's Head redevelopment.

The balcony would permit external domestic activity not otherwise associated with the use of the roof as an emergency escape/refuge. However replacement UDP Policy D5 acknowledges that balconies and roof gardens can provide an acceptable alternative source external amenity provision to conventional gardens and, in this regard, it is considered that there is tacit acceptance of the potential for elevated noise and disturbance. In the subject instance much of the balcony would be enclosed between a flank wall and the privacy screen and the impact of the balcony's use would therefore be largely contained.

In relation to the privacy and amenity impact, it can also be noted that the applicant seeks permission, separately, for the formation of a single unit from plots 1, 2 and 6.

**2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area, Setting of Listed Buildings, Area of Special Character**

Concerns raised by the officers and the conservation areas advisory committee about the impact of the privacy screen are reflected in the amended proposal, which simplifies the design of the screen and reduces its depth such that it would not project beyond the rear main wall of the former hotel building. As amended it is considered that views of the screen from within the King's Head site would be limited to glimpses and, together with the improved appearance, would not be detrimental to the setting of the listed building. When viewed from no. 86 and further vantage points to the north/north-east the screen would be read in the context of the redevelopment and would have minimal additional impact upon the setting of the listed building.

The railings would be of simple design and similar to those that will enclose the ground floor terrace to plot 2. It is not considered that these would detract from the setting, appearance or integrity of the listed building.

Taking into account all of the above and the potential development of the approved conservatory, neither is it considered that the screen and railings would harm the setting or character of no. 86, which is also listed.

continued/

Item 2/22 – P/598/05/DFU continued.....

As amended the proposal would, it is considered, preserve the character and appearance of the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area.

It is not considered that the development would have any adverse affects on any feature that contributes to this part of the Harrow-on-the-Hill area of special character.

**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.

PROVISION OF NEW GATES ACROSS ENTRANCE IN WOOD LANE

GAMI ASSOCIATES LTD for MR H HALAI

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: pg/gs/50a, Site 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 and drawings showing details of any electrical apparatus have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) gates  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality, the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building.

**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:

2004 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

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

T15 Servicing of New Developments

---

continued/

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Green Belt Impact (SEP5, SEP6, EP33)
  - 2) Character of Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, EP31)
  - 3) Character and Appearance of Area and Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D15)
  - 4) Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings (SD2, D11)
  - 5) Traffic Impact (T15)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

Consideration of this application was deferred at the Committee meeting on 6th July in order to undertake a Members Site Visit on 18th July.

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Listed Building

Conservation Area: Little Common, Stanmore

Green Belt

Site Area: 6.6 ha

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- large site on south side of Wood Lane close to junction with Warren Lane, grounds extending to Dennis Lane to the west
- within Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character
- northern part within Little Common Conservation Area
- southern part within Site of Nature Conservation Interest
- occupied by leisure and fitness club, vacant for several years
- buildings concentrated along Wood Lane frontage
- comprise squash courts/restaurant building (2 storeys) plus single storey changing accommodation, gymnasium, restaurant, open air pool
- Garden Cottage within grounds is Grade II Listed
- other buildings listed by virtue of attachment or location within curtilage
- main car park adjacent to Wood Lane, with overspill parking at rear at lower level
- access from Wood Lane through gap in Grade II Listed wall along Wood Lane frontage
- open air tennis courts, landscaped grounds plus woodland and open land beyond buildings
- land within Wood Farm to east
- Stanmore Country Park to south
- religious centre to west
- residential property to north

continued/

**bb) Listed Building Description**

Garden Cottage:

- circa 1840, faces away from road
- long 2-storey, 5 casement windows, fourth in gabled projecting wing
- round headed
- door in second bay with blind window over
- band at first storey
- slate roof

Boundary Wall:

- mid C.19
- yellow stock brick wall, some 4m high, stone coping, about 110m long

**c) Proposal Details**

- provision of pair of double gates across entrance in Wood Lane, opening inwards
- 3m height adjacent to listed wall, increasing to 4.4m in centre
- total width 7.5m
- comprised of vertical railings with decorative features
- wrought iron proposed, painted black
- amended drawing no. pg/gs/50a received 24-MAY-05 (simplified design of gate)

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/4249/1	Use of land as sports club with erection of 7 squash courts & ancillary accommodation, demolition & reconstruction of part of boundary wall to provide new vehicle access to Wood Lane & construction of car parking	GRANTED 21-OCT-77
LBH/4249/2	Details pursuant to planning permission LBH/4249/1	GRANTED 06-JAN-78
LBH/38355	Alterations, new covered swimming pool & covered link, first floor covered patio, reform entrance steps and use of squash court for staff accommodation and ancillary purposes (Partly Implemented)	GRANTED 17-AUG-89
LBH/44981	Leisure Development – golf course, stables, hotel and extensions to existing club, car parking, country park and visitor centre (including Wood Farm)	REFUSED 03-MAR-93

continued/

Item 2/23 – P/754/05/CFU continued.....

