

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

---

**CLOISTERS WOOD, (FORMERLY CLOISTERS WOOD FITNESS CLUB), WOOD LANE, STANMORE**

**1/01**  
**P/1306/05/CFU/TEM**  
Ward: CANONS

CHANGE OF USE: LEISURE TO RELIGIOUS USES INCLUDING CONVERSION OF GARAGES TO CARETAKERS HOUSE. INCREASE HEIGHT OF SQUASH/FUNCTIONS BUILDING BY 1M, EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS, ADDITIONAL CAR PARK

ASK PLANNING for SHREE SWAMINARAYAN SATSANG

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2005/364/P/01; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 08; 09; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; SK/C1; C2, SP/854C.

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 this application relating to:-
  - i) prior approval by the Local Planning Authority and implementation by the occupier of the development of a Travel Plan (to include an annual review) prior to commencement of the use.
  - ii) occupier of the development shall fund all costs of public consultation, analysis, reporting and implementation of local on-street waiting restrictions, at any time within 3 years of the commencement of the use, if in the Council's opinion, a monitoring period shows unacceptable local on street parking, up to a maximum amount of £15,000 index linked.
  - iii) parking within the site but outside the defined car parks shown on drg SP/854c shall not be permitted without the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority and on no more than 6 occasions per year.
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 Materials to Match
- 3 Completed Development - Use
- 4 Disabled Access - Buildings

continued/

- 5 Landscape Management Plan (Delete “other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens”)
- 6 The uses hereby permitted shall not commence 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 (with the exception of car park 3) 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.
- 7 Details of fencing around car park 3 shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and implemented in accordance with the approved details before commencement of the uses hereby approved. The fencing shall be retained thereafter, unless agreed beforehand in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To prevent the provision of parking outside the defined parking area, and to protect the characters of the Green Belt, Little Common Conservation Area, Area of Special Character and the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings.
- 8 The uses permitted shall not take place outside the hours of 07:00 and 24:00 hours.  
REASON: To protect the character of the area and neighbouring amenity.
- 9 The premises shall be used for the purposes described in the Planning Appraisal which accompanies the application and as shown on drgs 2005/354/P/07 and 08, 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: To ensure that the premises are used in accordance with the purposes hereby permitted.

#### INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 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:  
S1 The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use  
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

continued/

ST1	Land Uses and the Transport Network
SR1	Open Air Leisure and Sporting Activities
SC1	Provision of Community Services
EP28	Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
EP31	Areas of Special Character
EP32	Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses
EP33	Development in the Green Belt
EP37	Re-Use of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D11	Statutorily Listed Buildings
D14	Conservation Areas
D15	Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
T6	The Transport Impact of Development Proposals
T13	Parking Standards
R4	Outdoor Sports Facilities
C2	Provision of Social and Community Facilities
C10	Community Buildings and Places of Worship
C11	Ethnic Communities
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

- 1) Provision of Community Services (S1, SC1, C2, C10, C11)
  - 2) Green Belt Issues (SEP5, SEP6, EP34, EP37)
  - 3) Character of Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, EP31)
  - 4) Character of Conservation Area and Appearance of Character (SD1, SD2, D4, D14, D15)
  - 5) Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings (SD2, D11)
  - 6) Impact on Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SEP6, EP28)
  - 7) Loss of Recreational Facilities (SR1, R4)
  - 8) Traffic Impact (ST1, T6)
  - 9) Parking (T13)
  - 10) Impact on Neighbouring Uses (SD1, C10)
  - 11) Consultation Responses
- 

#### **INFORMATION**

##### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:

Conservation Area: Little Common, Stanmore

Grade II Listed Buildings

TPO

Car Parking

Standard:	116 - 232
Justified:	See report
Provided:	120 approx.

Site Area: 6.95ha.

Council Interest: None

continued/

**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
- occupied by leisure and fitness club, vacant for several years
- buildings concentrated along Wood Lane frontage
- comprise main squash courts/function room building (2-storeys) plus single storey changing accommodation, gymnasium, restaurant, open air pool
- Garden Cottage within grounds is Grade II listed
- other pre 1948 buildings listed by virtue of attachment or location within curtilage
- main car park 1 (41 spaces) adjacent to Wood Lane, additional car park 2 to south (37 spaces) with overspill parking, car park 3, beyond at lower level behind adjacent religious centre (approx 50 spaces)
- open-air tennis courts, landscaped grounds plus woodland and open land beyond buildings within Site of Nature Conservation Interest
- land within Wood Farm to east
- Stanmore Country Park to south
- religious centre to west

**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 C19
- yellow stock brick wall, 11ft high, stone coping, about 360ft. long

**c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of site from leisure to religious uses (Class D2 to D1) to include following functions:\_  
prayer halls; other religious events; youth activities (including cultural and religious teachings, careers advice, social discussions, meeting place); creche; pre-school education; sports and related activities; family events; activities for elderly and disabled persons; music, language and IT classes
- specific functions proposed at this stage only for main squash courts building which would contain prayer halls, 2 classrooms, playroom, office, 2 saints rooms, priests bedroom and ancillary accommodation on ground floor, with function hall (with stage), dining room, kitchen and ancillary accommodation on first floor

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1306/05/CFU continued.....

- 1m increase in height of this building proposed, (currently under construction) retaining flat roof, with alterations to external staircases, fenestration, entrances, infilling of recess
- conversion of pair of garages between car parks 1 and 2 to provide caretakers flat containing bedroom, living room/kitchen, bathroom, involving external alterations and increase in height of building from 2.3m to 2.8m
- formal use of existing overspill car park behind adjacent religious centre with approximately 50 spaces to support use
- application accompanied by Planning Appraisal, supporting Statement on Transport, Travel Plan

**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 09-MAR-93

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 Alterations/extensions for ancillary facilities for club, new hotel and golf course	Consent: REFUSED 09-MAR-93
-----------	--	----------------------------------

Reason for refusal:

"The proposed covered way would be premature in the absence of acceptable associated redevelopment proposals."

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1306/05/CFU continued.....

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	Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of all buildings apart from listed building, 'Garden Cottage'.	WITHDRAWN 17-MAY-04
P/754/05/CFU	Provision of new gates across entrance in Wood Lane	SEE AGENDA ITEM 2/05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Planning Appraisal contains Sections on the Premises and the Surrounding Area, The Planning History of the Application Site, The Proposals, Hinduism, Policy Considerations, Comparative Analysis between the Lawful Use and the Proposed Use by examining the Characteristics of Both, Conclusion
- Extracts from Comparative Analysis as follows:
  - leisure use was used intensively throughout daytimes and late into the evenings
  - use attracted large number of people arriving at various times and staying for a short period, thus generating considerable traffic movement into and out of the premises and producing significant demand for off-street parking
- adequate parking on site for proposed use, level of vehicle movements reduced compared with previous use
- duration of stay by proposed visitors no longer than patrons of recreational use
- extracts from Conclusion
- number of visitors to proposed use would be less than membership of previous recreational use
- proposed Temple represents a more tranquil use by a community which is highly represented in Harrow

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1306/05/CFU continued.....

- previous use generated more traffic movement, placed further demands on car parking and road network than proposed use due to short-term nature of visitors to sports use compared with smaller numbers, less frequent and longer stay visitations to proposed use
- applicants intent on refurbishing and reinstating listed Garden Cottage, and will be subject of listed building application and planning application for ancillary use
- comparative analysis shows undisputed advantage offered by proposed use for a site in Green Belt, Conservation Area, Area of Special Character, Site of Nature Conservation interest and containing Listed Buildings
- analysis proves that proposed change of use will be beneficial to area and will not cause harm to interests of acknowledged importance
- Supporting Statement on Transport: Conclusions
- local highway network considered suitable for proposed development, particularly in consideration of previous development on the site
- local highway and footway networks are suitable and provide easy access to local public transport services
- proposed use likely to generate less traffic than previous use
- existing provision of approximately 80 parking spaces should be generally sufficient for majority of usual religious events, while overflow car park will support major events such as large weekend weddings
- Schedule of Activity

Day	Function	Starting	Finishing	Hall Use	Number Attending
Monday – Friday	Prayer	9.00am	11.00am	Prayer Hall	100*
	Prayer	7.00pm	9.30pm	Prayer Hall	150*
	Function Hall	7.00pm	Evening	Building 1	200-250*

- Notes:**
- \* Please note that the number stated is the total flow of people during this time period, not at any one time.
  - \*\* Function Hall to be used for small parties/functions and the anticipated users is based on bookings and the numbers can be between 50-250.

Other activities will take place in building 5 for members who attend the prayers, during prayer times stated above.  
 Minor activities will take place during the course of the day, where small number of participants are anticipated.

continued/

Day	Function	Starting	Finishing	Hall Use	Number Attending
Saturday	Prayer	9.00am	11.00am	Prayer Hall	100*
		7.00pm	9.30pm	Prayer Hall	150*
	Function Hall	7.00pm	Evening	Building 1	300-400*
	Function Hall	11.00am	6.00pm	Building 5	100-200**
Sunday	Prayer	9.00am	11.00am	Prayer Hall	100*
		7.00pm	9.30pm	Prayer Hall	200*
	Function Hall	2.00pm	Evening	Building 1	400-500*
	Function Hall	11.00am	6.00pm	Building 5	100-200**

- Notes:**
- \* Please note that the number stated is the total flow of people during this time period, not at any one time.
  - \*\* Functions held in building 5 will only take place for 2-3 hours, the remaining time is used for preparation
  - \*\* Function Hall to be used for small parties/functions and the anticipated users is based on bookings and the numbers can be between 100-500. Based on bookings please note the hall will be used by the temple occasional.

**Occasionally:**

**Main Festivals:** On main festival there will be an ongoing flow of members throughout the day in which the over flow car park will be in use when needed.

**f) Consultations  
CAAC:**

There is no character to the proposal, with a worrying lack of detail shown on the plans for a change of use scheme. It is not clear how the proposal would respect the surrounding historic buildings (such as Springbok House) and landscaping.

The key concerns regard the potential traffic impact on Wood Lane and the impact of the large car park at the rear. It is not clear whether this car park (to house 500 cars) would be tarmaced and how the surrounding landscape would be treated. In addition to these concerns, the garage conversion to a caretaker's house is poorly designed and the building would still look like a garage. The plans also show insufficient detail on how "Building 1" would be extended by 1m in height.

continued/



Any proposal on this site should enhance the character of the conservation area and should include a schedule of repairs and refurbishment to the existing structures. A development envelope could be needed around the site, and a development plan for both sites (Springbok House and Cloisters Wood) would be beneficial.

TWU: No Objection  
Environment Agency: Unable to respond

<b>Advertisements</b>	Major Development	) Expiry
	Setting of Listed Building	) 21-JUL-05
	Character/Appearance of Conservation Area	)

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	37	16 + petition of 8 signatures	04-JUL-05

**Summary of Responses:** Existing traffic problems will be compounded, not appropriate Green Belt use by virtue of level of activity, vehicle movements, and presence of adjacent Mosque, increased traffic flows, no details of impact on listed building, no assessment by applicant of impact on conservation area or nature conservation, insufficient parking, harm to character of area, traffic congestion, noise, disturbance, pollution, loss of trees, strain on local services, harm to character of Little Common, local roads unsuitable for proposed traffic, not accessible location for proposed use, overintensive use, should be reduced in scale, on-street parking restrictions should be introduced, ecology will be eroded.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Provision of Community Services**

Relevant policies in the UDP generally encourage the provision of new community facilities in the Borough, including places of worship to serve the needs of different ethnic communities in the Borough. Policy C10 sets out criteria to be assessed in considering new proposals for such facilities. In relation to (A) the applicants currently occupy premises in Buckingham Road, Edgware. These are within the Borough and are located some 3km from the application site, which can therefore be regarded as within its catchment population.

### **2) Green Belt Issues**

Policy EP37 relates to the re-use of existing buildings in the Green Belt, as proposed here, and sets out 4 criteria for consideration in assessing relevant applications.

continued/

- A) No buildings on the site have been erected under Permitted Development powers within the last 4 years.
- B) While the proposed works to increase by 1m the height of the main building would reduce openness at upper levels, this would be only marginal, and given the size of the site would not be obtrusive or detrimental to Green Belt character. Nor would the 500mm increase in the height of the garages as part of their conversion to a caretakers flat be harmful to the appearance or amenity of the Green Belt.
- C) The only 2 buildings on the site for which works are proposed are the main building and the garages. Other buildings are generally of permanent and substantial construction and can be re-used without major or complete reconstruction.
- D) Permitted Development rights do not exist for the proposed use.

Policy EP37 also refers to the need to consider additional criteria which are contained in Policy EP34, viz:

- A) This has been discussed under EP37 (B) above.
- B) Not relevant here
- C) The reduction of existing environmental problems on the site by the extension of buildings is not applicable.

PPG2 (Green Belts) points out in para. 3.7 that with suitable safeguards the re-use of buildings should not prejudice the openness of Green Belts since the buildings are already there. It further states that the alternative to re-use may be a building that is left vacant and prone to vandalism and dereliction.

In para. 3.8 it states that the re-use of buildings inside a Green Belt is not inappropriate development provided a number of criteria are met.

Criterion (a) corresponds with criterion (B) of EP37 and is discussed above. Criterion (b) requires strict control over the extension of re-used buildings (criterion D of EP37), and over any associated uses of land surrounding buildings on the site. In this case, this relates to proposed car park 3 behind the adjacent Mosque site. It is clear by the presence of informal gravel hardsurfacing that this area was used for parking by the Leisure Club, albeit that no formal planning permission was granted for such use. In fact, evidence supplied by the applicant suggests that parking took place over a wider area of land than is currently proposed, although the frequency of such use is not known. It is considered that the area proposed for parking satisfactorily corresponds with the hardsurfaced area. This area, being the furthest of the 3 car parks from buildings on the site, can be expected to be used only when the other 2 car parks are full, and in these circumstances it is reasonable for the car park to be unmarked and surfaced with a form of gravel. Such a surface by virtue of its appearance and the extent of site coverage is not considered to be harmful to Green Belt character.

In order to accommodate larger gatherings (to be limited to 6 per year) it is suggested that some parking be allowed on the adjacent field in order to prevent on-street parking. This sporadic parking would not prejudice Green Belt character.

continued/

!

Levels of activity within the Green Belt are also relevant to this criterion. Given, however, the previous recreational use of the site, particularly in relation to the main building which contained 5 function halls, it is considered that these proposals would not give rise to an excessive increase in activity which would be harmful to the character of the Green Belt. Criterion (c) corresponds with (C) of EP37 and is discussed above.

Criterion (d) requires the form, bulk and general design of buildings to be in keeping with their surroundings. All buildings of any size on the site, with the exception of the main squash court building, by virtue of their design and scale are in sympathy with the rural character of the area. As previously stated, the proposed vertical extensions to the garages and main building would not be excessive in relation to the scale of the existing buildings. A condition regarding enclosure of the area is suggested to prevent uncontrolled parking in the adjacent field.

Given the above considerations it is suggested that an acceptable impact on Green Belt character would be provided.

**3) Character of Area of Special Character**

The proposed modest increases to the 2 buildings as previously described would not be obtrusive against the skyline. The loss of a small area of field for car parking can be accepted given the overall size of the site.

**4) Character of Conservation Area and Appearance of Area**

In assessing the character of the site, it is useful to establish a brief history of the site and its local context.

The site is part of the former Warren House Estate, now known as Springbok House, and the estate's home farm was located where the health club is now. The land was originally owned by the Duke of Chandos but was sold to James Forbes, along with the Stanmore Hall site, in 1780. He created ornate gardens in the grounds. Clara Bischofsheim owned the house and estate in the late 1800s. She was a keen gardener particularly of orchids, carnations and shrubs and she employed a Head Gardener, Mr. Michael Gleeson, who lived at Garden Cottage between 1893-1903. Michael Gleeson was an expert in Jersey cattle and developed the Warren House Farm's stock. A model farm was set up by Gleeson. Model Farms were designed to use new machinery with a new understanding of farming methods in order to have the best production and more healthy and hygienic farms. They were laid out in a courtyard plan which was considered the ideal. The 1896 Ordnance Survey extract shows the arrangement of Garden Cottage and its attached long narrow building, the adjacent long narrow building fronting Wood Lane and the narrow building forming the southern side of the courtyard.

continued/

After Clara Bischofsheim's death in 1922, her estate passed to Sir John Fitzgerald, her grandson. He too was a keen agriculturalist and he set up a herd of Kerry cows. The Warren House farm was one of the largest dairy farms in Middlesex and was prized for its modern farming methods. A quote in the local paper from the 1920s from Sir John describes how the milk was not touched by hand from the cow to the bottle.

The history has shaped the built form and therefore the character of the conservation area. The very high walls around the site reflect its ties to the main house as part of the estate. In addition, the site reflects a common trend in the conservation area of a few, very large estate houses, such as Stanmore Hall and Hill House, which were surrounded by smaller separate cottages where the workers within the houses lived. The older buildings on the site still reflect the dual role of this site as both a home farm to the main house, and as the gardeners quarters. Garden Cottage is an attractive house, built to be close to the gardens and agricultural buildings on the site. It forms a pleasant group. The other older buildings are still grouped around the courtyard and are single storey, simple agricultural buildings. Although much altered as a result of their current use they still retain their low key agricultural character. The conservation area has a semi-rural character, with the open common lands by the ponds and open fields further along Wood Lane. Although the high wall to the site means that open views are not afforded from the street, the openness within the site and low level buildings is still very much part of the character of the area.

One advantage of this proposal is that the existing configuration of buildings would be retained, to the benefit of the historical context of the site and thereby the character of the Conservation Area.

Although the main building does not make a positive contribution to the area, the increase in height of 1m would not be of such a scale to warrant refusal on grounds of harm to the character of the Conservation Area. Nor would the increase in the height of the garages be objectionable in Conservation Area terms.

With regard to car park 3, the use of an appropriate material e.g. gravel would be acceptable in this location and preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

#### **5) Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings**

The individually listed buildings on the site are Garden Cottage and the boundary wall but any building which is physically attached to a listed building, regardless of age, is regarded as being listed too, so both the long structures fronting Wood Lane are listed by attachment to Garden Cottage or the wall. Any structure within the curtilage of an individually listed building which forms part of the land and has done so since before 1st July 1948 is regarded as a listed building. Therefore, the buildings which pre-date 1948 are considered to be curtilage listed.

continued/

The main building is located about 10m from Garden Cottage and within 5/7m of the listed wall. The proposed 1m increase in height would take the building to a total height of some 7m. However, its true height in relation to the adjacent structures would be some 6m as its ground floor has been built 1m below the surrounding ground level.

It is not therefore considered that the resultant building height would be harmful to the setting and character of the adjacent listed buildings.

**6) Impact on Site of Nature Conservation Interest**

With the exception of the new car park, no proposals are made which have implications for the SNCI. As previously stated, a condition requiring fencing around the car park is suggested in order to prevent unrestricted parking on the adjacent field. A condition requiring the provision of a Landscape Management Plan is also suggested to ensure that a suitable plan for the area is put in place.

**7) Loss of Recreational Facilities**

The thrust of recreational policy in the HUDP is that existing facilities should be retained and proved not to be viable before considering a loss of facilities.

In this case it is acknowledged that the premises have been vacant for some 5 years at least.

The applicant has not provided evidence of marketing for continued recreational use. However, the somewhat remote location and increased provision of new recreational/fitness facilities in town centres in recent years must mean that the likelihood of a resumption of a recreational use for the site must be questionable.

Given also that some recreational activity is proposed in this application it is suggested that no objection is raised in recreational policy terms.

**8) Traffic Impact**

In traffic generation terms the proposal is considered acceptable as predicted traffic movements are mainly distributed during off peak periods. Therefore the existing highway network has the capacity to accommodate this additional traffic without detrimental impact.

This is further substantiated by the submitted travel plan which sets a target of 50% for car sharing which would significantly reduce car usage to and from the site.

**9) Parking**

A total of about 120 parking spaces would be provided on site. This assumes that no regular overflow parking would result on the open grassed areas of the site which is to be avoided on green belt/conservation area grounds.

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1306/05/CFU continued.....

In accordance with the schedule of activities submitted as part of the Transport Statement it is indicated that on Saturday from 7pm onwards the function hall will be utilised by up to 400 persons. This increases to 500 on Sunday (2pm onwards) and levels off to 250 during weekdays (7pm onwards).

These figures exclude other concurrent activities on the site.

It is therefore considered that even if a 50% car sharing can be achieved some overflow parking may well occur in Wood Lane and Warren Lane to the detriment of traffic flow and road safety.

This issue can be mitigated by the introduction of waiting restrictions on the local highway network which would need to extend over a wide area to limit any displacement of parking problems. A sum of £15,000 would be secured from the application for this purpose under a legal agreement.

**10) Impact on Neighbouring Uses**

In terms of activity on the site, and in view of the previous leisure use, it is suggested that the proposed religious use would be compatible with the neighbouring religious, agricultural and recreational uses. The authorised use is restricted by condition to be open only between 07.00 and 24.00 hours, and it is suggested that these hours be applied to the proposed use.