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposals would represent an overintensive use of the site resulting in overdevelopment within the Green Belt.
2. The proposed hotel is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances to justify it being allowed in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
3. The hotel building and associated car parking would be of excessive scale, contrary to the Council’s policies and detrimental to the Area of Special Character, the Green Belt and the Conservation Area.
4. The proposed hotel would have an adverse impact on the setting of Garden Cottage, a Listed Building.”

LBH/44980	Listed Building	Consent:	REFUSED
	Alterations/extensions for ancillary facilities for club, new hotel and golf course		09-MAR-93

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed covered way would be premature in the absence of acceptable associated redevelopment proposals.”

P/2716/03/CFU	Refurbishment of Garden Cottage as dwelling, demolition of all other buildings, 3 x 3 storey buildings to provide 15 flats, basement parking, detached dwelling, 2 detached garages, alterations to boundary wall	WITHDRAWN
		17-MAY-04
P/2715/03/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Internal & external alterations to Garden Cottage & demolition of curtilage listed structures	WITHDRAWN
		17-MAY-04
P/2714/03/CCA	Demolition of all buildings apart from listed building, 'Garden Cottage'.	WITHDRAWN
		17-MAY-04
P/1306/05/CFU	Change of use: Leisure to religious uses including conversion of garages to Caretakers House. Increase height of squash/functions building by 1m	CURRENT

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: (1st Proposal)

Need to see the gates in relation to adjoining brick wall. Traditional metal gates would be acceptable but should take their cue from age of brick wall and should be a subservient entrance to Springbok House. Gates should be set back behind brickwork so steel mechanisms are hidden from view.

continued/



CAAC: (2nd Proposal)      The revisions are an improvement on the previous design, but the comments from the previous CAAC meeting of 23 May 2004 still apply. The design should be more subdued and in keeping with the wall. The gates should be squared at the top, rather than curved upwards to a point.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area/ Setting of Listed Building	Expiry 09-JUN-05
----------------------	---	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 2	Replies 0	Expiry 01-JUN-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

## **APPRAISAL**

- 1)      **Green Belt Impact**  
The proposed gates would be permeable in appearance, and have an insignificant impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt.
  
- 2)      **Character of Area of Special Character**  
The proposal would not affect the structural features which comprise the Area of Special Character.
  
- 3)      **Character and Appearance of Area and Conservation Area**  
An acceptable design is shown for the gates which, together with the use of wrought iron materials, would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and the appearance of the area.
  
- 4)      **Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings**  
The proposed gates would be physically separate from the adjacent listed wall and there is therefore no need for listed building consent. The gates would be mostly subordinate to the height of the wall with only the centre section rising some 300mm above it.  
  
The gateposts would be located behind the wall, and overall the proposals would provide an acceptable impact on the character and setting of the listed wall, while also securing the site.
  
- 5)      **Traffic Impact**  
The gates would be set back by almost 6m from the edge of the carriageway, enabling vehicles to stand clear of the highway while waiting for the gates to open to the benefit of the free flow of traffic.
  
- 6)      **Consultations**  
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.

---

**1 MARLBOROUGH HILL, HARROW**

**2/24**

**P/1356/05/COU/RJS**

Ward: GREENHILL

OUTLINE:REDEVELOPMENT: 4 STOREY  
BUILDING, BASEMENT WORKSHOP/STORE,  
GROUND FLOOR PARKING, 1ST & 2ND  
FLOOR OFFICES, 2 FLATS AT 3RD FLOOR

G & D HIGGINS

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 05/121/2; OS

**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 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
  - (b) design of the building(s)
  - (c) external appearance of the building(s)
  - (e) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas 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.
- 4 Restrict Industrial Activities to Buildings
- 5 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 6 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:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Area  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
T13 Parking Standards

continued/

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Principle of Use
  - 2) Character of the Area
  - 3) Parking/Highway Considerations
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Town Centre	Wealdstone	
Car Parking	Standard:	9 maximum
	Justified:	6
	Provided:	6
Site Area:	759 sq.m.	
Habitable Rooms:	12	
No. of Residential Units:	4	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- the site is a small irregular shaped parcel of land located adjacent to the junction of Marlborough Hill with Station Road
- the existing building on this parcel of land is a two storey engineering works and offices, orientated to the southern boundary of the site
- the forecourt area is sealed with hardsurface and accommodates limited amount of on-site parking
- the existing building is surrounded by offices and commercial buildings, up to a four storey scale

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application to construct a four storey block containing a workshop/store at basement level, parking at ground floor, office use at first floor and second floors and 2 flats accommodated at third floor
- siting and access are to be determined at this stage

**d) Relevant History**

P/2009/03/COU Outline: Demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide 4 storey detached office building with 2 flats on 3rd floor, and parking on ground floor **GRANTED 18-MAR-05**

**e) Consultations**

TWU: No objections  
EA: No comment

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	22	1	11-JUL-05

**Summary of Response:** Traffic, parking and impact on deliveries to adjoining site, both during construction and upon completion. continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Principle of Use**

It is highlighted that the development is predominantly the same as previously proposed, except that the building would now incorporate a basement workshop.

As such the existing premises provides employment floorspace of approximately 250m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal would contain approximately 515m<sup>2</sup> of office and workshop/store floorspace between the basement and first/second floor levels. Therefore the employment generating potential of this site would be enhanced.

The site is within a commercial area and does not benefit from any amenity provision. However many commercial premises within this area contain residential units on upper floors, and likewise lack benefit of amenity provision. With respect of the proposed development, the residential premises are restricted to the top floor. It is likewise highlighted that the site benefits from good accessibility to public transport modes and to services.

### **2) Character of Locality**

There are examples of 3 and 4 storey buildings within the area and the site sits opposite the Civic Centre complex which contains the main 6 storey building. It is considered that the proposal would not be out of character with the area.

### **3) Parking/Highway Considerations**

The proposal contains provision for 6 car parking spaces at ground floor level. Taking account of the excellent transport accessibility of the site, the proposal is considered acceptable in this regard.

### **4) Consultation Responses**

Apart from the matters raised above the following comments are made:

- impact or disruption caused during construction is not a relevant planning consideration.

## **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 POLYTUNNEL AT SOUTH EAST OF SITE

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for HARROW COLLEGE

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1454 P1; 1454 P2

**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.

### INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 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:

- SEP5 Structural Features
  - SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
  - SD1 Quality of Design
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
  - EP32 Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses
  - EP33 Development in the Green Belt
  - EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
  - EP35 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
- 

continued/

**MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:

Green Belt: Wealdstone College Development Envelope

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- the large parcel of land that comprises Harrow College, Wealdstone Campus
- the school site is located both within the Green Belt and Area of Special Character
- the subject of this application is an open area of undeveloped land located to the south east corner of the site

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a polytunnel measuring 20 x 8m with a height of 2.5m
- the polytunnel would be located to the south east corner of the site, adjacent to the car park and school building

**d) Relevant History**

There are numerous applications relating to the school site, however none are specifically relevant to the proposed development.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The polytunnel will be used to support training programmes for students.

The College has a large centre for students with learning difficulties and disabilities and has been working with the Shaw Trust to develop opportunities for these young people.

A polytunnel is needed to expand this course.

The polytunnel will be used by students from the new Skills Centre development in Harrow which is supported by the LEA and the LSC.

The Skills Centre will be offering construction trades from its new base in Wealdstone and will offer programmes for students in horticulture which will need access to a greenhouse. Hence the polytunnel has been sized to allow all students to make effective use of it for both courses.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 5	Replies Awaited	Expiry 25-JUL-05
-------------------------	-----------	--------------------	---------------------

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character**

Firstly it highlighted that the proposed polytunnel is located within the Harrow College building envelope, as detailed on the Proposals Map. Therefore the polytunnel would be in line with established planning policy of this major development site.

Likewise, as it would consist of a lightweight frame construction with plastic sheeting, it is considered that the character of the site would be retained by the proposal and that it would not be harmful to the visual openness of the site. The proposed works would be predominantly screened by boundary vegetation and generally would not be visible from any external vantage points outside of the site.

For the reasons listed above it is considered that the polytunnel would have no impact on the Green Belt or Area of Special Character, of which the subject site is located within, nor would be detrimental to any residential property.