**11) Consultation Responses**

Noise, disturbance, pollution - it is not considered that the proposed use would increase levels of noise, disturbance and pollution in comparison with the extant leisure use for the site

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.

DETAILS PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION (P2527/03/COU) 90 X 2/2.5 STOREY HOUSES, 108 FLATS IN 3 X 4 STOREY BLOCKS WITH UNDERGROUND PARKING.ACCESS ROADS AND OPEN SPACE (REVISED)

CREST NICHOLSON (CHILTERN) LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 13104-TP-MP-003B, 004B  
13104-TP-SITE-001 - 004  
13104-TP-AA-001, 050, 051, 002, 003  
13104-TP-AH-001, 002, 003  
131-TP-PA-002A - 005A, 006B, 050A, 051B, 052B, 053A  
13104-TP-PH-001A, 002, 003, 006A, 007A, 008A, 009  
13104-TP-S-001A, 001 - 006  
DFD/STAN/L2 Rev B, L3 Rev B, L2, L1 Rev D, L3 Rev C  
05017/07B  
W851/003A  
CH493

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

1. 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 a visually appropriate manner 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.
- 2 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 3 Materials to be Approved
- 4 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 5 Notwithstanding the approved landscaping plans, further details of the siting, design and materials of the childrens play area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the play area is completed in accordance with the approved plans.

continued/

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 4 The applicant is advised that the following conditions of outline permission P/2527/03/COU are outstanding: 13, 27, 30, 32..

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:

**Strategic Policies**

- S1 The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use
- SEP4 Biodiversity and Natural Heritage
- 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
  - ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
- ST2 Traffic Management
- ST3 London Wide Highway Network
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix

**Environmental Protection and Open Space Policies**

- EP10 Sustainable Urban Drainage
  - EP12 Control of Surface Water Run-Off
  - EP14 Development within Areas at Risk from Sewerage Flooding
  - EP20 Use of Previously Developed Land
  - EP21 Vacant and Disused Land and Buildings
  - EP22 Contaminated Land
  - EP25 Noise
  - EP26 Habitat Creation and Enhancement
  - EP27 Species Protection
  - EP28 Conserving and Enhancing Bio-diversity
  - EP29 Tree Masses and Spines
  - EP30 Tree Preservation Orders and New Planting
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
  - EP32 Acceptable Land Uses
  - EP33 Development in the Green Belt
  - EP35 Major developed Sites in the Green Belt
  - EP41 Green Belt Management Strategy
  - EP42 Watling Chase Community Forest
- continued/



### **Design and Build Environment**

- D4 The Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D10 Trees and New Development

### **Transport**

- T6 The transport Impact of Development Proposals
- T7 Improving Public Transport Facilities
- T9 Walking
- T10 Cycling
- T12 Reallocating available Roadspace and managing Traffic
- T13 Parking Standards
- T15 Servicing of New Developments

### **Housing**

- H3 New Housing Provision - Land identified for Housing and Vacant Sites
- H4 Residential Density
- H5 Affordable Housing
- H7 Dwelling Mix
- H18 Accessible Homes

### **Recreation, Leisure and Tourism**

- R6 Informal Recreation
- R7 Footpaths, Cycle paths and Bridleways
- R8 Play Areas

### **Implementation, Resources and Monitoring**

- I3 Planning Obligations and Legal Agreements
- I5 Proposals Map and Proposal Sites Schedule

### **National and Strategic Considerations**

National Guidance:

DETR1988, Circular 6/98: Planning and Affordable Housing

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development

PPG2 Green Belts

PPG3 Housing

PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

PPG9 Nature Conservation

PPG10 Waste Management

PPG13 Transport

PPG15 Planning and the Historic Environment

PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control

PPG24 Planning and Noise

PPG25 Development and Flood Risk

continued/

Regional Guidance: Mayor of London 2004, 'The London Plan: Spatial Development strategy for Greater London) GLA

Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9 - 2001)

---

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

- 1) Principle of Residential Development
  - 2) Appearance and Character of the Area
  - 3) Layout, Design and Boundary Treatment
  - 4) Landscape and Ecology
  - 5) Residential Amenity
  - 6) Housing Provision, Density and Affordable Housing
  - 7) Access, Parking and Travel Plan
  - 8) Contaminated Land and Drainage Issues
  - 9) Impact on Grade II Listed Grotto
  - 10) Phasing of Development
  - 11) Consultation Responses
- 

### **INFORMATION**

#### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building (Grotto)

TPO

Site Area: 11.45ha total, 4.4ha developable area

Density - hrph: 44 dwellings per ha.

Council Interest: None

Major Developed site in the Green Belt

Proposal Site in HUDP 2004

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

- total site area of 11.45 hectares, developable area identified in previous outline consent of 4.4 hectares
- Stanmore Common lies to west and south, M1 motorway to north, 6 residential properties to east with Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital beyond, residential property at The Lodge to southwest at a distance of 40m from the existing buildings on site
- access to site from Warren Lane; bridleway running near to the southern and western boundaries, London Loop (public footpath around London) to east
- site originally formed grounds of The Grove, a manor house demolished in 1980s
- site used for research and light industrial uses since 1940s by Marconi and most recently BAE Systems Ltd, who are currently demolishing industrial buildings on site
- Grade II Listed Grotto located to south of existing security fence, suspected bat occupation
- existing 50 buildings on site with footprint of 19,206m<sup>2</sup> and gross floorspace of 41,111m<sup>2</sup>

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1650/05/CDP continued.....

- existing building heights vary from 3.06m to 20.1m
- parking for 1,000 cars occupying 44,394m<sup>2</sup> to north and northeast of site
- total of 55.5% of entire site is currently developed, rest of site is made up of woodland and grassland
- Tree Preservation Order
- ecology: evidence of bats, birds and possibly reptiles on site

**c) Proposal Details**

- approval of details pursuant to outline permission P/2527/03/COU
- removal of existing buildings and hardsurfacing
- replacement with 198 residential units and associated parking on developable area of 4.4 hectares, with 9.12 hectares of woodland, parkland, open space and domestic gardens
- conditions of outline consent to be agreed in current application: Conditions 1, 2, 5 to 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22 part of 22, 23, 24, 28, 29.
- outstanding conditions: 13, 27, 30, 32

**d) Relevant History**

P/2527/03/COU	Outline: Use of site for residential purposes (duplicate application)	NON DETERMINATION
		11-FEB-04
		APPEAL ALLWED
		31-MAR-05

Appeal Allowed by First Secretary of State following Public Inquiry held on 9th, 10th, 12th November 2004, subject to 32 conditions.

**e) Applicants Statement**

**Green Belt Character**

The proposed development will have a positive effect on its green belt location compared with the existing mass of commercial buildings on the site; it will result in a 46% reduction in footprint, a 33.3% reduction in gross floor area and a 46.6% reduction in the volume of buildings compared to the existing development; with the proposed removal of hardstanding and creation of a parkland, the provision of domestic gardens and common amenity space within the development envelope and the retention of the existing woodland areas, the amount of landscape/amenity land on the site will cover over 79% of the application site, compared with the current development where only 45% of the land is not developed; the proposed buildings are located within the 4.4 hectares development envelope stipulated by the First Secretary of State and as suggested in the UDP; the building density is 44 dwellings/hectare which accords with Government Guidance and ensures an efficient use of this brown field site, located within the green belt, this density of development creates a far more positive impact on the openness and character of the green belt compared with the existing buildings; the tallest proposed buildings (the apartment blocks which will be 4 storeys and will vary in height from 14.5m to 15.4m) will be 4.6m lower than the highest of the existing buildings on site

continued/

**Design**

the design of the apartment blocks which carries through the Arts and Crafts Style will provide a positive design feature on the site and the countryside as a whole, making a more subtle statement on the landscape generally compared with the more dominant unco-ordinated mass of large buildings on the site at present

**Housing**

the new development will provide much needed housing, the mix of dwelling types in terms of their size, design and tenure will generate a mixed community, the development will generate 73 'affordable homes' for rent and shared ownership, equivalent to 37% of the dwellings on site

**Landscape**

the proposal will result in benefits to the landscape environment by creating new landscaped areas and maintaining and enhancing the existing landscape features on the site, new tree planting will compliment the existing trees on and around the site, and they will compensate for the loss of any trees due to the development

**Summary**

the proposed development complies with the requirements of the UDP; the development will be subject to a Travel Plan and a Landscape/Ecology Management Plan and the development will bring forward the financial contributions agreed at the appeal inquiry.

**f) Consultations**

GLA:

No comments

EA:

No objection to the revised matters application, comments on surface water condition and contamination condition

TWU:

Increased flow from development may lead to sewage flooding. Impact studies of the existing infrastructure will be required in order to determine the magnitude of any new additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this and early contact with TW is recommended.

In respect of surface water it is recommended that the application should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving network through on or off site storage.

TW would recommend that petrol/oil interceptors to be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of petrol/oil interceptors could result in oil-polluted discharges entering local watercourse.

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1650/05/CDP continued.....

EH:	Do not wish to make representations
English Nature:	Satisfied with bat survey and methodologies, would like to receive reptile survey results and mitigation measures for approval.
L.B. Barnet	No Objection
Hertsmere B.C.:	No Objection

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 04-AUG-2005
----------------------	-------------------	-----------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 213	Replies 27	Expiry 04-NOV-2005
----------------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Responses:** would like to acquire one of the affordable housing units, impact on Little Common, parking inadequate, over-utilisation of local facilities, no pavements, countryside being swallowed up by housing on Uxbridge Road and Brockley Lane, chaos and noise on small lanes, traffic from this and other developments in the vicinity, residential development brings noise and activity, ecological impact of domestic pets, litter, alien plants, educational and medical needs, car dependence, security worries for pedestrians, poor services offered by Council, dominant height and scale of apartment blocks, overlooking, breaching existing footprint, road network totally inadequate, strain on local residents, tree and wildlife preservation, contrary to Green Belt principles, poor access to the site, change the nature of Stanmore Common, already too much housing destroying the character of Stanmore, bat survey inadequate, congestion, density too high, no landscape and ecological management plan, surface water run-off, inadequate mitigation for bats, development that goes against Green Belt principles.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Principle of Residential Development**

The site is identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt in Policy EP35 of the HUDP. It is also a Proposal Site in the UDP, identified for housing. PPG2 recognises that the redevelopment of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt offers the opportunity for environmental improvements without adding to their impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The brief for the Proposal Site indicates that affordable housing policy would apply, and in view of the site's isolated location, public transport services and other measures to improve the site's accessibility for housing will be sought.

continued/

Outline consent (P/2527/03/COU), for the principle of residential development on the site, was granted on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2005 by the First Secretary of State subject to 32 conditions. The formal decision of the Secretary of State concluded that the principle of housing development on this site was well established and would be consistent with the development plan. He also considered that “the proposal would make a significant contribution to meeting urgent housing need, on a previously developed site, with an acceptable proportion of affordable housing, and that it offers the potential for more jobs than existed when the site was in recent industrial use”. Subject to the limitation of the development envelope to 4.4 hectares of the total site area, with the north and northeast sections of the site to be the subject of landscaping with a management plan, the proposal was considered in principle to satisfy the relevant criteria in Annex C to PPG2.

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

The site is situated in the Metropolitan Green Belt and in Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character. The principle of the development has been established in the outline consent, thus the proposal is considered to be appropriate development, on the condition that no development other than soft landscaping and access roads shall take place outside the developable area. It was recognised at outline stage that this southern section of the site offered the best location for buildings, given the screening offered by trees on the boundaries, and it would restrict the encroachment of built form into the open area of the Green Belt to the north.

In accordance with Annex C to PPG2, proposals for the redevelopment of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt should (a) have no greater impact than the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in it, and where possible have less; (b) contribute to the achievement of the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts; (c) not exceed the height of the existing buildings; and (d) not occupy a larger area of the site than the existing buildings (unless this would achieve a reduction in height which would benefit visual amenity). Clearly, the acceptance in principle for the development at outline stage means that the proposal satisfies criteria (b) of Annex C.

Policy EP33 of the HUDP also states that applications for development in the Green Belt will be assessed in relation to a number of criteria. In accordance with these criteria, the proposal should be: appropriate to its Green Belt location; well designed in relation to the size and shape of the site and in particular, whether sufficient space exists within the site and its surroundings; retains the openness and character of the Green Belt; existing trees and natural features are retained and a high standard of landscaping could be achieved; it should not conflict with the purposes and proper functioning of the Green Belt; it should not have an adverse visual impact on the skyline and adjacent areas; and in the case of replacement dwellings there should not be any material increase in site coverage, bulk and height of buildings.

In order to facilitate consideration of the impact of the existing and proposed developments on the openness of the Green Belt, it is necessary to compare the footprints, floorspaces and volumes of both developments.

continued/

	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>% Decrease over Existing</b>
Footprint (m2)	19,206	10,393.85	46%
Floor Area (m2)	41,111	27,444.79	33.3%
Volume (m3)	164,839	88,174.69	46.6%

The calculations above indicate the significant benefit in traditional Green Belt terms of the proposal, with substantial reductions in the footprint, floorspace and particularly the volume of buildings on site. As the outline consent restricted the potential development envelope to 4.4 hectares in the south of the site, the overall area taken up by buildings is considered to be acceptable for the purposes of criteria (d) of Annex C to PPG2. The overall character and dispersal of the proposed buildings is considered to be acceptable, as the high buildings would be well contained within the built form and the development would integrate well with its surroundings.

The outline consent included conditions requiring analysis of the building heights and of the visual impact of the development from public points of view outside the site. The site is surrounded by woodland on the southern, southeastern and southwestern boundaries, while the north of the site is more open and visible where ground levels fall away towards the M1 and Bushey/Elstree. The existing development includes a number of high buildings and roof plant, the tallest of these at four storeys and an average height of 17.02m is B25, located to the southwest of the site and it is the nearest of the commercial buildings to the neighbouring property 'The Lodge'. However, there are also a number of three storey buildings, some of which are located at the northern extent of the area of the site covered by buildings. Buildings 23, 24 and 26, with average heights of 12.86m, 13.32m and 13.25 respectively, are far more prominent than Building 25 due to their larger footprints, and their closer proximity to the open northern boundaries where mature trees are lacking, both within and outside the site.

It is important to note the site survey and building heights submitted at the outline stage was flawed (the maximum height was underestimated) and did not account for the full extent of the built form on site.

It is not only the scale and mass of office buildings that detracts from the open character of the north of the site, but also the vast area of hardsurfacing which provides parking for approximately 1,000 cars. Further north and northeast are fields that have served as pony paddocks, these are enclosed by hedgerows and trees. Closer to the motorway the fields are larger and more open. All boundaries of the site except the M1 are contained by hedgerow. Thus, the long views from the M1 and Elstree are dominated by a mass of bulky and stark commercial buildings set against a backdrop of mature trees. The visual assessment of the proposal has concluded that there are also intermittent glimpses and short open spaces when viewed from the London Loop where there are gaps in the hedgerow. Elsewhere from within the woodland at Stanmore Common there are only occasional glimpses, and from the south nothing of the existing buildings is seen.

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1650/05/CDP continued.....

The analysis of the building heights and views from outside the site has highlighted the importance of the surrounding woodland at Stanmore Common and the belt of trees to the east in providing screening for the built development on site. The proposed development seeks to concentrate the highest buildings on the southern section, where screening from outside the site is offered by the mature woodland within and outside the site, and where some of the highest existing buildings are located. The original manor house for The Grove was also located in this area. The proposed apartment blocks A and B would be sited generally on the footprint of Building 19, which has an average height of 14.22m and a maximum height of 16.5m. The tallest of the apartment blocks, Block A, would measure 15.40m at the highest point the ridge level, however the main visible bulk at the half-ridge would reach only 12.50m. The apartment buildings would be sited towards the centre of the buildings on site, and thus the furthest possible from the boundaries. The remaining new buildings would be 2-2.5 storeys in height, which would result in a drastic decrease in heights and visible bulk in the more sensitive parts of the site to the north and northeast. For example, the detached houses that would replace Building 24 to the north would be between 6m and 7.5m lower than the main block of the existing building (which also has an associated tower that adds a further 1.5m), and they would have substantially less visible bulk and mass. Thus, the proposed development would comply with criteria (c) of Annex C to PPG2, that the redevelopment should not exceed the height of the existing buildings, and the building heights are considered to be acceptable.

The reduction in the site coverage by and heights of buildings would have a significant result in terms of improving the impact of the development on the openness and character of the Green Belt. However the containment of the built form alone would not be sufficient, part of the grounds on which the outline consent was approved related to an increased level of open space. This is to be achieved by a combination of measures, including the return of the land beyond the development envelope to natural landscaping, and the development of a hierarchy of public and private open spaces within the developable area. The land beyond the developable area is currently occupied by the large carpark and areas of grassland to the north, and a woodland belt on the western margin. The carpark would be removed, and an area of mowed lawns with semi-mature parkland style trees and grass footpaths would provide the transition from the formal appearance of the private gardens to the natural area beyond. A range of proposals, including the retention of a small area of rich grassland for a wildflower habitat and an informal wetland area, the thickening of boundary vegetation with various native species and the enhancement of woodland belts have been proposed for the areas furthest from the housing development. Bench seating will be provided to facilitate the use of the space for passive recreation. Within the development envelope, three principal open spaces have been proposed in order to “provide local identity and landscape structure”. The North Green would be located at the entrance to the site, and focuses around a large protected tree. The South Green would form the focal point for the apartment blocks, and would represent the historic open gardens in front of and a footpath link on the line of the original access route to ‘The Grove’. A smaller open

continued/



space at the Square would allow views to the northeast, linking into the formal grassland beyond the development envelope. The layout also involves tree-lined roads and private gardens for the houses. In total, the proposal would represent an increase in landscape provision from 45% to 79%, and the reduction in the level of hardsurfacing from 44,394sqm to 12,911sqm. Lighting would be required in the interests of highway safety and security for residents. Overall the proposed lamp standards (and uplighting in some places) in the contained development envelope would represent a significant improvement on the existing prominent floodlighting for the commercial buildings and car park.

Overall, the proposed buildings would be significantly intrusive than the existing buildings with respect to height, and they would have considerably less density and mass. The significant increase in the level of open space and private amenity space would also serve to make a positive contribution towards the openness and character of the Green Belt. Thus, the development would comply with criteria (a) of Annex C to PPG2.

Clearly, the landscaping and ecology of the site play an important role in safeguarding the character and appearance of the area. The existing trees on the site serve an important screening function. There is a woodland Tree Preservation Order for the site and while development necessitates removal of certain dead or dying trees, the proposal also involves additional planting, which would provide significant screening after a fifteen-year maturation period. When viewed from closer to the site, the proposed landscaping of the large carpark will assist in screening the majority of the properties. The required landscape management plan should balance the needs of the woodland to provide screening, woodland amenity and the protection of ecological value. The details of the proposed landscaping programme and ecological protection will be dealt with separately below.

### **3) Layout, Design and Boundary Treatment**

The proposed layout has been designed to benefit from the change in levels on the site, and the wooded areas around and within the site. With this in mind, the apartment buildings have been sited in the central/southern part of the developable area. They would create the focal point for the village green (south green) which is formed around a group of mature trees. To the north, houses of varying sizes in the Arts and Crafts style of the original manor house would be developed along a network of avenues and boulevards, with a hierarchy of open spaces between the dwellings. The design and layout is considered to provide a good balance between the Green Belt objectives for the site, and achieving a high standard of design with a permeable layout.

The boundary treatments proposed would provide an acceptable level of security and would be visually acceptable. The majority of the existing security fencing would be retained and is screened in most area by the woodland belt to the south and the hedgerow to the east.

continued/

The only break in this section of fencing would be in the area between units 86 and 87, in order to facilitate pedestrian access to Warren Lane. Where gardens would back onto security fencing, 2m close boarded or shiplap fencing would be erected, and the same type of fencing would be erected between gardens. These proposals would provide security and privacy for the future occupiers and would prevent any impact on Stanmore Common. The northern extent of the developable area would be bounded by a 1.2m metal railing with pedestrian gates for access to the parkland. Elsewhere gates and soft landscaping would be used to identify access points and boundaries between public and private spaces.

#### **4) Landscape and Ecology**

As outlined above, the existing and proposed landscaping of the site serves an important screening role for the built development on the site and forms a significant part of the overall character and appearance of the site. The site is in the Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character. To this end, the outline consent incorporated a range of conditions requiring assessment of the trees and shrubs to be retained, the proposed hard and soft landscape works and the provision of a village green (south green) in the southern part of the site. In addition, the importance of protecting the ecological value of the site was recognised, thus a methodology and assessment of the bats, reptiles, birds and water voles on site was required. These details have been submitted as part of the reserved matters application being considered here, with the required Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be submitted and approved prior to first occupation of the development in order to facilitate proper consideration of the matters arising from consultation on the reserved matters and the demolition of buildings on site.