### **2) Neighbouring Amenity**

By virtue of its siting, the polytunnel accommodates ample horizontal separation distance (18m) from the side boundary with the adjoining cemetery site, whereby mature trees located along the boundary would provide screening. Likewise the polytunnel would not be within the vicinity of any residential properties. Therefore there would be any impact to residential amenity.

### **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.

**HARROW COUNCIL CIVIC AMENITY SITE, FORWARD DRIVE, HARROW** P/1480/05/CLA/CM

Ward: KENTON WEST

RECONSTRUCTION OF PAPER BAY. REVISED SITE ACCESS INCLUDING FENCING

DAVID ROSE for HARROW COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: CMP917/DWR/07

**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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 3 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

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

EP16 Waste Management, Disposal and Recycling Facilities

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

1. Replacement Paper Bay (EP16)
  2. Visual Amenity (SD1, D5)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, D5)
  4. Revised Access
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...



## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Council Owned Property

### b) Site Description

- Civic Amenity Site, off Forward Drive, Wealdstone
- Site secured by 2.1m high palisade fence and gates
- Existing 3m environmental barrier along rear boundary of facing properties at Cullington Close
- Sharp bend from Forward Drive to public access to north-east of site

### c) Proposal Details

- Reconstruction of paper bay in main part of site
- Revised entrance to part of site with fence and gates moved forward closer to road
- Rear corner of garden at No.73 Cullington Close to be used to widen bend on Forward Drive, with existing 3m environmental barrier to be re-instated

### d) Relevant History

EAST/826/00/LA3	Replacement concrete panels with 2.1m palisade fencing (7.5m length adjoining access gates)	GRANTED 08-SEP-2000
P/2860/03/DLA	Single storey side extensions to site office	GRANTED 26-JAN-2004

### e) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
19	0	13-JUL-2005

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Replacement Paper Bay

Policy EP16 within the adopted UDP states that the Council will actively encourage recycling and waste minimisation. At the Civic Amenity Site, improvements are sought in view of the large and increasing volumes of waste passing through it. The proposal would comply with this policy objective.

Cont...

## **2. Visual Amenity**

The proposed new paper bay would replace the existing structure, and would not appear significantly larger. It would be well-contained within the CA site and would be more than 30m from the boundary with the nearest residential properties. The paper bay and new fencing would be consistent with the appearance of the existing structures on site and thus would not detract from the visual amenity of this part of Wealdstone.

## **3. Residential Amenity**

The proposed paper bay would be sited more than 30m from the nearest boundary with a residential property, and thus would not impact on amenity. The revised access and road re-alignment would involve the use of the rear corner of the garden at No.73 Cullington Close, and the removal of some trees on that site. The submitted plans indicate that replacement trees would be planted and the 3m environmental barrier along the rear boundary would be re-instated. Once these works are completed, no additional impact on residential amenity is envisaged.

## **4. Revised Access**

The proposed revisions to the entrance to the main level part of the site would involve the forward siting of the fence and gates on Forward Drive and the acquisition of the rear corner of the garden at No.73 Cullington Close in order to widen the bend opposite for improved access to the public access to the east. The alterations to the entrance would result in improved visibility from the egress onto Forward Drive and the widened bend would improve the existing tight access road to the east, and thus would represent an improvement in terms of highway safety.

## **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.

## SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

---

**LAND ADJ TO ELMCOTE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, PINNER**

**3/01**

**P/1573/05/CDT/CM**

Ward: PINNER

DETERMINATION 13.4M HIGH POLE AND ANTENNA  
EQUIPMENT CABIN

STAPPARD & HOWES

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 47000B/001 Rev.A; /002 Rev.B; /003 Rev.D; /004 Rev.D; /005 Rev.E

**REFUSE** approval of details of siting/appearance for the following reason(s):-

- 1 Prior approval of siting and appearance IS required.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

### INFORMATIVES

1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, D4, D24

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) ICNIRP Compliance (D24)
  - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D24)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character: Special Advert Cont.

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- edge of grass area on southern side of Uxbridge Road, to front of three-storey apartment block at 'Elmcote'
- proposed siting between street bench and bus shelter/bus stop sign, with trees to rear and sides
- other street furniture nearby includes electricity sub-station housed in shed to east, post box and road sign for 'Elmcote' to west, and street light to rear at parking area front of 'Elmcote'
- fall in ground levels to east and west along Uxbridge Road and from north to south; with proposed area of siting at prominent height on road and at higher level than residential properties at 'Elmcote'

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/1573/05/CDT continued.....

- Skillen Lodge opposite set at higher ground level but largely screened from highway by high evergreen trees, bus stop and shelter to front

**c) Proposal Details**

- provision of 12m high aircraft grey colour pole, with 3 no. antennae on top, to be sited forward of the trees on the grass area
- ancillary equipment cabin to be sited between the column and the trees, colour olive green. (Dimensions: 1.58m x 1.4m x 0.38m)

**d) Relevant History**

P/447/05/CDT	Determination: 13m high monopole mast and antenna and equipment cabin	REFUSED 13-MAR-05
--------------	---	----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement (Summary)**

The siting of the equipment has changed since the previous application in that the pole has been removed from the edge of the pavement to further into the grass verge so that the visual impact of the pole is further reduced and there will be less clutter within the streetscene. Additional landscaping could be implemented as part of the proposal and we would welcome discussions with the LPA during the determination period.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 77	Replies Awaited	Expiry 18-JUL-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) ICNIRP Compliance**

The proposal includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming compliance with the public exposure guidelines.

**2) Visual & Residential Amenity**

The proposed monopole would be sited on the grass area rear of the pavement, between the bus shelter and bus stop sign on the pavement edge. The associated equipment cabin would be sited behind the pole in front of the trees. Coupled with the bus shelter/bus stop sign, the bench and the shed housing an electricity sub-station further to the east and the postbox and road sign to the west, it is considered that the proposed telecommunications equipment would result in a proliferation of street furniture, to the detriment of the character of the area. The impact of this proliferation as well as the excessive height of the pole at 13.4m would be particularly obtrusive due to the prominent siting at a higher level than the land to east and west along Uxbridge Road. Furthermore it is not considered that the sparsely-located trees to the side or rear of the proposed siting would adequately screen the pole from the highway, in particular as they are deciduous.

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/1573/05/CDT continued.....

The proposed mast would be sited a distance of approximately 40m from the front of the apartment block at 'Elmcote', and a greater distance from the relevant elevations of the other neighbouring residential properties at Dingles Court, 'Skillen Lodge', and the nearest detached properties on Uxbridge Road, Waxwell Lane and Blythwood Road. Due to the significant distance to these properties and the screening offered by the evergreen trees to the front of 'Elmcote' and 'Skillen Lodge' in particular, it is not considered that the proposed mast and associated equipment cabin would be detrimental to residential amenity.

In summary it is considered that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to other street furniture, and would thus be detrimental to the character of the area and the appearance of the streetscene in general.

**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 refusal.

---

**KINGS HEAD HOTEL, BYRON HILL ROAD,  
HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**3/02**

**P/979/05/CLB/AB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT:  
CONSTRUCTION OF BAY WINDOW TO  
BASEMENT ON FRONT ELEVATION

MACLEOD & FAIRBRIAR

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2470 T03F, T04 I, CO8 E, 62.16.02B, 62.16.03A, 62.16.04A, 62.16.07A

**REFUSE** Listed Building Consent for the works described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed alterations would result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric to the detriment of the Listed Building.
- 2 The proposed alterations would facilitate an unacceptable residential use, which would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Listed Building and character of the Conservation Area.

INFORMATIVE:

1 INFORMATIVE:

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: D11, D15

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)**

- 1) Character and Appearance of the Listed Building and Conservation Area
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character: Special Char & Adv  
Grade II Listed Building  
Conservation Area: Harrow Village  
Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- the site is located on the west side of High Street, fronting on to the Green
- the application site is predominantly residential, although A3 use was retained in the basement and ground floor of the Edwardian section. An appeal has since been lodged against the refusal to allow this A3 element to be converted to residential

continued/

**bb) Listed Building Description**

The oldest part of the building dates from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is of three-storeys with later stucco rendering. The building has a central columned porch with later glazed sides and front. It has a parapet in front of a slate roof with end chimney stacks. The central section of the front part of the building is Edwardian.