The landscaping programme has been sub-divided between the land beyond the development envelope and the housing area within the envelope. The area north of the main carpark is currently occupied by a small area of species rich grassland and the majority containing a limited diversity of flora, shelter for birds, mammals and insects. The scheme for this area involves the retention of the small area of rich grassland for a wildflower habitat and an informal wetland area with a willow copse, the thickening of boundary vegetation with various native species and the enhancement of woodland belts in the areas furthest from the housing development. Semi-mature parkland style trees are proposed closer to the housing development where the grassland would be more formal. Within the development envelope, the proposed formal open spaces would, in general, be focused around single and small groups of protected trees with limited hard landscaping. While 20 of the existing trees would be removed, they are showing signs of decay and will be replaced by additional tree planting. At the level of the private house, the scheme involves a range of shrubs and plants, which added to the above would help to retain the green and leafy character of this Green Belt area. Thus the landscaping programme is considered to be acceptable, subject to the approval and implementation of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (required by condition of the outline consent).submitted

continued/

The existing landscaping not only benefits the site from a visual point of view, but it also represents an important ecological value. The site is immediately adjacent to Stanmore Common, a Site of Nature Conservation Importance. Policy EP28 of the HUDP seeks to resist development that would have a direct or indirect impact on such sites. A specific condition was attached to the outline consent to require boundary treatment along the boundary with the Common in order prevent easy access by people and domestic animals. The majority of the existing security fencing is in good condition and would be retained, with close boarded fencing added internally where the gardens of houses would back onto the fence. A gate for emergency access and a gate for pedestrian and cycle access to the route near 'The Lodge' would provide a link with The Common, as required by the outline consent, however this would not threaten the safety of The Common. When considering the outline proposal, the Inspector placed conditions relating to the investigation and removal of contamination and drainage (to be dealt with separately below), and considered that the highway improvements would be within the existing highway and would not affect The Common. He also stated that given the attached conditions and the financial contribution in the Unilateral Undertaking, there might even be an enhancement of the ecology of The Common. The First Secretary of State agreed that there would be no conflict with HUDP Policy EP28.

The improved landscape diversity has been outlined above, and the increase in the levels of open space, grassland and woodland with a wildflower habitat and wetland meadow would undoubtedly improve the ecological diversity of the land beyond the development envelope over the existing situation. Previous ecological surveys of the site indicated the importance of assessing the evidence of reptiles, birds, bats and water voles. A methodology and assessment was required by Condition 28 of the outline permission. A bat survey was deemed necessary and recommended mitigation including removal of roosts and the erection of bat boxes in accordance with the countryside legislation. Consultation with English Nature and the Biodiversity Team of the Greater London Authority has been carried out on the adequacy of these surveys, and the proposal is considered to be acceptable. According to the relevant condition attached to the outline permission, any matters arising during demolition and redevelopment should be carried into the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, the discharge of this condition will be subject to further consultation with English Nature and the GLA.

**5) Residential Amenity**

The nearest residential properties to the site are 'The Lodge' to the west, and the six properties immediately east of Warren Lane. The land between the site and these properties is, in the main, occupied by a belt of woodland.

continued/

For the same reasons outlined when dealing with the impact of the development on the character of the area, the proposal is not considered to represent a threat to the visual amenity of the occupiers of these neighbouring dwellings. There would be sufficient distance between the buildings on site and the boundaries, with mature trees between, thus no loss of outlook, overshadowing or overlooking would occur. When considering the issues of increased noise and activity accessing the site at the outline stage, the Inspector noted that in all likelihood, there would be less traffic at peak hours during the week and more at the weekends than the existing commercial development. However he considered that overall there “would be very little noise difference between the existing employment use and the proposed residential use, given the distances from existing dwellings and the intervening woodland”. The First Secretary of State agreed with this opinion, and the details of this reserved matters proposal would not suggest that any alternative view should be taken.

With reference to the amenity space being provided for the new units on site, the individual houses would have private rear gardens and the apartment blocks would be set around a formal green, with the development benefiting from access to the formal and natural landscaped areas to the north of the site. Further details are required to indicate the siting and design of the children’s play area required by the outline consent. Overall, the proposal is considered to represent an attractive setting and location for a housing development.

**6) Housing Provision, Density and Affordable Housing**

The benefits of the proposal from the point of view of providing much needed housing have been accepted since the outline stage. The proposal complies with PPG2 in respect of Green Belts as it is a Major Developed Site that has been identified for housing. Furthermore, PPG3 in respect of housing seeks the redevelopment of previously developed land for this purpose.

When considering the outline application the Inspector and the First Secretary of State were of the opinion that the given the high density, mass and scale of existing buildings on the site, there are “no environmental reasons why the recommended PPG3 housing density of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare could not be achieved with good, informed design”. The proposal involves the provision of a density of 44 dwellings per hectare on the developable area of the site, which is considered thus to be acceptable. The proposed dwelling mix and unit sizes of the houses and flats are also considered to be acceptable.

The Inspector and First Secretary of State accepted at the outline stage that the 37% agreed level of affordable housing provision was appropriate, and relevant details were included in the Unilateral Undertaking attached to that permission P/2527/030COU. This includes 29 houses for rent and 44 shared equity apartments, comprising a split of 40% rented and 60% shared ownership. The apartments are contained in one block (Block C) and are all 2-bedroom units. The houses have a mix of sizes, 1 five-bed unit, 4 four-bed houses, 10 three-bed units and 14 two-bed houses. Three of the three bed units are designed to full wheelchair standards.

continued/

**7) Access, Parking and Travel Plan**

The vehicular access to the site was agreed at the outline stage, via a 'quiet lane' on Warren Lane. The existing bridge on Warren Lane requires structural upgrading, and the submitted appraisal is considered to be acceptable in this respect. Further details of the proposed improvement are required prior to development. No highway or associated sustainability objections were raised at the outline stage, and the proposed highway improvements are considered to be acceptable in respect of ensuring highway and pedestrian safety.

Within the site, the proposal involves one central road across the site from east to west, with gates at the western entrance to restrict use to emergency access and a small gate for pedestrian and cycle use (as required by a condition attached to the outline permission in order to safeguard The Common and highway safety). A series of loop roads and avenues/lanes, some gated, would develop from the main axis road, to provide access to the surface parking spaces for the houses. The roads have been designed with speed control humps, raised tables and gates to reduce speeds to 20mph. Condition 16 of the outline permission requires the provision of footpath links to the southern principal access road and to the London Loop footpath in the northeast of the site. Thus, the scheme involves a pedestrian and cycle path in the line of the original access to The Grove from Warren Lane, with retractable bollards to allow for emergency vehicles to easily access the site. To the northeast, the landscaping drawings show a footpath to link into the land owned by London Borough of Harrow, to provide a link with the London Loop. There is also an access gate for pedestrians and cyclists near West Lodge to link with Stanmore Common, as required by condition of the outline approval.

The proposed level of car parking provision on site is an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling, comprising one space for each apartment (in basement parking) and affordable house with visitor parking, and at least two spaces for each private house. The layout of and access to the parking spaces and the 198 covered cycle spaces (1 per unit to be stored in garages and/or sheds for houses and securely in the underground parking area and storage building for the flats) is considered to be acceptable. The Inspector and the First Secretary of State noted at outline stage that the site is isolated and some distance from local facilities and services. However they were satisfied that the principle of a residential scheme contained within the development envelope could be satisfactory in respect of highway issues, subject to the development and implementation of a Travel Plan.

continued/

The Travel Plan has been submitted with the reserved matters application and is considered to be acceptable. The relevant condition in the outline approval states that no part of the development shall be occupied prior to the implementation of the Plan (or those parts identified in the approved Plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation of a particular phase). An agreement was reached at outline stage on financial packages for the improvement of local bus services, footpath and cycleway improvements to encourage use of local facilities, and off-site highway improvements to improve safe crossing of Warren Lane. According to the Plan, its purpose is to “ensure that the travel demands of the proposed residential development are met in the most sustainable manner by promoting and securing initiatives and incentives to minimise the need to travel, especially by car, and where necessary to encourage the use of alternative travel modes”. The Plan aims to achieve this by ensuring that the developer will set up a private group under the West London Car Share Scheme and will dedicate two spaces on site for car sharing; an information pack for new residents on local public transport options, walking/cycling, and car sharing etc.; cycle storage for all units; an on site car club and pool bicycles; and each home will be provided with broadband in order to encourage home working etc..The management company will take over from the developers once the dwellings are occupied, and Travel Plan Promoters will keep in regular contact with Harrow Council’s Travel Plan Coordinator for the 5-year monitoring period.

**8) Contaminated Land and Drainage Issues**

The commercial buildings on site are currently being demolished by BAE Systems Ltd prior to the hand over of the site to the developer. The submitted contamination and site investigation studies required by condition of the outline approval are being constantly monitored by the Council’s Environmental Health Department, and the relevant condition of the outline permission requires LPA approval of a remediation strategy before any remediation occurs on site. This condition cannot be fully discharged until works are completed and a closure report is submitted and approved.

The outline approval included a condition relating to drainage works. An assessment is required to investigate the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with PPG25. The submitted flood risk assessment is being considered by the Council’s Drainage Services in consultation with the Environment Agency, and must be agreed in writing prior to development.

**9) Impact on Grade II Listed Grotto**

The Grade II Listed Grotto (‘Ice-House’) located just outside the existing security fencing to the south of the site, and is the only remaining feature of the original Grove estate. It dates possibly from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Grotto is to remain behind security fencing for health and safety reasons and due to possible bat occupation. While it is regrettable that this will isolate the Grotto somewhat, it will not be obscured from view as the layout of the nearest houses and associated parking creates a gap at that point. The unilateral Undertaking relating to the outline permission provides £50,000 towards the upkeep of the Grotto. It may be beneficial if some of this funding could be used to provide an information board.

continued/

**10) Phasing of Development**

It is proposed to construct the development and scheme in one continuous phase, starting at the south and finishing at the northern end.

**10) Consultation Responses**

See 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.

## SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**84 STANMORE HILL, STANMORE**

**2/01**

**P/2048/05/CFU/SC2**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

DAVID RESNICK ASSOC for T ADEBAYO

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 05/88/1(a), 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 Completed Development - Buildings

#### 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

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

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

SEP5 Structural Features

SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on Green Belt, Area of Special Character and Appearance of Area (EP31, EP32, EP33, SD1, D4, D5, SH1, SEP5, SEP6)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Area of Special Character

Green Belt

TPO

Council Interest:

None

continued/



**b) Site Description**

- located on the north-eastern side of Stanmore Hill, north of Stanmore Hill junction with Hill Close and south of its junction with Spring Lake
- 3 storey semi-detached dwelling situated within a plot that adjoins the Abercorn Arms Public House to the north
- surrounding area is predominantly residential with larger detached dwellings on substantial site plots located to the north of the application site while smaller, higher density residential development can be found south of the site

**c) Proposal Details**

- single storey rear extension on eastern side
- rear extension will represent a continuation of the rear building line for the rest of the house
- the extension would provide an additional 4.32m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace in the existing ground floor living room
- extension will contain a large north facing window similar in size to the existing glazed windows and sliding door at the rear
- a rooflight is also proposed

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/14378/C	Demolish existing house erect house or bungalow	GRANTED
		04-NOV-59
HAR/14378/D	Erect detached house and garage	GRANTED
		27-MAR-61
LBH/6613	Demolish existing house and erect pair of semi-detached houses and double garages	GRANTED
		22-SEP-71
EAST/199/02/FUL	Single storey front extension & alterations to elevations	GRANTED
		10-APR-02

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections

**f) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
2	0	06-OCT-05

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Impact on Green Belt, Area of Special Character and Appearance of Area**

One of Harrow Council's primary aims is to protect and retain the openness and special character of the Green Belt area within the borough, from the pressures of development. The provision of a minor rear extension, as proposed in this application, does not contravene Council policy. The extension proposed would create an additional 4.32m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace and represents a minor extension to a 3-storey house. The segment of the house designated for extension is currently stepped back from the main rear wall of the dwelling. The applicant wishes to extend this part of the rear by 1.6m in order to be flush with the existing rear wall. The Council feels that any loss of openness incurred would be minimal and both the site and applicant dwelling are large enough to accommodate the proposed extension comfortably. Furthermore, the Council is of the opinion that the extension would not have any negative effect on the character of the area.

### **2) Residential Amenity**

The proposed extension would not impact negatively on the residents of No.82 Stanmore Hill, the adjoining property. The flat roof of the extension would not be used as an extension of the existing first floor balcony area and this, coupled with the presence of an existing boundary fence and foliage, means the erection of the proposed extension would not raise any overbearing, loss of sunlight or overlooking/loss of privacy issues.

The dimensions of the proposed extension also ensure compliance with Harrow Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Residential Extensions. The extension will protrude by 1.6m from the rear main wall of the adjacent semi-detached house, well within the maximum 3m outlined in the SPG while the 3m height of the extension matches the height advocated in the SPG for single storey extensions.

### **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.

**LAND AT R/O RISING SUN PUBLIC HOUSE, 138 GREENFORD RD, HARROW**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 3 X TWO STOREY TERRACED HOUSES (REVISED)

OAKCLIFFE PROPERTIES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Site Plan and Drawing No. 050715/01.

**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 Completed Development - Buildings
- 3 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 8 Water Storage Works
- 9 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 24 - 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  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens

Cont...

SH1	Housing Provision and Housing Need
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D9	Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
D12	Locally Listed Buildings
T13	Parking Standards
H4	Residential Density

---

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

1. Character of Area (SD1, D4, H3)
2. Residential Amenity (SD1, D5)
3. Impact upon Locally Listed Building (SD2, D12)
4. Parking and Access (T13)
5. Consultation Responses

---

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Listed Building:	Locally Listed	
Conservation Area:	None	
Car Parking	Standard:	3
	Justified:	
	Provided:	
Residential Units:	3	

### **b) Site Description**

- land to rear of Rising Sun public house, located on the east side of Greenford Road, just north of the railway line. The applicant site has an area of 323 sq m.
- Rising Sun public house is locally listed.
- site faces access road to adjoining sports club and Hussain Close residential development.
- site bounded by 1.7m brick wall and contains some non-protected trees adjacent to side boundary.
- former repair garage to rear of site now occupied by 'Southern Place' residential development of three storey flats blocks.
- private residents-only parking in Hussain Close; parking along access road predominantly prohibited but with Council controlled residents' permit bay adjacent to no. 11 Hussain Close.
- Sudbury Hill BR station within 100m walk of site; local bus services, shopping facilities and Sudbury Hill LU station (Piccadilly line) within easy reach on Greenford Road.

Cont...

**c) Proposal Details**

- current application proposes the development of similar type houses to those previously approved only bigger. The applicant is willing to waive the permitted development rights granted in the appeal permission should the Council grant the permission.
- the main differences between the original and current schemes are as follows:
  1. proposed dwellings would have an additional depth of 2m. The number of habitable rooms would remain the same.
  2. units proposed would be 2.5m from the road rather than the 3m originally proposed.
  3. rear gardens would be reduced by 1-1.5m. The section of the rear wall extending in the original application is replaced with a level rear wall.
  4. relocation of the car parking space from the west side of the dwellings to the east.
- full application to provide 3 dwellings in terraced form each with 3 bedrooms.
- main front wall of dwellings sited 2.4m back from the site boundary. Front wall of all 3 dwellings includes a section set back a further 2.5m from the main front wall and front door in order to accommodate one parking space per dwelling.
- proposed dwellings will have a depth of 8.6m with gabled roof over.
- ground floors to contain living/dining room, kitchen and bathroom while upstairs will accommodate 3 bedrooms and a bathroom.
- external walls to be rendered with brick detailing over ground floor door and window openings
- white pvc windows and doors proposed.
- brown concrete plain tiled roof with white pvc-u gutters and down pipes.
- planning permission exists for the provision of 2 x two storey dwellings (semi-detached pair) with garages and permission was recently granted, on appeal, for the provision of 3 x two storey terraced properties.
- 

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/707/01/OUT	Outline: residential development	GRANTED 12-MAR-02
P/1422/04/CFU	Redevelopment to provide 3 x two storey terraced properties	REFUSED 11-NOV-04
	Decision successfully appealed	
P/604/05/DFU	2 x two storey dwellings (semi-detached pair) with garages	APPEAL ALLOWED 21-JUN-05 GRANTED 19-MAY-05 Cont...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- the conditions of the recent approval at appeal for 3 no. three bed houses did not take away permitted rights to the proposal.
- it is therefore, possible to extend the previously approved dwellings, once built, by a further 50 cubic metres or 10% of the volume, whichever is greater.
- in order to save cost and make the houses more functional, the applicant wishes to make the dwellings slightly larger at this stage. The applicant would be happy for the Council to remove permitted development rights from this scheme, via an appropriate condition, should the Council consider the scheme acceptable.
- the proposed development has the same number of habitable rooms as the scheme approved at Appeal. The only real difference is the bedrooms are now of a more usable size than previously approved.

**f) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
28	2	25-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** Two response letters have been received from the resident(s) of 2 Hussain Close and 10 Southern Place respectively. The objector residing in 2 Hussain Close does not raise concerns regarding the proposed development but instead uses their letter to highlight the problems of anti social behaviour emanating from the Rising Sun Public House.

The respondent residing in 10 Southern Place does not object to the actual scheme either but does raise concerns about the trees surrounding the site which the respondent says currently offers him/her a degree of privacy.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Character of Area**

The suitability of the applicant site for residential development has been established in recent planning permissions. Outline permission for the accommodation of residential development on the site was granted in March 2002. Subsequent to this decision, permission was granted for two different schemes for the provision of 2 x two storey dwellings (semi-detached) with garages and 3 x two storey terraced houses respectively. The latter was very similar to the current application and was granted on appeal. These approvals of similar recent schemes also establish the suitability of residential development with regard to the areas of local character.

Cont...

The houses proposed would fit nicely into the rear garden of the Rising Sun Public House with the high walls on both sides offering a sense of enclosure. The public house would still remain part of its beer garden for customer use. At present the land to the rear of the public house is under utilised. The scheme proposed would make very effective use of this land as advocated in both national (PPS3) and local (2004 Harrow UDP Policy H3) planning policy. Its density of 372 habitable rooms per hectare would not be excessive for the applicant site considering it is situated between a public house and a sports club and is within very close proximity to a railway line. It is the Council's opinion that the proposed scheme would satisfactorily complement the surrounding developments at Southern Place, to the south of the site, and Hussain Close, to the north. The proposed scheme would not be over dominant due to its height being limited to two storeys and a sufficient amount of open space being retained between the development and the existing public house. As such, the Council considers the proposed development to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character of the surrounding area.

## **2. Residential Amenity**

The proposed front elevations of the houses would be sited at a distance of approximately 9.5m from the flank boundary of no. 10 Hussain Close. The Council considers this to be a sufficient distance so as to protect the amenity of the existing and future occupiers. A sufficient distance would also exist between the rear of the proposed dwellings and the new development at Southern Place. This development is also offset at an angle in comparison with the proposed rear elevation and therefore no problems or overlooking would arise. Furthermore, both flank walls of the proposed development would not contain any windows and would therefore eliminate any potential overlooking problems that the scheme may have caused to the rear of the public house.

## **3. Impact on Locally Listed Building**

The historic character of the pub, the merits of which are principally in the façade, are essentially urban and would not be affected by the close presence of similar scale housing. Although it is unfortunate to lose a public house beer garden, there will still be a substantial piece of garden remaining. The proposals would have little impact on the character of the locally listed building and therefore, there are no conservation objections to this proposal.

## **4. Parking and Access**

Parking would be provided in the form of one space, in the forecourt of each house. In this location, with good links to public transport and services, this level of provision is acceptable.

Cont...

## **5. Consultation Responses**

The concerns raised by the resident(s) of 2 Hussain Close regarding the anti social behaviour of the cliental and bad management of the owners of the public house is not seen as an objection to the proposed development but rather a complaint against the Rising Sun Public House. The Council feels however that the impact of any noise and disturbance emanating from the public house on any potential occupiers of the proposed houses would be no worse than for the remaining residents of Hussain Close and therefore a refusal on such grounds would be unsustainable.

The resident(s) of 10 Southern Place, while not objecting to the proposed scheme, did raise concerns regarding the existing trees on site. The granting of planning permission is conditional to the submission of landscaping plans to be approved by the Council. Another condition stipulating that no existing trees are to be looped, topped, felled or uprooted without prior permission from the Council further safeguards the existing trees within close proximity of the applicant site.

## **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 STOREY REAR EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF HOUSE INTO 2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS (REVISED)

S KARA

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: PP2-1, PP2-2, PP3B-3.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plans 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 The window(s) in the flank wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 5 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.
- 6 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 7 Landscaping to be Approved

## INFORMATIVES

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

Cont...

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

EP25   Noise

SH1    Housing Provision and Housing Need

SH2    Housing Types and Mix

D4      Standard of Design and Layout

D5      New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D9      Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

H9      Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats

T13     Parking Standards

---

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

1.      Single Storey Rear Extension (SD1, D4, D5)
2.      Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
3.      Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
4.      Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
5.      Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
6.      Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

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

**a)      Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	2.8 (max)
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	2
No. of Residential Units:	Existing:	1
	Proposed:	2
Council Interest:	None	

**b)      Site Description**

- 2-Storey, un-extended semi-detached property situated at the southern end of Portland Crescent;
- Hard-surfaced front garden with vehicle crossover access;
- Dwelling is setback approximately 5m from public highway;

Cont...

Item 2/03 - P/1913/05/DFU Cont...

- No existing extensions at the site;
- Existing rear garden depth is approximately 16m;
- The site is located in close proximity to a bus services along Streatfield Road and is relatively close to Queensbury Underground Station

**c) Proposal Details**

- Single storey rear extension to 3m depth
- Conversion of dwelling to two self-contained flats: 2 x 1 bedroom flats on the ground and on the first-floor;
- Access to the units would be via the existing entrance door, with the internal communal hallway split into two for the respective flats
- One parking space on the front curtilage and one to rear accessed via shared driveway
- Refuse storage on the front curtilage

**d) Relevant History**

P/1006/05/DFU      Single storey rear extension and conversion of      REFUSED  
house into two self-contained flats      29-JUN-2005

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Rear, excessive bulk.
2. Pattern and Character of Development
3. The proposal would result in an unreasonable loss of privacy for the future occupiers of both flats by reason of the rear kitchen window of the ground floor flat overlooking the section of rear garden belonging to the first floor flat.
4. The internal layout of the proposed flats would be likely to give rise to unreasonable levels of noise transmission between the units, to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers thereof

Revisions

1. Rear extension depth reduced
2. Revised parking provision arrangement
3. Revised internal layout
4. Revised rear garden arrangement

**e) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
6	1	29-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** devalue property, loss of privacy and overcrowded.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Single Storey Rear Extension**

The application proposes a single storey rear extension to a depth of 3m with a flat roof over to a height of 3m. The extension would span across the rear of the dwelling to a width of 6m reducing to 5.3m due to a slanted easterly flank wall. The extension would abut the flank boundary with No.237. This adjoining dwelling has not been extended to the rear but by complying with the relevant SPG for such development it is considered that no unreasonable impact would be imposed on this property.

No.241 has a rear extension and converted garage extending to approximately 7m on the boundary. It is hence considered that no adverse impact would be imposed on this property by way of the extension.

The proposed extension has been sufficiently reduced in bulk from that which was proposed in the previously refused application (P/1006/05/DFU).

2 flank windows are proposed. One would be sited within the original depth of the dwelling and would serve a WC, the other would be sited in the flank of the single storey rear extension. Both would be single casement with a condition placed on the permission that the windows will be of obscured glass and fixed closed below a height of 1.8m. It is considered that this sufficiently removes the potential for any unreasonable loss of privacy for the adjacent property at No.241.

### **2. Conversion Policy**

#### **Suitability of the new units created in terms of sizes, circulation and layout**

No external alterations are proposed at the front of the building. Both units would be accessed via the dwellings main front entrance, with two separate entrances from the communal hallway.

It is considered that the size of the proposed flats would reasonably meet the needs of non-family occupiers that the development would be likely to attract. Both flats comprise one double, a living room, a kitchen and one bathroom.

The submitted plans show the layout of the rooms in each unit to be acceptable in relation to one another as well as an appropriate vertical alignment.

The internal layout has been revised from that which was considered to be unacceptable in the previously refused application (P/1006/05/DFU).

Cont...

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

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above and it is considered that the proposed layout would be acceptable in terms of noise reduction. Sound insulation measures can be controlled by condition and therefore, subject to this, this proposal is not considered to affect the amenity of the adjoining dwellings by way of noise and/or disturbance.

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

In relation to outdoor amenity space, the property would have a rear garden length of approximately 13 metres (taking into consideration the proposed single storey rear extension) and an overall area of approximately 80m<sup>2</sup>. It is proposed that the property's rear garden would be split between the two units by a boundary line running from the rear wall of the rear extension to the gardens rear boundary line. The positioning of windows in the rear of the proposed rear extension has been revised to allow no overlooking of the other flats section of rear garden. This provision and means of access is considered to be acceptable for both units.

### **3. Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking**

The existing front garden of the site provides one off street parking space.

The scheme has been revised to provide a second parking space to the rear, alongside the flank of the proposed rear extension. The space would be accessed via a shared driveway. This provision is considered to be sufficient in avoiding contribution to on street parking pressure. Many of the surrounding properties within the vicinity of the site have off-street parking; therefore it is considered that providing parking in the front garden is not out of character with the surrounding area. The siting of the second car park space was the originally intended use for this space with neighbouring properties having a garage in this space accessed via a shared driveway.

The site is located close to Streatfield Road for local bus services, and within reasonable walking distance to Queensbury Underground Station.

The submitted plans also indicate details related to storage of refuse/waste, and scheme of front landscaping which are considered to be acceptable.

### **4. Character of Area**

Given that the proposal complies with the criteria set out in policy H9, it is not considered that any detrimental change to the character of Portland Crescent would occur as a result of this proposed conversion. The proposal would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the street scene, by the retention of a single door to the front elevation. It is recognised that activity associated with the property at the front would be likely to intensify with occupation by two households, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Portland Crescent.

Cont...

**5. Residential Amenity**

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

**6. Consultation Responses**

- Loss of property value – non-planning issue
- Loss of privacy – The 2 proposed flank windows would be single casement with a condition placed on the permission that the windows will be of obscured glass and fixed closed below a height of 1.8m. It is considered that this sufficiently removes the potential for any unreasonable loss of privacy for the adjacent property at No.241.
- Overcrowding- the size of the units comply with the Institute of Environmental Health standards for habitable floor space and as such would not contribute to overcrowding

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**LAND ADJACENT 4 DORCHESTER AVE, HARROW**

**2/04**

**P/1774/05/DFU/OH**

Ward: WEST HARROW

TWO STOREY DETACHED HOUSE

MRS S VIGNARAJAH

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5/HP/01B, 02, 03A, 04A, 100, unnumbered A4 plan 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 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 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 development which would otherwise fall within classes A to F in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that order shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the character of the area by restricting the amount of site coverage and size of dwelling in relation to the size of the plot and the availability of amenity space and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no 5/HP/04A 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.
- 5 The landing window(s) in the flank wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Cont....

Item 2/04 - P/1774/05/DFU Cont...

- 6 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.
- 7 Landscaping to be Approved  
8 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  
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Appearance and Character of Area (SH1, SH2, SD1, D4, D5, D9)  
2. Neighbouring Amenity (D4, D5, D9)  
3. Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)  
4. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont....



## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as one petition objecting to the development has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	1.8 (max)
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	2.0
No. of Units:	1	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- West side of Dorchester Avenue
- Side garden of semi-detached house at number 4 Dorchester Avenue
- End of rear garden at 15 Sandhurst Avenue to west
- Service road between rear boundaries of houses in Blenheim Road and Sandhurst Avenue to north of site
- Area characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses and rows of four terraces, of 1930s construction
- Detached property opposite at number 1 Dorchester Avenue given permission in the late 1970s

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Construction of a detached two-storey dwelling with off-street parking
- The main front wall of the proposal is sited along the established building line of the road, the depth of the proposal is comparable to that at the adjacent property 4 Dorchester Avenue
- There is a gap of 3.3 metres between the southern flank wall and the boundary shared with number 4 Dorchester Avenue
- The northern flank wall is sited 0.15 metres from the boundary shared with the service road
- The maximum height of the proposal from ground level to the pitch of the roof is 9.2 metres
- Two tandem off-street parking spaces provided on the site curtilage along with remedial landscaping
- The rear garden would be to a depth of approximately 7 metres

Cont....

**d) Relevant History**

P/706/03/DOU Outline: pair of semi-detached houses with REFUSED  
parking at front 01-JUL-2003

Refused for the following reasons: -

1. The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessive density, inadequate space about the building and cramped rear gardens, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenities of the occupiers of no. 4 and the proposed new houses.
2. The proposed hard-surfaced front garden areas would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the buildings and the streetscene, and give rise to an excessive length of vehicle crossing to the detriment of the safety and convenience of pedestrians with adverse consequences for the furtherance of Government policy to encourage walking.

**e) Consultations**

Drainage Services: Restrict access for maintenance to underground culverted watercourse

Highways Engineer:

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	15	7 + 1 Petition	30-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** restrictive covenants, underground culvert will be affected by flooding, traffic, parking, out of character, detrimental impact on house prices in area, open views destroyed, openness of alleyway destroyed leading to unsocial behaviour.

+ 1 petition containing a total of 5 signatures objecting to the proposed development - diversion of underground culvert could give rise to localised flooding, also flooding of Vaughan School, restrictive covenant, increase in traffic, noise and dust created by building works, spoil local character.

Cont....

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Appearance in the Street Scene/Character of Area**

This scheme overcomes the previous reasons for refusal (P/706/03/DOU). This application proposes a detached house rather than a pair of semi-detached dwellings and it is considered that the proposed new house is acceptable with regards to its appearance in the street scene. This proposal complies with the policies of the UDP (i.e. SD1 and in particular D4) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance. The main front wall of the property is sited in line with the adjacent properties; it therefore blends well with the pattern of development.

The total area of the rear garden space would equal approximately 67.5 m<sup>2</sup> and the depth of this area would be a maximum of 7.5 metres. In comparison, the remaining amenity area for 4 Dorchester Avenue would equal approximately 84m<sup>2</sup> and the depth of this rear garden would be a maximum of 8.5 metres. The amenity space for the proposed house would be comparable to the character of the surrounding area. In accordance with policy D5 it is considered that the layout of the amenity space would be sufficient as a useable amenity area for the occupiers of the proposed development.

Dorchester Avenue is a road that is characterised by pairs of semi-detached houses (although it should be noted that there is a detached house on the opposite side of the road that was granted planning permission in the late 1970s). In the surrounding roads, there is a mixed pattern of semi-detached houses and rows of terraces. The area is generally characterised by houses of inter-war construction. The predominant feature of these houses is the existence of bay windows. In accordance with policy D4 the design of the proposed house takes into account the character and landscape of the locality surrounding the site; the replication of the front bay feature imitates the predominant character on this road.

The frontage of the site is currently close-board fencing to an approximate height of 1.8 metres. It is not thought that any significant trees on this site will be lost. A suggested landscaping condition has been attached to safeguard the appearance and character of the area and to enhance the appearance of the development. In line with this, the extent of proposed hard standing has been reduced on the frontage of the site. This then allows more remedial landscaping on the frontage, greening the development further in the street scene in accordance with policies D4 and D9.

### **2. Neighbouring Amenity**

The proposal complies with the 45° Code in respect of the neighbouring houses at number 4 Dorchester Avenue, therefore there is not considered to be any unreasonable impact with regards to loss of light or outlook at the rear of this property.

Cont....

The proposal involves facilitating four windows on the southern elevation facing the flank of 4 Dorchester Avenue. There are three ground floor windows leading to the hallway, a W.C and the dining room. There is one first floor window leading to the landing. The ground floor hallway and W.C window would be directly adjacent to the blank flank wall of the integral garage at 4 Dorchester Avenue, therefore having no detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. The first floor landing window would be opposite the first floor landing window at 4 Dorchester Avenue. This is not considered to be unreasonable and as this window would not serve a habitable room it is considered rational to ensure that it is obscure and un-opening below 1.8 metres. This step would overcome any perception of overlooking or loss of privacy.

The ground floor window leading to the dining room would be a secondary window, with the primary window located on the rear elevation of the property. This flank dining room window would be sited directly opposite a similar window on the flank of 4 Dorchester Avenue. This window would be located approximately 3.3 metres from the shared boundary. In accordance with the SPG, this distance is considered sufficient to overcome any negative impacts with regards to loss of privacy or overlooking and as such a glazing condition should not be required.

The submitted plans indicate details related to storage of refuse/recycling, which is considered to be acceptable in relation to neighbouring amenities.

It is considered that the appearance of the proposal would enhance this site. The introduction of remedial landscaping works to the frontage will mitigate any perceived 'concrete' appearance and enhance the appearance of the development in the street scene.

### **3. Traffic and Highway Safety/ Parking**

Three off-street parking spaces would be retained within the curtilage of 4 Dorchester Avenue (two spaces on the frontage and one space in the integral garage), which is more than adequate in accordance with Schedule 5 of policy T13. The proposed development makes the provision for two tandem off-street car parking spaces on the frontage of the site. This is considered to be adequate with regards to the parking standards, which stipulates that the parking provided should not exceed the maximum of 1.8 spaces. The proposal provides more than the maximum standard. Therefore, it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal is justified in the above circumstances.

### **4. Consultation Responses**

- Restrictive covenants, traffic, detrimental impact on house prices in area, open views destroyed, openness of alleyway destroyed leading to unsocial behaviour – these are not material planning considerations
- Disturbance to underground culvert – this would be dealt with by other legislation outside of the planning remit
- 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.

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) gatesThe 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
- 

**INFORMATION**

Consideration of this application was deferred at the Committee meetings on 6th and 27th July in order to undertake a Members Site Visit which took place on 30th August, and from the meeting of 7th September 2005 for joint consideration with application P/1306/05/CFU (See Agenda Item 1/01)

**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 2/05 – 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	SEE AGENDA
		ITEM 1/01

**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.

continued/

- 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.

PROVISION 2 DORMER WINDOWS IN SIDE ROOF

MR R GUNARATNE for MR K S GILL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: PSH/001(A); PSH/002; 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 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 rooflights  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 4 Completed Development - Buildings
- 5 Notwithstanding the details of the 2 dormer windows shown on drg no. PJH/001(A) the dormer windows in the side roof of the approved dwelling shall:  
(a) be of purpose-made obscure glass  
(b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **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:

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

EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

continued/

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

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, EP33, EP34)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, EP31, D15)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:

Conservation Area: Pinner Hill Estate

Green Belt

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- site located within the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area, Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Special Character
- property comprises a detached bungalow on an 1474m<sup>2</sup> site
- Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area is characterised by a low density of development, and a high level of greenery, which in combination suggest a rural appearance to the surroundings
- dwelling is situated on eastern side of Potter Street Hill, north of Hillside Road and south of Potter Heights Close
- eastern side of Potter Street Hill contains a number of large detached houses on ample sized plots while the western side contains vacant undeveloped land some of which is used for recreational purposes by St. Johns School which is located north of the property

### **c) Proposal Details**

- proposal involves construction of 2 side dormer windows on the northern side of the dwelling
- proposed dormer windows are in conjunction with the planned conversion of the existing property's roof space in order to provide 2 en-suite bathrooms
- scheme also includes the installation of 4 rooflights, one at the rear, one on the same side as the proposed dormers and two on the southern side all of which would be permitted development.
- the dormer windows would extend by 1.3m from the existing roof and would be 1.6m in height
- a small semi-circular roof window already exists on the southern side of the dwelling

continued/

Item 2/06 – P/2099/05/CFU continued.....

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/7418	Erect dwellinghouse (outline)	GRANTED 08-MAY-53
HAR/8709/A	Erect detached bungalow and garage (amended)	GRANTED 26-FEB-54
HAR/7418/A	Amended layout for dwelling house (outline)	GRANTED 27-MAY-54
HAR/7418/B	Erect 4 houses	GRANTED 22-JUL-54
HAR/8709/B	Erect detached bungalow and garage (amended)	GRANTED 10-AUG-54
HAR/7418/I	Garage extension new sun lounge	GRANTED 14-OCT-63
LBH/2545/5	3 two-storey detached dwellinghouses with garages (plots 1,2,3)	GRANTED 08-DEC-75
LBH/2545/6	Detached house and double garage (plot 5 land at Potter Street Hill rear High Loaning and Tanglewood)	GRANTED 09-JUN-76
P/652/05/DCP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: erection of two side roof extensions	REFUSED 10-MAY-05

**e) Consultations**

CAAC:

No objections

**Advertisement**

Character of Conservation Area

Expiry

**Notifications**

Sent  
2

Replies  
0

Expiry  
22-SEP-05

continued/

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character

Plan policy requires that 'development will be strictly controlled within the Green Belt to ensure that such land remains primarily open and existing environmental character is maintained or enhanced' and in the case of extensions to dwellings, 'not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling.'

	Original	Existing	% increase over original	Proposed	% increase over original
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	154.4	168.1	+8.9%	0	+8.9%
Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	154.4	168.1	+8.9%	226.1	+46.6%

The existing bungalow was previously extended to the rear of the original garage. Both the garage and bungalow were originally granted planning permission in 1954 and represent the original property. The extension to the rear of the garage was minor (13.7m<sup>2</sup>) and only increased the footprint of the original building by 8.9%. A conversion of the buildings roof space to provide 2 en-suite bedrooms and the associated dormer windows, sought in the current application, would not result in an increase in the buildings footprint. The proposal, coupled with the garage extension, would however, result in a 46.6% increase in floor area from the original property.

A previous Certificate of Lawfulness application included the installation of 2 much larger dormers in the same positions as proposed in the current application. This application for a Certificate of Lawfulness was refused. After consultation with the applicant the dormers proposed in the current application have been scaled down from what was previously sought. These amendments have decreased the potential impact the proposed dormers would have on the surrounding area. The Council considers that the 2 proposed dormer windows would not be overbearing or disproportionate in terms of size of the original detached bungalow and garage. As such, the proposal would comply with Council Policies EP31, EP33 and D15, would retain the openness of the property and would not impact negatively on either the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

### 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area

The proposed dormer windows originally sought in the current application had an awkward elongated design that would have had a negative impact on the character of the property and the wider Conservation Area. However, after consulting with the applicant, the plans were amended with the overall height of the dormers reduced from 2m to 1.6m and the section of the dormers beneath the glass was eliminated. The resulting dormers have a much more balanced appearance and the amendments have reduced the overall bulk of the dormer thus minimising the effect on the property and Conservation Area. Planning consent would be conditional to the applicant ensuring that the roof tiles and tiles hanging on the dormer cheeks would match the existing roof tiles.

continued/

The number of rooflights proposed is considered excessive but is difficult to resist as they are permitted development. The granting of planning permission however, is conditional to the applicant submitting details of the proposed rooflights to be approved by the Council.

The amended design of the proposed dormers coupled with adherence with the conditions attached would result in the works having a minimal effect on the existing dwelling and would not detract from the character of the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The proposed dormers would face the existing southern gable wall of Tanglewood, the adjoining detached property located directly north of the site. This property already has 4 small windows in its south facing flank wall, which currently look onto the application property. The dormers would directly overlook the flat roof of the applicant property's original garage and extension. The boundary between both properties also contains some mature trees and a certain amount of foliage all of which would lessen any possible overlooking or loss of privacy issues. Furthermore, there is a distance of 14m between both dwellings. The combination of this distance and the presence of some mature trees and foliage would eliminate any potential loss of privacy or overlooking issues. No objection to the proposed scheme has been made by the neighbouring property.

**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.



TEMPORARY USE AS AN 8 BED WINTER NIGHT  
SHELTER (20:00-08:00 HRS) FROM 1ST DECEMBER  
2005 TO 1ST MARCH 2006

IAN PIKE for WEST LONDON YMCA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Drawing by Max Lock & Partners; Site Plan

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

- 1 The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the West London YMCA and shall be for a limited period being 1st December 2005 to 1st March 2006 between the hours of 20:00 and 08:00 for a maximum of 8 people.

REASON: To reflect the particular circumstances of the application

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans

- 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:

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

SH2 Housing Types and Mix

H17 Access for Special Households with Particular Needs

---

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

- 1) Housing Policy (SH1, SH2, H17)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (SH1)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as a petition opposing the proposal has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Site area: 630m<sup>2</sup>  
Council interest: None

continued/

Item 2/07 – P/2320/05/DFU continued.....

**b) Site Description**

- south east corner of intersection of Welldon Crescent and Angel Road
- occupied by single storey building with curved roof used as community centre
- former church building to south also in community use
- parking within site
- 2-storey residential development to east and on opposite sides of Welldon Crescent and Angel Road

**c) Proposal Details**

- temporary use of building to provide sleeping accommodation for homeless people
- permission is sought to run from 1st December 2005 to 1st March 2006 between 8pm and 8am the following morning; similar applications were granted planning permission last year and in 2003
- bed spaces for up to 8 people proposed
- internal alterations to provide shower and kitchen areas

**d) Relevant History**

P/2324/03/CFU	Temporary use as homeless accommodation for up to 8 people (1st December to 1st March 8pm to 8am)	GRANTED 16-DEC-03
P/2557/04/CFU	Temporary use as an 8 bed winter night shelter (20:00-08:00hrs) for 3 months period commencing 1st December 2004	GRANTED 11-NOV-04

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- refuge under control of full-time professional Project Manager, a full complement of specialist staff plus volunteers from local churches
- will identify and refer single people in most need
- will seek to find more permanent accommodation for users of refuge and help them change their lifestyles
- users provided with food, bed and washing facilities
- will ensure that local residents and neighbours not disturbed nor inconvenienced
- regular activities in centre will be free to continue during daytime

**f) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
97	1 + petition of 3 signatures	10-OCT-05

**Summary of Responses:** Noise and disturbance, elderly residents insecure, proximity of school, negative affect on residence for disabled, increased crime, concern that centre is becoming a long term shelter, decline of Harrow, nature of shelter's users, need for long term solution, safety precautions, frequency of police patrols.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Housing Policy**

Policies SH2 and H17 of the adopted UDP encourage the provision of accommodation for people with special housing needs. Whilst it is acknowledged that the shelter would provide short term rather than long-term accommodation, the proposal would comply with the aforementioned policies.