**c) Proposal Details**

- extend southernmost bay window into basement area to provide additional light/space
- internal alterations comprising removal of some of spine wall

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/143/02/FUL	Change of use: Hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking	APPEALED AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED 06-JUN-03
P/1915/03/CFU	Redevelopment to provide 10 dwellings in a 3 storey building with rooms in roofspace as extension to development allowed on appeal ref. W/143/02/FUL, with access and parking.	APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION UNDETERMINED
P/1941/04/CFU	Use of ground floor & basement area intended for A3 use in permission WEST/971/02/FUL as residential unit.	REFUSED 10-DEC-04 APPEAL LODGED

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: Awaiting

**Advertisement**

Alteration/Extension of Listed Building

Expiry  
09-MAY-05

**Notifications**

Sent  
5

Replies  
1

Expiry  
02-JUN-05

continued/

**Summary of Response:** Harrow Hill Trust: Before the current development there was no basement in front of the Kings Head. The extant permission allowed such an area in order to facilitate the use of the basement as a restaurant. So there are two problems with the proposals. Firstly it prejudices the application for a change of use of the basement from restaurant to flat which is currently under appeal. On these grounds it cannot logically be permitted until the appeal is decided, one way or another. Secondly if there were to be no basement restaurant then there is no reason for there to be a basement area, a feature which, as I have said, is not part of the original listed building.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Character and Appearance of the Listed Building and Conservation Area**

Permission was granted at appeal in June 2003, which gave consent to the conversion of the majority of the listed building to residential use and for new housing to the rear and on the site of the Assembly Rooms. Work has been progressing to implement this scheme. An important part of the consented scheme was the retention of an A3 use in the original bar and in the cellar beneath it because it was felt that much of the historic character of the building was linked to its original use and purpose.

An application was subsequently submitted (P/1941/04/CFU) to change the use of the basement and ground floor element from A3 to residential use. This was refused for the following reason:

“The proposal would result in the future loss of an A3 use for which this part of the building was intended and such loss would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Listed Building and character of the Conservation Area.”

This application has subsequently been appealed and an Inspector’s site visit arranged but the Planning Inspectorate has been unwilling to determine an application for a change of use within a listed building, where the new use would require physical changes. Therefore this application has been submitted which shows the proposed alterations in the context of the proposed residential use.

#### Alterations to form the additional new bay window

Permission was granted in the original appealed scheme, for a lightwell to be formed in front of the original bay windows at the front of the building and to extend the northern-most bay down in to the lightwell as an additional entrance into the basement for the A3 unit. There are 2 rooms in the basement and one was to be the dining/public area and served by the new bay, while the other was the kitchen, which had no windows at all.

continued/



This current application seeks to extend the adjacent southern bay window in a similar manner into the lightwell, replicating the style of the bay window above and the new adjacent bay to the side. It is considered that the principle of allowing some form of bay window would be difficult to resist, given that the Inspector felt that a large bay window and the formation of the light well was acceptable. Indeed, it is considered that lighting and ventilation could be required to this room in the basement whether it was in A3 or any other use. The bay window has been designed to replicate the original window above and to match that of the approved adjacent bay window. Therefore, on balance it is considered that the proposed bay window would not detract from the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. It would not have an impact on the streetscene of the conservation area as it would be hidden below ground level.

### Internal Alterations

The basement of the Kings Head is one of the few areas where little alteration has taken place over time. Basements exist beneath the Georgian and Edwardian parts of the building and were used for the storage of beer and wine in association with the pub use of the building. Within the part of the basement that this application is concerned with, there are 2 main rooms and a small storage room. The original application, which was allowed at appeal, sought to minimise loss of original load bearing walls and to keep the form of the original building as far as possible. The Inspector in allowing the appeal said that:

“the plan form of the frontage buildings contributes to their special interest and this would be generally preserved. Moreover I am satisfied that the proposed demolitions form part of a comprehensive scheme which would achieve the restoration of the key elements of the listed building that contribute to its special interest.”

This proposal seeks to demolish approximately half of the dividing spine wall between the two main rooms, in order to ensure that the second bedroom is larger and also because the existing dividing wall runs across where the proposed bay window would be. It is considered that this would represent an unacceptable loss of historic fabric and as such would detrimentally affect the historic character and appearance of the listed building. It is acknowledged that there would be some loss of the wall were the bay window to be built, but it is considered that this could be reduced to a minimal amount, rather than the extent which is proposed.

Notwithstanding the concerns regarding the physical changes to the building, these are being proposed in the context of the proposed change of use, which has already been refused as it was considered to detrimentally affect the character of the listed building and that of the conservation area. An A3 use may not require these alterations, and in any event, making alterations to allow an important use to continue within the historic building would be easier to justify than making alterations to facilitate further residential use.

Therefore, on balance it is considered that these proposals would fail to preserve the building's special interest and should be refused.

continued/

Item 3/02 – P/979/05/CLB continued.....

- 2) **Consultation Responses**  
Addressed 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 refusal.