### **2) Neighbouring Amenity**

Residents concerns relating to potential noise disturbance, increased crime and the general perceived impact of the shelter on their amenity are acknowledged. However, the shelter has operated during two previous winters with no complaints being received at the time of the use. Given this and the level of staff which is proposed to supervise the use, it is considered that detriment to neighbouring amenity need not result from the proposal.

### **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 grant.

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A 2 STOREY BLOCK WITH ROOMS IN THE ROOF, CONSERVATORY CONTAINING 3 FLATS, 1 INTEGRAL GARAGE AND A DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE WITH ACCESS

SIMPSON McHUGH for MR & MRS SHAPIRO

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2403/6 Rev F, 2403/7 Rev F 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 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 The ground floor bathroom and utility and first floor bathroom window(s) in the east flank wall(s) as indicated on plan nos. 2403/6 Rev F and 2403/7 Rev F of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan nos 2403/6 Rev F and 2403/7 Rev F 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.
- 5 Disabled Access - Buildings

Cont...

Item 2/08 - P/781/05/CFU Cont...

- 6 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.
- 7 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.
- 8 Highway - Approval of Access(es)  
9 Highway - Approval of Construction  
10 Landscaping to be Approved  
11 Landscaping to be Implemented  
12 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling  
13 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained  
14 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 2403/7 Rev F 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.
- 15 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces  
16 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.
- 17 Water Storage Works

Cont...

- 18 The roof area of the rear single storey element hereby permitted shall not be used 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 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:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D10 Trees and New Development
- D19 Ancient Monuments
- T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D10, D19)
  2. Residential Amenity (D4)
  3. Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)
  4. Parking and Access (T13)
  5. Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument (D19)
  6. Consultation Responses
- 

#### INFORMATION

##### a) Summary

Listed Building:	Not Listed	
Conservation Area:	None	
Car Parking	Standard:	5
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	6
Adjacent to Scheduled Ancient Monument (Grims Ditch)		
Council Interest:	None	

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- Corner site on junction of Royston Grove and Royston Park Road, occupied by small bungalow
- Bungalow at 'Beamsley' to south on Royston Grove, general area characterised by large detached properties, particularly on Royston Park Road
- Opposite corner occupied by two smaller detached houses
- Trees on all boundaries, especially dense at corner and rear boundary with 'Beamsley'
- Existing vehicular access on Royston Park Road adjacent to boundary with No.38
- Grims Ditch (Scheduled Ancient Monument) to east, with designated area extending to rear boundary of application site

**c) Proposal Details**

- Demolition of bungalow and erection of two-storey block with rooms in the roof, containing 3 self-contained flats; one integral garage on Royston Park Road elevation would serve ground floor unit; double garage and two parking spaces to front off Royston Grove would serve upper flats and visitor spaces.

**d) Relevant History**

P/2762/04/DFU	Single storey & roof extensions; boundary fence/wall on frontages	GRANTED
		15-DEC-2004

**e) Consultations**

English Heritage: Awaiting

**1st Notification**

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	16	34	15-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** no flats on Royston Grove at present; overdevelopment; inadequate parking; busy corner with learner drivers; higher than other properties; overlooking; prominent; obtrusive; overspill of parking; proximity to Grims Ditch; flooding, loss of trees; strain on utilities; upheaval during construction; flats would devalue properties; congestion; undertaking that no flats would be built in Royston Grove; overshadowing; noise; obtrusive; agree but on smaller scale; rights of light; out of context; would be similar to The Avenue; unnecessary increase in density; would set a precedent.

Cont...

## **2nd Notification**

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 36	Replies Awaited	Expiry 08-OCT-2005
----------------------	------------	--------------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Awaited

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Character of the Area**

The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by large two-storey dwellings, with a significant number of trees between and to the front of the houses. The site subject of this application is located on the corner of Royston Park Road and Royston Grove, and is currently occupied by a modest bungalow with shrubs and trees on the boundaries. The opposite corner is occupied by two detached two-storey properties. Substantial extensions to the application property have been approved recently, which would involve increased height on the Royston Grove elevation in particular.

The proposal would involve a two-storey building with rooms in the roof, facing Royston Park Road. On that elevation the main element of the building would be generally in keeping with the large detached properties in the street. A corner element would address the junction, but would be a modest feature in keeping with some of the other large properties nearby. Towards the rear of the building, the bulk of the projection towards the boundary with 'Beamsley' has been set down to ensure that the dominance of the main front section would be emphasised, and bulk reduced closer to that bungalow. Coupled with the proposed retention of the trees and new landscaping on the boundary and the general adherence to the established building line on both roads, the proposed building would fit well into the pattern of development in the area.

### **2. Residential Amenity**

The impact of the proposal on the amenity of the nearest neighbouring residents at No.38 Royston Park Road and 'Beamsley' is considered to be acceptable. The depth and height of the building would not result in a negative impact, given compliance with the 45° code in relation to No.38, and the distance to the boundary with 'Beamsley'. The flank windows facing No.38 would be obscure glazed, and would not serve habitable rooms. The distance of 26m from the deepest two-storey window and 30m from the dormers on the rear elevation to the boundary with 'Beamsley' would represent an acceptable relationship, and no overlooking would occur.

Cont...



### **3. Housing Provision**

The LPA, in accordance with PPG3, seeks to encourage the provision of additional housing on suitable sites in order to respond to the housing need in the London area. The redevelopment of this site to replace a small bungalow with three units is considered to represent a good use of residential land.

### **4. Parking and Access**

The provision of 6 parking spaces would comply with the standard requirements of the HUDP, which is considered to be necessary given the relative distance from the nearest transport node at Hatch End. The proposed siting of accesses is considered to be acceptable.

### **5. Impact on Scheduled Ancient Monument**

Although the designated area around Grims Ditch extends to the rear boundary of the site, the proposed double garage would be set in from the boundary by approximately 1.5m and would not impact on the scheduled ancient monument.

### **6. Consultation Responses**

- Value of properties, strain on utilities: not planning issues
- Other: 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.

ADDITIONAL DETACHED HOUSE  
AND TWO DETACHED DOUBLE  
GARAGES IN GARDEN  
(REVISED)

JAMES ROSS ARCHITECTS for MR P MYERS

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 20402/01, 02A, 03B, 04A

**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), to include details of windows and bonnet tiles to hips
  - (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 development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
The boundary treatment shall be completed:
  - b: before the building(s) is/are occupiedThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 4 The window(s) in the south-east flank wall of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 8 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
- 9 Levels to be Approved
- 10 Parking for Occupants - Garages

continued/

Item 2/09 – P/933/05/DFU continued.....

- 11 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.
- 12 PD Restriction - Classes A to F
- 13 PD Restrictions - Minor Operations
- INFORMATIVES:
- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 4 INFORMATIVE:  
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D10 Trees and New Development  
D12 Locally Listed Buildings  
T13 Parking Standards
- 5 Standard Informative 43 - Building Adjacent to Public Sewer

---

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

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, D10)
- 2) Impact on Locally Listed Building (D12)
- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
- 4) Parking and Traffic (T13)
- 5) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Locally Listed Building		
Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	4
Site Area:	924m <sup>2</sup> (new house)	
Habitable Rooms:	9	
No. of Residential Units:	1	
Density:	11 dph 97 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- backland site on north-west side of Uxbridge Road
- occupied by locally listed detached bungalow with thatched roof, outbuildings adjacent to north-west and north-east boundaries
- 2 preserved oak trees within site, other protected trees and vegetation along site boundaries
- vehicle access from Uxbridge Road via gravel drive between 2 recently built detached 3 storey flat blocks which are located between the site and Uxbridge Road
- 2 detached houses adjacent to north-west boundary
- rear gardens of residential premises in Dearne Close and Uxbridge Road abut north-east boundary
- garden area of recent development fronting onto Uxbridge Road adjacent to south-west boundary

### **c) Proposal Details**

- provision of new detached house in eastern corner of site adjacent to north-east and south-east boundaries
- 2-storeys with rooms in roof plus single storey element adjacent to boundary with 22 Uxbridge Road
- contains kitchen, dining, family and living rooms on ground floor, 3 bedrooms on first floor and 2 bedrooms in roofspace, lit by dormer windows
- brick and rendered elevations, tiled roof
- ancillary double garage shown in front of proposed house
- new double garage proposed alongside existing bungalow to replace existing garage proposed for removal, requiring removal of existing timber shed next to boundary with 17 Dearne Close

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

P/1404/03/COU Outline: Demolition of existing property REFUSED  
and redevelopment to provide 3 houses 06-NOV-03  
(revised)

Reason for refusal:

“The development would be an overdevelopment and over intensification of the site resulting in the loss of a unique locally listed building to the detriment of the character of this 1930's enclave. The close proximity of the development to the properties which abut the rear of the site would result in a loss of residential amenity to the neighbouring residents and would spoil the tranquillity of the gardens of these properties.”

APPEAL DISMISSED  
19-AUG-04

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- scheme acknowledges points from previous hearing:-
  - retention of existing locally listed building
  - new dwelling positioned further from north-east boundary to permit maximum retention of existing planting and provide for new planting
  - new dwelling in size and scale with previous application
  - scale and bulk of dwelling and space about it reflects setting of nearby similar buildings and is in keeping with character of the area
  - single dwelling would create less vehicle activity and subsequent disturbance

**f) Consultations**

TWU: Informative suggested

<b>1st Notification</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	42	7	31-MAY-05

**Summary of Responses:** Site unsuitable for proposed development, harm to character of area, traffic congestion, impact on drainage, increased car noise and disturbance, out of character, southern garage out of keeping, loss of privacy, overpowering impact, overlooking, loss of visual amenity, land affected by covenant

<b>2nd Notification</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	42	Awaited	07-NOV-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Appearance and Character of Area**

In dismissing the previous appeal the Inspector considered a scheme which showed 2 houses on the site of the existing dwelling (houses A and B), and a third house (house C) in fundamentally the same position as the unit proposed in this application.

continued/

The Inspectors main concerns related to units A and B in terms of their cramped siting.

In terms of house C the Inspector stated that “this dwelling would be set in a more spacious context but would still be very close to the north-east and south-east boundaries of the site. There would be very little room in my view for any effective planting or boundary treatment that would be in keeping with the generous green hedging and planting evident around most properties in the area.” In response to these comments the house has been re-sited further from these boundaries so that the 2-storey element would be located 2.5 – 3.5m from the north-east boundary, with the single storey element at least 3.5m from that boundary. The single storey element would be at least 2m from the south east boundary.

These distances would be sufficient to safeguard existing planting and provide additional vegetation where required.

The preserved trees within and around the site would not be harmed by the proposal and to this end the proposed garage to serve the new house has been re-sited to avoid possible root damage by foundations.

A side private garden area of over 200m<sup>2</sup> would be provided, not dissimilar from the size of some adjacent gardens in Dearne Close.

## **2) Impact on Locally Listed Building**

The Inspector stated that he was unable to give significant weight to the potential loss of the existing building in considering the appeal proposal.

Nonetheless, its proposed retention complies with Policy D12 to the benefit of the character of the area.

The proposed separation distance of 14m between the new and existing dwellings would safeguard the setting of the building.

The proposed 2 double garages would be acceptably designed and sited in relation to the locally listed structure, and the removal of the existing timber shed would improve its setting. Overall, an acceptable impact would be provided in terms of the locally listed building and the area within which it is located.

## **3) Residential Amenity**

The Inspector’s chief concern in relation to this issue was the impact on 17 Dearne Close of the new houses proposed on the site of the existing bungalow. This concern is resolved by the deletion of those houses from the scheme. The double garage proposed between the bungalow and the boundary with No. 17 would not be obtrusive due to its single storey character, siting away from the boundary, and the lack of main windows in the facing elevation of No. 17.

continued/

Item 2/09 – P/933/05/DFU continued.....

The Inspector concluded that the distance between the rear elevation of 15 Dearne Close and the new dwelling would be just about acceptable. This relationship is replicated in this application so that at least 30m would be provided between facing elevations and 13.5 - 16.5m to the boundary.

He considered that the outlook from the internal living areas of other houses and flats around the site would not be significantly affected by the appeal proposal. With the exception of the proposed garage in front of the new dwelling these outlooks would be unchanged in this application.

Obscure glazing is suggested to windows facing the Uxbridge Road flats to preserve privacy.

14m would separate the front walls of the new house and the bungalow.

Although ground and first floor windows are shown in the new house to face the bungalow a large oak tree is sited between the properties, reducing intervisibility and softening the impact of the house in terms of outlook and amenity.

Overall it is considered that neighbouring amenities would be adequately preserved by the proposals.

**4) Parking and Traffic**

It is considered that the existing access is adequate to serve the proposed development, which would have acceptable levels of parking.

**5 Consultation Responses**

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Increase car noise and disturbance | - it is not considered that the proposed additional house would give rise to excessive levels of noise and disturbance from vehicles |
| Land affected by covenant          | - not a material planning consideration  |
| Impact on drainage                 | - neither Thames Water nor the Council's Drainage Section has objected on drainage grounds, nor suggested conditions.                |

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.

---

**LAND REAR OF 45-51 SOUTHFIELD PARK, NORTH HARROW**

**2/10**

**P/1943/05/COU/CM**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

OUTLINE: CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE HOUSES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

CHRISTOPHER PRING for MR DREW, DR & MRS MARSDEN,

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: KP060604, Tree Survey rec'd 29-JUL-05, 861/1A, OS

**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)
  - (d) design of buildings
  - (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.

continued/



Item 2/10 – P/1943/05/COU continued.....

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 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.

6 Highway - Approval of Construction

7 Landscaping to be Approved

8 Landscaping to be Implemented

9 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained

10 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved

11 Trees - Protective Fencing

12 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling

13 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.

14 Disabled Access - Buildings

15 The window(s) in the flank wall(s) of the proposed development shall:

(a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,

(b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

16 Levels to be Approved

17 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 861/1A 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.

18 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces

19 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

20 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

continued/

Item 2/10 – P/1943/05/COU continued.....

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

SH2 Housing Types and Mix

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D10 Trees and New Development

T13 Parking Standards

C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

- 1) Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)
  - 2) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D10)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, C16, D4, D5)
  - 4) Access and Parking (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

This application was deferred at the Planning Committee Meeting on 11th October 2005 to allow for a Members Site Visit. This visit took place on Saturday 29th October at 10:00am.

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	)
	Justified:	) See report
	Provided:	)

Council Interest:

**b) Site Description**

- land to rear of detached and semi-detached properties 45, 49 and 51 Southfield Park, which extends to rear of gardens at 39-43 at end of gardens
- detached garage to side of No.49, which has a double width plot
- recent development of 4 flats to the rear of No.33, with access from Yewtree Close

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application for the development of 5 houses (pair of semi-detached houses to the rear of No.45 and a terrace of 3 houses to the rear of Nos. 49 & 51)

continued/

Item 2/10 – P/1943/05/COU continued.....

- access to the side of No. 49 once garage is demolished
- all houses with integral garages and 2 spaces to the rear of No. 45
- design, external appearance and landscaping to be submitted as reserved matters

**d) Relevant History**

P/624/04/COU Outline: redevelopment, 3 storey block of 17 flats, 2 bungalows and garages at rear

REFUSED  
24-MAY-04  
APPEAL WITHDRAWN

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The access would be via a shared driveway with a bell mouth in accordance with 'Residential Road and Footpath' guidance; 6.5m has been allowed for access to the integral garages; the carrying out of a tree survey and the commissioning of an arboriculturalist shows the client's respect for trees; the scheme is sited on rear gardens of the applicants homes so good landscaping will be very important to their amenities; the wheelie bin enclosure siting would meet the limits for collection and proximity to houses

**f) Consultations**

EA: Unable to respond

TWU: Awaiting

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	88	21	29-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Overlooking, impact on the peace and enjoyment of gardens, security risk, poor sight lines from access road and would be dangerous, width of driveway insufficient for emergency vehicles, integral garages often used for storage and will increase parking problem, tree felling will have detrimental environmental impact, bin store too far from houses, cramped distribution of buildings, lack of green space, lack of parking provision, traffic, overdevelopment, would set a precedent, impact on preserved trees, depth of rear gardens inadequate, strain on existing drainage and sewerage system, flooding, threat of terrorism to capital, hazard to pedestrians, already a high degree of infill housing, Harrow is committed to Agenda 21, inadequate amenity space, congestion on refuse collection day, light pollution, increased strain on services, loss of parking for and in front of No.49, established emergency route for fire station, anti-social behaviour, impact combined with Safeway development

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Housing Provision**

Policies within the adopted UDP, in accordance with PPG3, seek to promote the provision of new housing to meet the needs of prospective occupants. As such the proposal would provide much needed relatively affordable housing in an area in close proximity to North Harrow district centre and its associated services and facilities.

continued/

**2) Character of the Area**

The proposed development would be generally in keeping with the pattern of development found in Yewtree Close and Hazelwood Close to the west, with the formation of a small terrace and a pair of semi-detached houses. The siting in relation to the boundaries with the properties fronting Southfield Park would provide sufficient separation, and although the design of the houses would be dealt with as a reserved matter, the size of the dwellings would be similar to nearby recent close developments.

There is an area Tree Preservation Order for the site, however a tree survey has been prepared and the proposed scheme for retention is considered to be acceptable. Thus the character of the area will not be unduly affected.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The siting of the new houses would provide an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties on Southfield Park and Hooking Green. The location of new boundaries would provide rear gardens of 13.5m in depth for Nos.45, 49 and 51, which is considered to be adequate. The new houses would have rear garden depths of 9m, the smallest garden providing amenity space of 54m<sup>2</sup> which is considered to be acceptable. The nearest property would be sited a distance of 18.5m from the nearest dwelling at Hooking Green, with the opportunity for new planting on the boundary. No habitable room windows would be allowed in the flank walls, and the distance to the rear boundaries is considered to be sufficient given the considerable depth of the rear gardens along Southfield Park. As there is significant tree cover on site and the majority of the trees on the boundaries would be retained, the proposal would not result in undue overlooking. Given the existence of garages accessed by a shared driveway to the rear of nearby properties on Southfield Park, the proposed 2 visitor parking spaces would not result in any further undue impact in terms of amenity.

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

**4) Access and Parking**

The proposal involves integral garages for the 5 houses and 2 additional visitor spaces. The Council's standards require a parking provision of 7 spaces for such a development, thus the provision would be acceptable. While the scheme would involve the loss of the garage for No.49 Southfield Park, the impact on the area is not considered to be unacceptable given the existence of on-street parking and the proximity of North Harrow District Centre.

**5) Consultation Responses**

These are largely dealt with in the appraisal above. Drainage and flooding issues are technically not planning issues, although a condition has been attached to ensure water storage/attenuation works are provided. Similarly, the strain on services in the area is not a 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.

---

**9 WELBECK ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/11**

**P/2041/05/DFU/OH**

Ward: WEST HARROW

TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE HOUSE; SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO EXISTING HOUSE AND PARKING AT FRONT

M ASSI for RAVI OUTT

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 207-3 rec'd 30-SEP-05; 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)
  - (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 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 4 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

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

continued/

- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - SH2 Housing Types and Mix
  - T13 Parking Provision
- 

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

- 1) Appearance in the Streetscene (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
  - 2) Character of Area (SH1, SH2, SD1, D4, D5, D9)
  - 3) Landscaping (D4, D9)
  - 4) Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
  - 5) Parking Provision/Highway Safety (T13)
- 

**INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as a petition objecting to the development has been received.

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	1.8 (max)
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	1.0
No. of Residential Units:	1	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- two storey semi-detached dwelling with no previous extensions
- located on southern side of Welbeck Road on a large corner plot at the junction with Furness Road
- property on opposite side, number 7 Welbeck Road has a large single storey side extension with a flat roof, the whole property has been converted into a doctors surgery
- there is an existing garage and dropped kerb at the rear boundary fronting Furness Road
- the rear amenity space is approximately 20 metres long and wider than any others in the immediate vicinity

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a side extension to the existing dwelling to a width of 4.57 metres from the flank wall and to the full depth of the main house
- the first floor element is set back for a depth of 1 metre and the roof over is subordinate
- the flank wall of the first floor side is set in further from the side boundary for 0.5 metres; therefore the ground floor is set away from the boundary for 1.55 metres and the first floor is set away from the boundary for 2.05 metres

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/2041/05/DFU continued.....

- single storey rear extension to a depth of 3 metres and a height of 3 metres (with a flat roof) sited along the boundary shared with 11 Welbeck Road and extending to the full width of the existing dwelling and the side element described above
- conversion of the side element into a separate house, main entrance door on the front elevation facing Welbeck Road
- accommodation to provide five habitable rooms (of which, two would be bedrooms)
- rear amenity space split into two, one off-street parking space provided for the new dwelling within the existing garage at the rear

**d) Relevant History**

P/2568/03/DFU	Single storey side and rear extension	REFUSED 21-JAN-04
---------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed roof over the single storey side and rear extension, by reason of excessive size, bulk and unsatisfactory design, would be unduly obtrusive and overbearing, would detract from the appearance of this and adjacent properties, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the locality.”

P/616/04/DFU	Single storey side and rear extension	GRANTED 29-APR-04
--------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------

P/1880/04/DFU	Single and two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch	GRANTED 02-SEP-04
---------------	--	----------------------

P/169/05/DFU	Two storey side to rear extension to provide two additional houses; single storey rear extension to existing house, garages at rear	REFUSED 23-MAR-05
--------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed two storey side to rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk, prominent siting and unsatisfactory design, would be unduly obtrusive with inadequate space about the buildings and would detract from the established pattern of development in the street scene and the character of the locality.
2. The proposed single storey rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property.
3. The proposed additional residential units would amount to an over-intensive occupation of this site, would give rise to an unreasonable increase in residential activity and associated disturbance to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.
4. The proposed development, by reason of its design and layout, would deny access to the garden from one of the units and as a result would fail to secure satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers and would be out of character in the area.

continued/

5. The width of the proposed rear parking area access in conjunction with the neighbouring crossover at the adjacent 2 Furness Road would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to pedestrian safety.”

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 10	Replies 1 + petition of 22 signatures	Expiry 13-SEP-05
----	----------------------	------------	---	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Removal of parking spaces to enable another garage at 9 Welbeck Road, traffic congestion, overlooking, how would garden cater for 3 families: makes properties look terraced rather than semi-detached, spoil outlook at bottom of road, properties would have access onto Furness Road restricting pedestrian movement, excessive bulk, prominent siting, obtrusive out of character, over-intensive development, loss of light and overshadowing, noise and disturbance, environmentally unfriendly, plot being used purely for a commercial venture.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Appearance in the Streetscene**

It is considered that the proposed new house is acceptable with regards to its appearance in the street scene. It is considered that this proposal complies with the policies of the UDP (i.e. SD1 and in particular D4) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance in respect of development on corner boundaries. The flank wall of the development is set a substantial distance from the boundary on the corner, this along with the set back and subordinate roof reduces the bulk and any unreasonable impact that the development may have on the street scene (including Furness Road). The set in from the corner boundary retains the character of space in the corner plot and reduces its visual impact.

It is recognised that the proposal would be viewed when travelling down Furness Road onto Welbeck Road. As a result of this proposal the rear garden within the site would be 17.5 metres overall, it is considered that this distance along with the subordinate bulk is sufficient to provide a suitable spatial setting for the development without any detrimental impact on the Furness Road street scene.

The physical elements of this scheme are almost identical to a previous application, which was granted on the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2004. For this reason it is considered that a refusal related to the appearance and bulk of the proposal could not be justified.

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

As a two storey dwelling, the proposal would be consistent with the character of buildings in this locality and while the local form is predominantly semi-detached, the introduction of an end of terrace dwelling is not considered to be significantly at odds with the grain/pattern of development, especially as the principle for the extension has already been agreed in P/1880/04/DFU. The depth of the dwelling and its hipped roof form are also considered to be in keeping, and together with the width it would be of a satisfactory bulk in the street scene and therefore in character with the general area.

continued/



**3) Landscaping**

The frontage of the site is currently landscaped with a hedge forming the boundary treatment along the corner towards the front. The submitted drawings suggest an indicative scheme of landscaping on the frontage along with a space for refuse storage for the proposed house and the existing dwelling, which is considered to be acceptable in relation to neighbouring amenities. It is not thought that any significant trees on this site will be lost, however a suggested landscaping condition has been attached to safeguard the appearance and character of the area and to enhance the appearance of the development. In line with this, the extent of proposed hard standing has been reduced on the frontage of 9 Welbeck Road. This then allows for more remedial landscaping on the frontage, greening the development further in the street scene in accordance with policies D4 and D9.

**4) Residential Amenity**

The proposed extensions would have an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties (see above). It is considered that the proposed house will not have any unreasonable impact by loss of light to the properties on Furness Road because of the distance between the properties. The dimensions of the proposed single storey rear extensions accord with the advice contained in the Householders SPG and therefore this element would not have any unreasonable impacts on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers of 11 Welbeck Road.

The formation of the site along with the single storey rear extensions would curtail the garden of number 9 Welbeck Road to approximately 14 metres in length and an area in the range of 84m<sup>2</sup>. By comparison, as noted above, the proposed dwelling would have a rear garden depth of 17.5m and a rear garden area of 112m<sup>2</sup>. Nearby dwellings in Welbeck Road typically have rear garden depths of approximately 17m and areas in the region of 150m<sup>2</sup>. In accordance with policy D5 it is considered that the layout of the amenity space would be sufficient as a useable amenity area for the occupiers of the proposed development.

Subject to suitable boundary treatment, that could be required by condition, it is considered that the form and amount of amenity space for the dwelling proposed would be sufficient to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers in relation to ground floor windows and outdoor activity.

The distance to the rear boundary (of 17.5 m) is considered sufficient to ensure that overlooking from the window on the first floor rear elevation of the side extension would be indirect, likewise the addition of this proposal would not directly overlook the adjoining properties at nos. 9 and 11. It is therefore considered that the degree of actual or perceived overlooking would not be detrimental to the privacy amenity of the neighbouring occupiers on Furness Road or 9 Welbeck Road or 11 Welbeck Road.

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/2041/05/DFU continued.....

Activity associated with the site- access/aggress at the front and use of the rear garden would intensify as a result of the formation of an additional dwelling of the size proposed. In view of the generous width and depth of the forecourt at the front and the acceptable size of the rear gardens, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by reason of noise/disturbance or general loss of privacy. Neither is it considered that the increased use intensity would be so significant as to be detrimental to the character of the locality.

**5) Parking Provision/Highway Safety**

This proposal will occupy a part of the site that is currently used for parking a vehicle in relation to number 9 Welbeck Road because the proposed development makes the provision for one off-street car parking space within the existing garage at the rear fronting Furness Road. The application details indicate that this space will be substituted by an off-street parking space directly in front of number 9 and is considered to be acceptable in terms of the safety and free flow of traffic using the highway. Therefore, the future occupiers of the proposed development will facilitate the existing vehicle crossover at the rear for the purpose of parking their domestic vehicle and the existing dwelling at number 9 will have their parking space substituted on the frontage which in itself is considered acceptable (see landscaping section above). There is not considered to be any shortage of on street parking within the vicinity of the site, and in accordance with policy T13 one off-street parking space for the development is considered acceptable. Therefore, it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal is justified in the above circumstances.

**6) Consultation Responses**

Removal of parking spaces to enable another garage at 9 Welbeck Road, how would garden cater for 3 families?, properties would have access onto Furness Road restricting pedestrian movement - these objections appear to relate to the previously refused scheme P/169/05/DFU

Plot being used purely for a commercial venture - not a material planning consideration

Other issues discussed in report.

**CONCLUSION**

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

CHANGE OF USE: CLASS A1 (RETAIL) TO CLASS A2 (FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

BELLGRANGE MORTGAGES for BELLGRANGE MORTGAGES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered floor plan (02.08.05) and OS 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 Shop Window Display

## **INFORMATIVES**

### **1 INFORMATIVE:**

#### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

EM20 Change of Use of Shops Outside Town Centres

T13 Parking Standards

C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

1. Retail Policy (EM20, C16)
  2. Parking/Highway Issues (T13)
  3. Residential Amenity
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- south side of London Road near roundabout with Stonegrove/Brockley Hill Road.
- within Canons Corner local shopping parade.
- comprises vacant shop unit, which was previously an off-license.
- upper 2 floors are residential.
- parking lay-by in front of shopping parade.
- parade comprises of the following (in order from no. 1-9): clothing store (A1), vacant (previous use was A1, has valid permission for A3), convenience store (A1), butcher (A1), delicatessen (A1), newsagent (A1), subject site (A1), dry cleaners (A1), chemist (A1).

**c) Proposal Details**

- it is proposed to change the use of the shop from A1 (retail) to A2 (real estate agent and mortgage broker)
- the application proposes no structural changes, only refurbishment.

**d) Relevant History**

**7 Canons Corner**

P/1879/04/DFU	Roller shutter curtain and box	GRANTED 26-AUG-2004
---------------	--------------------------------	------------------------

**2 Canons Corner**

P/1443/03/CFU	Change of use from Class A1 to A3 (food and drink)	REFUSED 15-SEP-2003
---------------	--	------------------------

Refused for the following reason:

“The proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties in the adjoining roads giving rise to the noise and disturbance with the resulting overspill parking and activity associated with A3 hours of use”.

Appeal Allowed: 02-JAN-2004.

**e) Consultations**

LBH Highways Engineer: No Objections

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	12	1	25-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** All the shops in the parade are retail orientated. The proposed industry would not attract customers to the parade, and would not be an asset to the parade.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

The subject site is within a small local parade of shops that does not have a local parade designation. In this instance, EM20 is the relevant policy of the 2004 adopted UDP. This policy states that the Council will normally permit changes of use from retail shops (A1) outside of town centers providing that the proposal would not result in the loss of a necessary local retail provision; parking is provided in accordance with Council's standards; and the premises can be adequately serviced without causing harm to highway safety and convenience.

### **1. Retail Policy**

The proposed change of use from A1 to A2 is considered acceptable with regard to the first criterion of Policy EM20. The small parade, comprising of 9 shops, currently has all 9 with A1 uses. No.2 Canon's Corner is currently vacant but has a valid unimplemented permission for an A3 use. Should this application be approved there would remain seven A1 uses, one A2 use, and a possible A3 use. It is not considered that the approval of this change of use would result in the loss of a necessary retail provision; especially considering the subject site is currently vacant, as is no.2. It is not considered that the proposed A2 use would prejudice the retail function of the parade, nor would it create a harmful concentration of non-A1 uses. An estate agent and mortgage broker would still attract visiting members of the public and is not considered to be detrimental to the viability of the shopping parade.

### **2. Parking/Highway Issues**

Policy T13 and the associated Schedule 5 of the adopted UDP require a maximum of 1 parking space for an A2 use with a floor area of 75 square metres. This is the same as the maximum parking required for an A1 use. The existing shop has no off-street parking provision. There is no off-street parking proposed in this application; however the standards in Schedule 5 are the maximum requirements, and the proposal is in accordance with PPG13. The Council's Highways Engineer has no objections on transportation grounds. Additionally, the shop can be serviced via the existing service road to the rear of the site. A change of use to financial and professional services is not considered to result in any adverse highway issues, any more than the existing retail use of the shop.

### **3. Residential Amenity**

Residential flats are located at the first and second floor level above the parade of shops. It is considered that the proposed A2 use would not give rise to any undue increase in noise and disturbance over and above a retail use.

Cont...

#### **4. Consultation Responses**

It is considered that the consultation responses have been addressed in the above 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.

---

**103 ELMSLEIGH AVE, KENTON**

**2/13**

**P/2091/05/DFU/SL2**

Ward: KENTON WEST

CONVERSION OF HOUSE INTO 2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; SINGLE STOREY SIDE TO REAR EXTENSION

MR R SODHA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 01 to 05 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), other than those shown on the approved plans 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 Disabled Access - Use
- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme of soft and hard landscaping of the forecourt has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and enhance the appearance of the development.

## **INFORMATIVES**

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

### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- EP25 Noise
- H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
- H18 Accessible Homes
- T13 Parking Standards

Cont...

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

1. Conversion Policy
  2. Amenity and character of proposed extension
  3. Residential amenity
  4. Consultation responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

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

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest:                      None

### **b) Site Description**

- Two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the south-west side of Elmsleigh Ave
- Has an attached garage at the side, with a small shed to the rear and a large dormer in the rear roof slope
- Forecourt is paved with a single crossover; parking not controlled in the street
- Attached dwelling has a small rear extension stepped away from the shared boundary
- Adjacent no.105 has an attached garage to the side, but is otherwise unextended
- Existing rear amenity space approx 220 square metres

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Single storey side extension, details comprise:
  - projecting 1.9 metres wide from the original flank wall
  - continuing rearwards and linking into single storey rear extension
  - high-level obscured window in proposed flank wall
  - set away from boundary with no.105 by 700mm
  - mono-pitched roof over with single velux roof light
- Single storey rear extension, details comprise:
  - project rearwards to a depth of 3 metres along the party boundary stepped away from the boundary by at least 3 metres before projecting out a further 1 metre
  - mono-pitched roof over to a mid-pitch height of 2.9 metres
- Conversion of extended dwelling into 2 self-contained flats:
  - Ground floor, flat A, to comprise 3 bedrooms over approx 78 square metres floorspace

Cont...



Item 2/13 - P/ 2091/05/DFU Cont...

- First floor and loft space, flat B, to comprise 2 bedrooms over approx 66 square metres floorspace
- Both flats to be accessed via internal shared lobby, with existing single entrance door retained
- Private rear amenity space to be shared between the flats
- Additional crossover proposed to access independent parking
- Space for refuse storage allocated to the front of the single storey side extension.

**d) Relevant History**

P/3234/04/DFU	Single storey front & rear, single & 2 storey side to rear extensions; rear dormer	GRANTED 25-APR-2005
P/2517/03/DFU	Two storey side to rear, single storey front and rear extension, and conversion to 3 self-contained flats, parking and widened access	REFUSED 19-JAN-2004

Refused for the following reasons:

1. The development would result in an over-intensive use and unacceptable level of activity within the property, to the detriment of the character of the area and the amenities of adjoining residents.
2. The development would fail to provide adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the first floor flat which would have no access to the rear garden.
3. The forecourt parking provision would result in an unsatisfactory visual appearance and loss of forecourt greenery, to the detriment of the streetscene.

APPEAL DISMISSED: 04-AUG-2004.

**e) Consultations**

LBH Highways Engineer: Originally stated preference that the parking spaces should be accessed via the existing crossover. However, due to a streetlamp being positioned directly adjacent, this existing crossover could not be widened without first moving the streetlamp. In light of this it is agreed that the additional crossover is acceptable due to site circumstances.

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	9	2	16-SEP-05

Cont...

**Summary of Responses:** Increased noise and disturbance from more residents and more vehicles, already disturbed by noisy music and parties from other properties; loss of light to lounge and overshadowing of garden; change of character of area from quiet residential suburb; there is already a block of four self-contained flats opposite; the proposal will make the already busy and dangerous junction even more hazardous with more cars parked on the street; current building work at 103 has caused a lot of noise.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Conversion Policy**

Policy H9 of the UDP undertakes to permit flat conversions subject to the following considerations:

#### *A The suitability of the new units created in terms of sizes, circulation and layout*

In terms of floor space, it is considered that the size of the proposed flats is satisfactory, given the size of household likely to occupy the units. The vertical stacking of the flats is appropriate in accordance with Policy H9, providing like room above like room help minimise noise transmission between the flats. A condition is recommended to ensure the ground floor flat is accessible to disabled persons in accordance with Policy H18.

The communal internal lobby is to be accessed via the existing single entrance door; this retains the character of a single dwelling house when viewed from the street. Both flats have access to the private amenity space at the rear.

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

As noted above the proposed internal layout will assist in minimising noise nuisance between the units. To supplement this it is recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a suitable sound insulation scheme.

#### *C The level of usable amenity space available*

The remaining area of rear amenity space, at approximately 180 square metres, is to be divided equally between the two flats. Flat A will access this rear garden space internally through the flat. Access from Flat B will be externally, via the remaining path between the proposed side extension and site boundary. The proposed level of private amenity space is suitable to meet the criteria of Policy D5 for new residential developments.

Cont...

*D Traffic and highway safety*

Policy T13 and the associated parking standards in Schedule 5 require a maximum of 3 spaces at the site given the size of the proposed flats. The proposed provision of two off-street spaces is considered adequate; this view is supported by the Council's Highways Engineer. An additional vehicle crossover is proposed in order for the parking spaces to be utilised independently. Although the Highways Engineer would prefer the spaces to be accessed by widening the existing crossover, he agreed that in this instance that it would unreasonable to insist on this due to the position of the existing streetlamp directly adjacent to the crossover. The proposed parking is not considered prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicle safety in the locality.

*E Landscape treatment and the impact of any front garden/forecourt car parking*

The existing forecourt has been recently hard paved, as permissible under permitted development. The submitted site plan details the provision of two parking spaces in the forecourt. In the previous appeal of planning permission P/2517/03/DFU at this site, the Inspector concluded that the hard landscaping of the forecourt was not considered to be detrimental to the established character of the immediate vicinity, given the presence of numerous similar forecourts along the avenue; I am of the same view. Notwithstanding this, a condition is recommended ensuring permission is subject to a scheme of soft and hard landscaping of the forecourt, which is to be agreed upon by this Authority.

The proposed site plan also details a satisfactory storage area for refuse/waste bins, at the side of the dwelling, in front of the proposed side extension. This is acceptable in terms of the visual amenity in the street scene.

**2. Amenity and character of proposed extension**

The single storey side and rear extensions are compliant with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for householders. The 4 metre depth of the single storey rear extension exceeds the SPG maximum by 1 metre, however is justified in this instance as it meets the 'two-for-one' rule with regard to both adjoining and adjacent dwellings. The main rear wall of no.105 is set away from the shared boundary by approximately 2 metres. No.105 Elmsleigh Ave also has an application for a residential extension currently under consideration. The window originally proposed in the flank wall of the proposed side extension has been reduced to a high-level obscured window. A velux roof light has also been added in the sloping roof face. It is not considered that these windows would result in any actual or perceived overlooking of the neighbouring property.

Cont...

**3. Residential amenity**

While it is acknowledged that some increase in activity may occur as a result of this permission, it is not considered that the proposal is an over-intensive use of the site. The site already has a valid unimplemented permission (ref P/3234/04/DFU) to extend the property, increasing it from a three, to a six-bedroom dwelling. The site is considered suitable for a conversion, and would contribute to additional small units and a variety of dwelling types within the borough in accordance with Housing policies.

**4. Consultation responses**

It is considered that the consultation responses have been addressed in the above 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.

---

**BRIDLE COTTAGES, BROOKSHILL DRIVE, HARROW**

**2/14**

**P/1322/05/CFU/SC2**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

DETACHED TIMBER GARAGE

MR FITZGERALD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 318E; O.S.

**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 Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building
- 3 Materials to Match
- 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) proposed doors
  - (b) proposed windows
  - (c) roof tiles

The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

### INFORMATIVES:

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

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SEP6 Areas of Special Characters, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
- EP33 Development in the Green Belt
- EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
- D14 Conservation Areas

---

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

- 1) Green belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, SD2, EP33, EP34)
- 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, SEP6, D14)
- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D14)
- 4) Consultation Responses

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character:

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: Brookshill

Green Belt

Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- site located on north side of Brookshill Drive, within Green Belt, Brookshill Drive Conservation Area and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character
- site originally occupied by 2 adjacent single-storey cottages, now joined together to form 1 L-shaped dwelling house
- cottage consists of multi-brick elevations, tiled roof of complex form and prominent high chimneys
- Dukes Cottage, a more modern house, bounds the applicant site to the east
- rear garden of 2 Brookshill Cottages bounds the site to the north while the side garden of 1 Brookshill Cottage bounds the site to the west
- a stable block within a disused Riding School and part of a side garden of a detached house are located directly opposite the applicant site on the southern side of Brookshill Drive
- existing gravel drive located beside the front of the dwelling

### c) Proposal Details

- construct a detached timber garage in the grounds of Bridle cottages
- the garage will include a 10 course brick plinth on the bottom, to match the existing cottages, with timber above
- a roof tiled roof is proposed with a 30° pitch
- the garage is proposed to be constructed at the north east corner of the site and would replace an existing water tank
- a gravel track will extend from the existing entrance to the proposed garage

### d) Relevant History

LBH/26949	Listed Building Consent: Alterations and replacement of internal doors	GRANTED 14-MAR-85
P/74/04/CFU	Single storey side to rear extension	WITHDRAWN 25-MAR-04
P/137/04/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Single storey rear and side extension; glazed screen and internal alterations	WITHDRAWN 16-APR-04

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/1322/05/CFU continued.....

P/1049/04/CFU	Single storey rear extension	REFUSED 30-MAR-05
P/1098/04/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Single storey rear extension and internal alterations	REFUSED 30-MAR-05

**e) Consultations**

**CAAC:** Concerns about hardsurfacing at front and the loss of rural character. Tiles pitch does not match existing house and would therefore not be capable of taking clay tiles to match the main house, which is important. Poor quality drawings do not provide enough information on what will be built. Feather-edged boarding and clay tiles are appropriate for the area. Needs to be a proper oak framed structure, (such as those made by Oakwrights, based in Herefordshire or Carpenter and Oak)

**Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Development affecting the Setting of a Listed Building Expiry 18-AUG-05

**Notifications** Sent 6 Replies 3 Expiry 23-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** 2 letters of support

Hatch End Association: concerns about loss of character to the area should the driveway be hardsurfaced; concerns regarding the appearance and quality of materials.

**APPRAISAL**

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

Plan policy requires that 'development will be strictly controlled within the green belt to ensure that such land remains primarily open and existing environmental character is maintained or enhanced'. The construction of a detached garage is not considered over bearing and the site is able to accommodate it. It is sited towards the back of the site in the north eastern corner and would replace an unsightly existing water storage tank.

	Original	Existing	% Over original	Proposed	% over original
Footprint (m2)	156	156	0%	16.8	10.78%
Floor Area (m2)	156	156	0%	16.8	10.78%
Volume (m3)	606	606	0%	40.32	6.65%

continued/

Previous applications have been made to extend the dwelling house but all have been refused and therefore the existing house retains its original footprint, floor area and volume. The current application would see the erection of a 16.8sq m detached garage and would represent a 10.78% increase on the existing dwelling. The Council feels that the site and location of the proposed garage would not detract from the listed building, conservation area or the green belt. Such buildings are common throughout the area and the design proposed is such that it will complement the existing cottages and not detract from the special character of the area.

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

The Conservation Area is relatively open and rural, but there are already a number of garages and storage units, especially stabling in the conservation area. Therefore it would seem unacceptable to resist a garage on this plot.

The location of the garage on the plot would have the least detrimental impact on the character of the listed building and the character of the conservation area. The garage could not be sited any further forward as this would close the gap between Bridle Cottages and the boundary, and therefore close off the openness that characterises the conservation area. The area from Brookshill Drive to the proposed site of the shed is going to be gravel surfaced as recommended by the Council. It would be limited to two wheel tracks, running towards the shed and not into the rest of the garden.

The proposed design of the garage is in keeping with the character of the listed building and the rural character of the conservation area. The timber boarding should be thick slightly overlapping weatherboarding (like Copse Farm Barn) as wavey-edge boarding is not really found in the conservation area and this often can appear 'fake'. The roof tiles should also match the existing house but the pitch of the roof is such that it may not be able to accommodate them.

After discussion with the agent, the introduction of a brick plinth to the garage structure was agreed. This 10 course brick plinth will use bricks matching those on Bridle Cottages and will result in the garage resembling a permanent structure. The original proposal for a timber shed with no brick plinth appeared more temporary in nature.

The proposed oak doors, preferably side hung are acceptable as are the window design, which appears to match the design of the cottage windows. The granting of permission however, shall be conditional to the submission and approval of details for the proposed doors and window by Harrow Council.

continued/



**3) Residential Amenity**

The construction of a single storey detached garage is not considered to result in a reduction of local residential amenity levels. An existing brick wall, with trees behind it, separates the applicant property from Dukes Cottages to the east. The proposed garage would be constructed close to this wall but the size of the garage coupled with the presence of this existing boundary should ensure that the residents of Duke Cottages would not experience any amenity loss.

**4) Consultation Responses**

Concerns about loss of character should be addressed - The amended application addresses these concerns.  
driveway be hardsurfaced, and the appearance and quality of materials

**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.

CONTINUED USE OF PROPERTY AS 2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

S S DESIGN LTD for MR K M KERAI

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: R/E650/418 and Location 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 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:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
EP25 Noise  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery  
H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats  
T13 Parking Standards

Cont...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
  2. Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
  3. Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
  4. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

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

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2.8 (max)
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	0
No. of Residential Units:	Existing:	2
	Proposed:	2
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- 2-Storey, terraced (14 dwelling row) property situated on the western side of Frogna Avenue, currently existing as two self-contained flats;
- Approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  of dwellings in Frogna Avenue have been converted to two self-contained units;
- Dwelling is setback approximately 3m from public highway with no off-street parking potential;
- Dwelling has a single storey rear extension;
- Existing rear garden depth is approximately 8m;
- The site is located in close proximity to a bus services along Station Road and Harrow & Wealdstone Station;

### c) Proposal Details

- Conversion of dwelling to two self-contained flats: 2 x 1 bedroom flats on the ground and first-floor;
- Access to the units is via the front entrance door, with the internal communal hallway split into two for the respective flats
- Sole access to rear garden for ground floor flat

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

None.

**e) Consultations**

Highways and Transportation: No Objection

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	8	0	28-SEP-2004

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Conversion Policy**

**Suitability of the new units created in terms of sizes, circulation and layout**

The circulation arrangements of each of the flats are considered to be satisfactory and the sizes of the rooms are considered to be appropriate to their proposed functions.

The existing stacking of units places the living area of the first floor flat above the front bedroom of the ground floor flat. The proposed scheme to be implemented on approval of the application, proposes a vertical arrangement of rooms that results in same room types being placed above one another, with living areas and kitchens being located at the rear of both units.

With permission being conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation between the flats as to negate any potential for adverse impact on the living amenity of the occupiers of each unit, the arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

**The level of useable amenity space available**

In relation to outdoor amenity space, the property has a rear garden length of approximately 8m. Due to the property being mid-terrace, the ground floor flat has sole access to the rear garden, with the first floor flat having no provision of amenity space. Paragraph 6.53 of policy H9 states, "The Council acknowledges that access to rear gardens in conversions involving terraced houses could be a problem especially for those flats above the ground floor level... it would be inappropriate to insist on all the units in a conversion to have their own private garden. In light of this guidance it is considered that the existing arrangement of amenity space is considered to be acceptable.

Cont...

**2. Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking**

The existing front garden, due to its nature cannot not provide off street parking. On street parking in Frognal Avenue is permit restricted. It is considered that the availability of shops/services in The centres of both Harrow and Wealdstone, bus routes and train travel from nearby Harrow and Wealdstone Station make the units ideal for non car owning occupiers.

Therefore it is considered that the parking standards comply with Government advice, which is seeking to discourage reliance on the private motor vehicle. It is not considered that the proposal could be reasonably refused permission on parking grounds.

Highways and Transportation raised no objection.

**3. Character of Area**

It is not considered that any detrimental change to the character of Frognal Avenue has occurred as a result of this conversion. The property retains the appearance of a single dwelling in the street scene, by the retention of a single door to the front elevation. It is recognised that activity associated with the property at the front is intensified with occupation by two households, it is not however considered that the effect of this is so significant as to harm the character of this part of Frognal Avenue.

**4. Residential Amenity**

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

**5. Consultation Responses**

Highways and Transportation: No objection

**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.

---

**139 STANMORE HILL, STANMORE**

**2/16**

P/1829/05/DFU/MRE

Ward: STANMORE PARK

TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION; DOUBLE GARAGE AT REAR; 1 VEHICLE CROSSOVER AT FRONT

KISHORE KARIA for DR HATIM KAPADIA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: DHK 01 A, 02 A, 03 B, 04 B, 05 A, 06 B, 07 B, 08 B, 09 A, 10 B & Location 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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 3 Parking for Occupants - Single Family Dwellinghouse
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) 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.
- 5 The double garage with integral room hereby approved shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such and for no other purposes without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure an appropriate form of development and to safeguard the character of the locality.

## **INFORMATIVES**

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

### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

Cont...

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

None

### **b) Site Description**

- Two storey, detached Edwardian dwelling, situated on western side of Stanmore Hill, at the junction with Old Forge Close;
- Very prominent site with Stanmore Hill rising up to the property;
- Adjacent dwelling at No.141overhangs applicants dwelling significantly to the rear at two stories;
- Existing rear garage with access to Old Forge Close;
- The property currently has a rear garden depth of approximately 25m;

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Two-storey rear extension with subordinate roof over to a maximum depth of 6.5m
- Double garage abutting rear boundary line
- Vehicle crossover at front

### **d) Relevant History**

P/368/05/DFU	Two storey side and rear, single storey rear extensions; double garage at rear; two vehicle crossovers at front, new boundary walls	REFUSED 05-MAY-2005
--------------	---	------------------------

Refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed side to rear extension, by reason of excessive size, bulk and prominent siting, would be unduly obtrusive in the streetscene, detrimental to the spatial setting around this junction and the visual amenities of the adjacent occupiers.
2. The proposed glazing in the northern flank of the single storey rear extension would give rise to actual and perceived overlooking of the adjacent property, resulting in loss of privacy to the detriment of the residential amenity of adjacent occupiers.

Cont...

3. The proposed garage, by reason of excessive size, bulk and prominent siting, would be unduly obtrusive and overbearing, result in loss of light and overshadowing to No. 2 Old Forge Close, and be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers thereof.

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
		8	3	25-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** Loss of light to kitchen of no. 2 Old Forge Close from proposed garage due to excessive size and prominent siting, unreasonably high level of provision for off-street parking, overall development constitutes over development causing harm to the character of the area, loss of light to ground and first floor flank windows and loss of outlook from flank windows of no. 141 Stanmore Hill.

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Visual and Residential Amenity

#### Two Storey Rear Extension

The existing dwelling is staggered to the rear. The proposed two-storey element would project 3.8m beyond the deepest point of the existing rear building line and 6.5m beyond its shallowest point, nearest to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling at No.141.

The new flank wall adjacent to Old Forge Close would be set in 0.5m from the existing flank wall. This factor together with the provision of an appropriately designed subordinate crowned roof over, to the same height as the ridge of the front gabled element are considered to sufficiently reduce bulk of this element as viewed from the street scene. The recessed flank would be spaced 3.4m from the flank boundary with Old Forge Close and hence it is considered that although this element would be visually prominent, it would not be unduly overbearing in the street scene.

While the building line to the front of No.139 and No.141 is approximately level, at the rear No.141 overhangs the applicants dwelling by approximately 4.5m at two stories and an additional 2m at single storey. The implementation of the proposed two-storey element would result in the applicants dwelling overhanging No.141 by approximately 1.7m at two stories but would not project beyond the single storey element at the rear of No.141. With a spacing of approximately 2.1m between the dwellings the proposed rearward projection would fall within a 45° line drawn from the nearest first floor rear corner of No.141 and, in so doing, would comply with the Council's guidelines for such developments. Accordingly it is not considered that there would be any unreasonable effect on light to, or outlook from, the rear habitable room windows of this property.

Cont...



Towards the rear of the flank wall of No.141 are two small windows at ground floor serving a living room and 2 small windows at first floor serving a bedroom. The proposed two-storey rear element would be at the depth of all these windows and would hence cause loss of light to the windows. Both the ground floor living room and the first floor bedroom have a primary window at the rear and hence the loss of light to the windows is not considered to impact the living amenity of the occupiers of this dwelling to a significant degree as to warrant the refusal of the application.

### **Vehicle Crossover**

Two vehicle crossovers onto Stanmore Hill were originally proposed. Highways and Transportation raised an objection to two access points on safety grounds. The proposal has been amended to provide just one access point at the northern flank of the site, away from Old Forge Close. This is considered to be acceptable.

### **Double Garage at Rear**

A garage in dilapidated condition currently exists at the rear of the site, abutting the boundary with No.2 Old Forge Close. The existing garage is set back 2.5m from Old Forge Close and is to a depth of 5m. The proposed garage would be set back 4.7m from the roadside and be to a width of 6m and a depth of 10m.

The new siting of the garage spaces it further from the public highway that the dwelling house and in doing so puts it within the remit of what would be considered to be acceptable under permitted development.

However, in applying for planning permission, potential impact on adjacent properties and on the street scene must be considered. Regarding the street scene, although the garage would be bulkier it is considered that by way of the increase in spacing from the public highway its impact would be reduced.

The rear of the garage would be spaced 0.6m from the flank boundary with No.141. Being at the rear of the garden and with a ridged roof not beyond 4m it is considered that no adverse impact would be imposed on this property.

The garage would impact most significantly on No.2 Old Forge Close. The flank of this dwelling is spaced 1m from the applicant's rear boundary and at the new depth of the garage, exists a section of glazing in No.2's flank wall, to which the existing garage is sited in front of and hence does not overshadow. Comprising a glazed door and large window, these openings serve a kitchen/diner. However, while it is acknowledged that this glazing would suffer a degree of overshadowing, the proposed roof would serve to reduce this impact to an acceptable level by rising from a sympathetic height of 2.5m on the boundary. It is however considered that this flank glazing is of a secondary nature with the kitchen/diner main primary window being to the front.

Cont...

The garage has been significantly reduced in bulk from that proposed in the previously refused application, which proposed a ridged roof to a height of nearly 6m.

## **2. Consultation Responses**

The Transportation Manager was consulted and raised objections to the provision of two access points onto Stanmore Hill due to safety issues. As a result the proposal was reduced to one access point and is considered to be acceptable.

- Loss of light to kitchen of No.2 Old Forge Close from proposed garage due to excessive size and prominent siting – Flank glazing of No.2 Old Forge Close is not considered to be protected for the purposes of SPG. See report.
- Unreasonably high level of provision for off-street parking – Not considered to be excessively high
- Overall development constitutes over development causing harm to the character of the area – Site is considered to be of sufficient area to accommodate proposed extensions and hence is not considered to be over development
- Loss of light to, and outlook from, ground and first floor flank windows of No.141 Stanmore Hill – The windows are not protected for the purposes of SPG and hence the impact was not considered to unreasonable.

## **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.

---

**83 DRURY ROAD, HARROW**

**2/17**

**P/1882/05/DFU/RM2**

Ward: WEST HARROW

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

MR K DESAI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: RD/1-3

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match

### **INFORMATIVES**

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

#### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- 

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as one petition objecting to the development has been received.

This application was deferred at the Development Control Committee meeting on 11th October to allow for a Members site visit. This took place on 29th October 2005.

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- mid-terrace dwelling located on east side of Drury Road
- dwelling features a rear dormer and large detached store at the bottom of the garden; this spans the width of the plot and is 4m deep and 2.5m high

continued/

Item 2/17 – P/1882/05/DFU continued.....

- rear garden of the house is small, 5.4m wide and 7m deep, enclosed by a 1.8m high brick wall on the south side and a 1.6m wooden fence on the north side
- the adjoining dwelling located to the south, No. 85, features a rear dormer, a 2.4m wide rear extension and detached store at the bottom of the garden of similar size to that described above and the rear extension also spans the full width of its plot with a mid-pitch height of 3m
- the adjoining dwelling to the north, No. 81, is not extended
- No. 85 is slightly higher in level than No. 83, by 0.1m, but No. 81 is at the same level as No. 83, otherwise the terrace is in a uniform line

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a single storey rear extension, 2.4m into the rear garden and spanning the width of the plot

**d) Relevant History**

ENF/580/02/WEST	Complaint of large building in rear garden under construction.	CASE CLOSED 05-NOV-02
-----------------	--	--------------------------

P/3025/04/DCP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: Loft conversion incorporating rear dormer roof extension and front roof lights	GRANTED 02-DEC-04
---------------	--	----------------------

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 2	Replies 2 + petition of 5 signatures	Expiry 22-AUG-05
-------------------------	-----------	--	---------------------

**Response:** Overdevelopment, insufficient size garden, height is too great, extension will unduly enclose rear of No.81, loss of light, loss of outlook

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

The application site is within a row of terraced houses. There is a similar situation on the neighbouring property at No. 25. This property has a single storey rear extension and a garage to the rear, near mirroring what is proposed at No. 83.

Due to site circumstances it is not considered that the proposed extension will have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

**2) Residential Amenity**

It is sought to construct a single storey rear extension, 2.4m deep, which spans the width of the plot. The extension will have a pitched roof with a mid-pitch height of 3m. One rear window and a pair of patio doors are present in the rear elevation.

continued/

Item 2/17 – P/1882/05/DFU continued.....

The extension complies with the Council's guidelines for single storey extensions on terraced houses as set out in the SPG. The depth is the recommended maximum depth, 2.4m, and the height is the recommended maximum height, 3m. The extension will match and will abut into the existing rear extension to the south at No. 85 Drury Road. The proposal will not project further forward than the rear elevation of the adjoining extension and therefore it is considered it will have no impact upon levels of light or detriment to the outlook from the rear of this dwelling.

The extension will impact the light levels and outlook from the adjoining dwelling to the north, No. 81 but it is not considered the effects will be unreasonable or unduly detriment the amenity of neighbouring residents.

**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 grant.

---

**141-143 HEADSTONE LANE, HARROW WEALD**

**2/18**

**P/1928/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: HEADSTONE NORTH

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE DETACHED  
BLOCK OF 7 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING

ANTHONY KEATING

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 05101/101 Rev.B; /102 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)
  - (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 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 6 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.
- 7 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.

continued/

Item 2/18 – P/1928/05/CFU continued.....

- 8 Water Storage Works
- 9 Landscaping to be Approved
- 10 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
- 11 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 12 Highway - Closing of Access(es)

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

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

SH2 Housing Types and Mix

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

D10 Trees and New Development

T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D8, D10)
  - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Housing Provision (SH1)
  - 4) Access and Parking (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	10
	Justified:	8
	Provided:	8
Site Area:	988m <sup>2</sup>	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- the site comprises of two attached bungalows located on the corner of Headstone Lane and Almond Way
- the opposite corner is occupied by a detached two storey house
- to the rear is a row of garages for the terrace of houses on Almond Way

continued/

- the majority of properties on Headstone Lane are semi-detached properties, with some detached dwellings to the north
- the properties on this side of Headstone Lane have significant tree cover to the front

**c) Proposal Details**

- erection of a block of 7 flats to replace the pair of bungalows
- provision of 8 parking spaces to the rear with access from Almond Way, shared with the garages for the properties on Almond Way
- bin storage and bike facilities would be provided adjacent to the parking area
- the remaining space would be occupied by communal garden area

**d) Relevant History**

P/552/05/COU	Outline: Redevelopment to provide a detached block of 10 flats, access and parking	WITHDRAWN 15-APR-05
P/1045/05/COU	Outline: Redevelopment to provide a detached block of 7 flats, access and parking	GRANTED 07-JUL-05

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 49	Replies 26 + petition of 73 signatures	Expiry 22-SEP-05
-------------------------	------------	--	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Shadowing, eyesore, family area, overspill parking, road is congested, overlooking, out of character, access to emergency vehicles on Almond Way restricted, traffic noise, this corner is used for turning lorries due to width restriction, unsightly, road accidents, inferior quality of new homes, will set precedent, traffic hazard with school nearby, bins will be left on Almond Way, impact on electricity sub-station, pollution, over-population, water pressure, fire escape, access to parking shared with Almond Way garages, no other flats in the area, devaluation of properties, safety fears, size of building, community feel, use of driveway as a throughway

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of the Area**

The surrounding area is characterised by a variety of residential properties, with mainly semi-detached and detached houses on Headstone Lane and smaller terraced properties in the more recent Almond Way development to the west. While the site in question is currently occupied by a pair of small bungalows, the site is a relatively large plot and benefits from the additional strip of land to the north for setting space.

continued/



The previous outline permission involved the siting and means of access for a block to accommodate 7 flats on the site, which was considered to be acceptable given the large size of the plot and the general accordance with the pattern of development along Headstone Lane. The current application involves a building with additional depth to the rear where the building abuts Almond Way, and the forward siting of the entire block marginally. The block has also been stepped to reflect the change in the building line to either side, and the depth to the rear on the boundary with the neighbouring property No.139 has been reduced in order to safeguard amenity. As this is a full application, the design of the block must also be accounted for. The visual bulk of the block has been reduced by setting back at first floor level at both sides on the front elevation, and by setting in towards the rear where the depth goes beyond that of the main block and the roof set down at the rear with a smaller crown roof. Although the shape of the block has been altered since the outline scheme, the impact on the character of the area is considered to be acceptable as it would generally reflect the scale of the semi-detached pairs along Headstone Lane. Further details of bin storage have been required by condition.

**2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The general siting of the block was accepted in principle in the outline permission, and the current scheme improves the relationship with the only immediate neighbour (No.139). The proposal would comply with the 45° code in respect of this property. No flank windows would face this property, thus no overlooking would occur.

The communal garden area is considered to be acceptable in respect of providing adequate amenity space for the future residents.

**3) Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the HUDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. The proposal would make good use of a previously developed residential site

**4) Access and Parking**

The parking requirement would equate to 10 spaces, with 8 to be provided to the rear of the site. Given the availability of on street parking and the reasonable access to public transport on Headstone Lane and Harrow View, this provision is considered to be acceptable. The proposed access off Almond Way was accepted at outline stage and is considered to be acceptable.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Devaluation of properties, water pressure, safety - not planning issues  
fears, fire escape  
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.

DETACHED HOUSE AND GARAGE, PARKING AND ACCESS

DUSEK DESIGN ASSOCIATES LTD for LANDKEY DEVELOPMENTS LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 981/P/1B; 2B; 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)
    - (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 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
  - 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. 981/P/2B 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.
  - 5 Parking for Occupants - Garages
- INFORMATIVES:
- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
  - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
  - 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
  - 4 Applicant is reminded that all parts of the building, including the foundations, roof and guttering, must be contained within the curtilage of the property, in order to comply with the terms of the planning permission hereby granted.
  - 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

continued/

Item 2/19 - P/1977/05/DFU continued.....

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

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

- 1) Principle of Development (SD1)
  - 2) Changes from previously approved scheme
  - 3) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers (D4, D5)
  - 4) Amenity Space (D4)
  - 5) Appearance in Streetscene (D4, D5)
  - 6) Protected Trees
  - 7) Impact on Watercourse
  - 8) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

TPO

Site Area:	539m <sup>2</sup>
Floorspace:	275.3m <sup>2</sup>
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- side and rear amenity space attached to no. 3 Royston Park Road
- adjacent site to west (1 Royston Park Road) contains 2-storey detached dwelling orientated to face The Avenue
- area characterized by detached dwellings in substantial plots. Infilling has occurred at nos. 7a, 8a and 11a Royston Park Road, and 43a, 49a, 52a and 54a The Avenue

**c) Proposal Details**

- detached 2-storey dwelling, sited minimum 8m from 1 Royston Park Road and 3m from 3 Royston Park Road
- rear garden 17m deep by 13 m wide
- single storey attached garage to front, 5.7m deep by 5m wide
- proposed eaves height of 5.2m rising to main ridge 8.8m high

**d) Relevant History**

P/1801/03/DFU Detached house with garage

GRANTED  
06-NOV-03

continued/

Item 2/19 - P/1977/05/DFU continued.....

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Proposal follows approval of similar scheme (P/1801/03/DFU) in November 2003
- Objections relate to previous scheme
- Petition is a copy of that submitted against previous scheme - should not be taken into account
- style of new dwelling in keeping with existing developments in locality
- siting of building meets UDP requirements
- house will enhance character of area

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
4

Replies  
1 + petition of  
17 signatures

Expiry  
31-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Carries forward previous objections, site area and floorspace increased from previous scheme, overcrowding, felling of trees, windows and doors in flank elevation; includes copies of previous representations and petition.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Principle of Development**

This application follows the approval of P/1801/03/DFU in November 2003, which also sought planning permission for a 2-storey detached on this site. Given that this Planning Permission remains valid, the principal of residential development on this site cannot therefore be challenged.

**2) Changes from previously approved scheme**

The present proposal differs from the previous scheme in the following respects:

- mock tudor detailing deleted from front elevation
- gabled roofs to garage and front bay replaced with hipped roofs.
- high level ground floor windows proposed in west elevation
- floorspace increased to 275.3m<sup>2</sup>

**3) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers**

The neighbouring dwelling at no. 1 Royston Park Road is orientated such that its front elevation faces west towards The Avenue, and its rear elevation faces east towards the boundary with no. 3. Although no. 1 has several protected windows in its rear (east) elevation, the proposed dwelling would comply with the 45-degree code in relation to all of them, and given the orientation of the properties, would be unlikely to give rise to unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing.

continued/

At its closest point, the proposed dwelling would be sited c.7m from the rear elevation of no. 1. Like the existing dwelling at no. 3, the proposed dwelling would be orientated to front Royston Park Road. As a result of the different orientations, the outlook from the main part of no. 1 would be over the rear garden of the proposed dwelling. The main area of usable amenity space associated with no. 1 is to the south of that dwelling, and would be largely unaffected by the proposed dwelling. Although the flank elevation facing no. 1 would include two doors, these would service the proposed garage and utility room and were previously considered to be acceptable. The addition of high level windows in this elevation, serving the proposed study, is considered acceptable as these windows would be sited 1.8m above finished floor level, and would therefore not enable overlooking. It is therefore considered that the revised proposal would have no unreasonable impact on the amenity to the occupiers of no. 1.

The existing dwelling at no. 3 has a protected window facing the flank elevation of the proposed dwelling. However, the proposed dwelling would comply with the 45-degree code in relation to that window. It is therefore considered that there would be no unreasonable loss of residential amenity to the occupiers of the existing dwelling at no. 3 by reason of loss of light or overshadowing. Further, as the proposed dwelling would be set away from the existing dwelling by c.3m it is also considered that an overbearing impact would not arise.

#### **4) Amenity Space**

As with the previously approved scheme, the existing dwelling would retain an area of private amenity space in excess of 400 sq. m. It is therefore considered that the application site is considered to be large enough to accommodate the proposed development without any adverse impact on the availability of amenity space for the existing dwelling.

The proposed dwelling would have private amenity space to its rear measuring 17-19m long by 13m wide (c.221 sq. m area). It is considered that this level of provision would be sufficient to meet the reasonable requirements of future occupiers. Whilst it is acknowledged that this area would be overlooked by no. 1 Royston Park Road, this relationship was previously considered to be acceptable on grounds that it would not be significantly worse than the existing relationship between nos. 1 and 3.

#### **5) Appearance in Streetscene**

Development in the vicinity of the application site is characterized mainly by detached dwellings set in substantial plots of land. However, several of the plots have been sub-divided to enable the construction of infill dwellings, for example nos. 7a, 8a and 11a Royston Park Road, and 43a, 49a, 52a and 54a The Avenue. It is therefore considered that the construction of a dwelling of the size proposed between nos. 1 and 3 Royston Park Road would not be out of character with the established pattern of development in the locality.

continued/

As with the previously approved scheme, the main part of the proposed dwelling would respect the existing front and rear building lines along the north side of Royston Park Road. As a result, proposed dwelling itself would be sited c.11m from the back of the footway, although the single storey garage would project further forward to within c.6m of the front boundary. However, this layout was previously considered acceptable and the change in the garage roof design from gabled to hipped would significantly reduce its overall bulk..

Given the above, it is not considered that the proposed 2-storey detached dwelling would be unduly obtrusive in the streetscene, or have an unreasonable on the character of the existing dwelling at no. 3 or the surrounding area.

**6) Protected Trees**

The application site is subject to TPO no. 61. However, the protected trees are mainly located away from the proposed dwelling. Given this, and in the light of the outstanding approval for a 2-storey detached dwelling on the application site, it is considered that a refusal on grounds of the impact of the current proposals on the protected trees would be unreasonable.

**7) Impact on Watercourse**

The comments of the Council's Drainage Services Manager regarding the proximity of the proposed development to a tributary of the Woodridings Brook are noted. However, given the outstanding approval for a dwelling of almost identical size and footprint on this site, it is considered that a refusal on grounds of the current proposals impact on the watercourse would not be justified.

**8) 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.

ALTERATIONS TO PORCH AND CHANGE OF USE FROM  
DWELLING HOUSE TO 4 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS  
WITH PARKING ACCESS FROM VILLAGE WAY

ALAN TRUEMAN for ALBION HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 05/056/Planning/001 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 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing the boundary treatment, to include acoustic fencing adjacent to the boundaries with neighbouring property, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the boundary treatment and acoustic fencing has been erected in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.
- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing the appearance, height and materials of the rear pergola structure, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the pergola has been erected in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.

continued/

Item 2/20 – P/2027/05/DFU continued.....

- 6 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing delineating the size/positions of the planting beds at the rear, and indicating details of plant species, numbers and/or planting densities, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the landscaping has been provided in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.
- 7 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing the appearance, height and materials of the bin store and making provision for the storage of recycling boxes, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the bin store and recycling area have been erected in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until surface water attenuation/storage works have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

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

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

SH2 Housing Types and Mix

EP25 Noise

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

H9 Conversions of Houses and other Buildings to Flats

H18 Accessible Homes

T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Amenity and Character of Alterations and Parking Area (SD1, D4, D5)
- 2) Conversion Policy (H9) including Parking and Access (T13)
- 3) Consultation Responses

---

continued/



## **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 semi-detached dwelling at junction of Village Way and Cannon Lane, Rayners Lane
- house has existing two storey side extension and front porch; shared crossover with no. 140 Village Way provides access to part hardsurfaced area at rear
- attached semi to north, no. 252 Cannon Lane, has side/rear dormers and single storey side extension
- adjacent semi to rear, no. 140 Village Way, has hardsurfaced forecourt and attached garage at side
- Village Way forms part of designated Borough Distributor Road; crossover approximately 20-25m east of junction with Cannon Lane
- new residential development adjacent to no. 155 Village Way recently completed (three terraced houses) with access for one house onto Village Way and further access/parking at rear from Cannon Lane (P/256/03/CFU)

### **c) Proposal Details**

- conversion to four self-contained flats; accommodation as follows:
  - ground floor: 1 x one-bed (three habitable room) flat and 1 x studio (one habitable room) flat
  - first floor: 1 x one-bed (three habitable room) flat and 1 x studio (one habitable room) flat
  - access from front
  - communal rear garden area of 86m<sup>2</sup> retained
- front porch 0.945m deep and 2.065m wide; gable roof over 3.3m to ridge falling to 2.4m at eaves
- rear parking area utilising existing crossover from Village Way adjacent to no. 140 comprising four spaces within pergola structures, bin enclosure, turning space, landscaping and acoustic fencing at the boundary
- drawings also show boundary wall fronting Village Way boundary

### **d) Relevant History**

WEST/195/94/FUL	Part single/part two storey side extension	GRANTED 15-AUG-94
P/938/05/DFU	Alterations to porch and change of use from dwelling house to four self-contained flats with parking access from Village Way	REFUSED 28-JUN-05

continued/

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed conversion, by reason of the likely increased use of the rear garden for parking and refuse storage, would give rise to excessive general activity and disturbance that would be harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers, and would further detract from the appearance of the property in the streetscene of Village Way, to the detriment of the amenity and character of the locality.”

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

The revised garden layout and car parking scheme reflects the Council’s requirements. There is a very regular bus service that is virtually on the doorstep and there are tube stations at Rayners Lane and Eastcote. To keep noise and visual nuisance to a minimum it is proposed that the parking spaces be shielded by a pergola structure with planting and close-boarded fencing at the boundaries. A reversing bay will be provided to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The parking area will be blocked paved with a feature entrance. Together with the planting it is considered that there would be an improved and more pleasing outlook for neighbouring property.

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
8

Replies  
3

Expiry  
13-SEP-05

**Summary of Responses:** Parking area will increase noise and pollution to garden, loss of security to garden, already high noise and pollution due to traffic lights, three parking spaces inadequate, rest of garden could be converted to parking, loss of family homes character on prominent site, front porch disproportionate, overdevelopment, danger to pedestrians, additional accident risk, new block of flats will add to cars exiting onto Village Way, bins on frontage an eyesore and will be difficult to collect, precedent, people will not use amenity area bordered by pavement, loss of light from pergola, seeking legal advice as to responsibility for boundary fence.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Amenity and Character of Alterations and Parking Area (SD1, D4 & D5)**

The proposed front porch would replace an existing canopy, retaining a single door to the front elevation. As with the existing it would be no deeper than the dwelling’s original front bay and would remain detached from it. In these circumstances and taking into account the Council’s supplementary planning guidelines for such developments, it is not considered that there would be any obtrusive or unsightly appearance in the streetscene. This element of the proposal would preserve the visual amenity and character of the locality.

continued/

The previously refused scheme had proposed four parking spaces with manoeuvring space and utilising the existing vehicle crossover onto Village Way; there was also a space for bin storage at the rear though this was considered to be of inadequate size. The vehicle access opens this part of the site to view in the streetscene of Village Way and, whilst its existing poor appearance and the presence of forecourt parking to adjacent Village Way properties was acknowledged, it was considered that the increased use of the rear garden for parking/refuse storage would exacerbate the harmful visual impact to the detriment of the amenity and character of the locality.

The subject proposal, as amended, continues to provide four parking spaces with manoeuvring space and utilising the existing vehicle crossover. However, the scheme now also proposes to enclose the parking spaces with pergola structures, an enclosure for 8 bins behind the boundary wall to Village Way, the use of block paving as the surfacing material and remedial landscaping. Subject to the use of timber as the structure material for the pergola, an appropriately detailed scheme of landscaping and agreement of the paving material to be used – all matters that can be controlled by condition – it is now considered that proposal would enhance the appearance of the property in the streetscene of Village Way. Details of the bin enclosure and new boundary wall to Village Way should also be controlled, in the interests of visual amenity and character.

It is also considered that the proposal would enhance the appearance and condition of the property when viewed from neighbouring houses and gardens. The height of the pergola has not been specified – again it is recommended that details be reserved by condition – but it is unlikely to exceed 3m. Whilst this would be visible above fence height from the neighbouring gardens and would increase in ‘solidity’ when planting matures, it is not considered that the resulting impact would be so significant as to cause undue loss of light/overshadowing or an overbearing visual impact. The bin store would be kept away from the common boundaries with neighbouring property and would minimise nuisance to an acceptable degree.

Whilst recognising that the rear part of the garden is already partially hardsurfaced and available for parking it is considered that the actual use of this area for parking, associated with the use of the property as a single house, is commensurately modest. As with the previously refused scheme, it is considered that the proposal would be likely to increase actual levels of use for parking and associated activity by reason vehicle movements etc. In response to this, the applicant now seeks to ameliorate the impact upon the amenities of adjoining occupiers by offering to erect acoustic fencing to the common boundaries with no. 252 Cannon Lane and no. 140 Village Way. Manufacturer’s data supplied by the applicant states that with a 2m high acoustic fence sound reduction of 13.6dB is achieved at a distance of 5m from the noise generator (though it should be noted that reductions fall with distance).

continued/

Subject to the provision of an acoustic fence along the full length of the boundaries, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, it is considered that the general activity and disturbance from increased use of the rear garden for parking/refuse storage would be mitigated to a degree that there would be no unacceptable detriment to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The fence may also help to reduce noise pollution already suffered by neighbouring occupiers from traffic using Village Way.

In terms of visual impact/lost light, the acoustic fence at 2m height need have no greater impact than a standard wall/fence that could be erected as permitted development.

In all of these circumstances and subject to the conditions suggested, it is considered that this revised application would overcome all aspects of the previous reason for refusal.

## **2) Conversion Policy**

Policy H9 undertakes to permit conversions of dwellinghouses and other buildings to flats, recognising their contribution to housing supply. However individual proposals are to be assessed against specific criteria pursuant to the protection of amenity, character and highway safety. In relation to these criteria proposal is assessed as follows:

- The units, particularly the studios, would comprise compact living areas. However it is not considered that they are so small, having regard to the needs of the likely occupiers (single persons or couples) as to lead to substandard living conditions. Communal circulation arrangements within the building are also considered to be reasonable to meet the needs of future occupiers.
- The layout of the flats within the building secures satisfactory vertical alignment of room uses. In conjunction with a scheme of sound insulation, that could be controlled by condition, it is considered that this would provide adequate safeguard for future occupiers from noise and disturbance within the building. The scheme could also control works to the party wall, in the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property.
- After the rear parking/bin storage areas an area of 86m<sup>2</sup> would be retained. It would be made communally available with direct access from the ground floor units and via the side from first floor units. Although small in area it is considered to be sufficient in quality and quantity, having regard to the likely size/type of households that would occupy the units proposed. This aspect of the conversion is therefore also considered to be acceptable.

continued/

!

- The provision of four parking spaces – equating to one space per flat – sits comfortably within the maximum requirement of five spaces applicable to this development. These would make use of the existing crossover and although it is likely that there would be increased vehicle movements using the crossover than would be generated by the use of this property as a single dwelling, given distance from the junction and sight lines it is not considered that there would be any significant detriment to the safety or free flow of pedestrians and traffic using the adjoining highway.
- The forecourt of the property, which occupies a prominent location at the junction of Village Way, Cannon Lane and Eastern Avenue, would remain soft-landscaped and would therefore have an acceptable appearance in the streetscene. The position of the proposed bin store has been re-sited from the front to the rear during the course of this application and is considered to be sufficient, in size, for the four waste bins and four 'brown' recycling bins that would be generated by the development. Space has not been provided for recycling boxes but it is considered that this can be easily rectified through the landscaping condition suggested.

The proposal – by reason of the number of independent households involved - would increase activity in terms of comings and goings associated with the property at the front, and would increase the intensity of residential activity associated with the rear garden. However as a corner site and with the acoustic fencing suggested it is not considered that the resultant increase in noise and disturbance would be detrimental to the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

Taking all of these matters into account and subject to the conditions suggested neither is it considered that the proposal would lead to an overdevelopment of the property or be detrimental to the character of this established residential locality.

Details of disabled access to, and egress from, the building have not been demonstrated. However it is considered, on balance, that this could be satisfactorily addressed by the imposition of an appropriate condition.

### **3) Consultation Responses**

Loss of Security: no material change from existing situation

3 spaces inadequate: increased to 4

rest of garden could be converted: would need planning permission

loss of family home character: not considered to be unacceptable

Overdevelopment: not considered to be an overdevelopment

bins on frontage: relocated to rear

precedent: each application considered on its own merits

amenity area wont be used: no different to current arrangement

seeking legal advice about fence: noted but immaterial to planning decision

All other matters address 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.

---

**19/21 ROXBOROUGH ROAD, HARROW**

**2/21**

**P/1479/05/CFU/DT2**

Ward: GREENHILL

DETACHED THREE STOREY  
BUILDING TO PROVIDE 9 FLATS

WILLIAMS LESTER for FOR SHINGLEBANK LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2487/PL01 Rev 2, 2487/PL02 Rev 2, 2487/PL04 Rev 4, 2487/PL05, Rev 3,  
2487/PL06

**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 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 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 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.
- 6 Water Storage Works
- 7 Disabled Access - Buildings

continued/

Item 2/21 – P/1479/05/CFU continued.....

8 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.

9 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.

10 The development hereby approved shall not commence until details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing 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.

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 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994

5 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

D10 Trees and New Development

H4 Residential Density

T13 Parking Standards

---

continued/

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

- 1) Residential Character (SD1, D4, D9, D10)
- 2) Neighbouring Amenity (D5)
- 3) Parking and Highway Considerations (T13)
- 4) Consultation Responses

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	)
	Justified:	) See report
	Provided:	)
Site Area:	0.74ha.	
No. of Residential Units:	9	
Habitable Rooms:	27	
Density:	121 dph 364 hrh	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- site is on east side of Roxborough Road near the A404 Pinner Road/Greenhill Road traffic roundabout
- comprises a detached gable house that has two flat roofed single storey wings, one of which extends to the rear of the site and a single storey extension to the kitchen. Both wings have a recessed entrance to the property. The exterior walls are finished in smooth faced render and the house has an artificial slate roof. The property has a long rear garden and two off-street parking spaces on the frontage. There is a detached garage and several outbuildings in the garden towards the eastern boundary of the site
- site is bounded to the rear by a triangular wedge of green open space that lies adjacent to the footpath and the dual carriageway along Greenhill Way
- Roxborough Road is characterised by a mix of semi-detached houses and short terraces of house and several detached buildings at the northern and southern ends of the road, of which the application site is an example

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on the site
- development of a detached three storey block to provide 9 x 2 bedroom flats
- proposed building would have a maximum height to the roof ridge of 10.1m (6.8m to eaves line on road frontage) a depth of 20.7m and a width of 13.7m on a plot width of 18m
- spacious communal garden area

**d) Relevant History**

None

continued/



**e) Consultations**

Highways Engineer: No Objections

Drainage Engineers: The Development must not commence until surface water attenuation/storage work details have been approved in writing by the LPA.

**f) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
33	22 (inc 1 petition with 21 signatures)	13-JULY-05

**Summary of Responses:** Proposed building is out of keeping with scale and architectural style of the locality, a traditional landmark building is being replaced by yet another block of flats, intrusive, intensify feeling of enclosure, increase in on-street parking, congestion, encourage use of front gardens as hardsurfaced parking area increasing risk of flooding, question Council's motives in that it stands to gain extra revenue from parking permits, overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of daylight, noise and disturbance due to increase in number of residential units, increase in visual clutter, quality of local environment being eroded, Bradstowe House site would be a better site for more affordable housing, no more building should occur in Roxborough Road until low water/flash flooding has been alleviated; sewage/manholes overflow causing harm to health

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Character**

**Siting and Setting**

The proposed development would occupy a larger footprint than the existing building, although it is set in further on the southern boundary with the adjoining terrace No's 17 – 13 Roxborough Road (a registered community mental health care home). The proposed development would extend more deeply into the rear garden than the existing building. The rear building would be 4m deeper than the rearmost part of the existing property. The proposed rear building line would be 1.5m deeper than that of No 17- 13 Roxborough Road and 4.5m deeper than the rear building line of No 23 Roxborough Road, the semi detached house on the northern boundary of the site. The proposal also respects the existing front building line of the property.

Notwithstanding the demolition of the garage and the outbuildings in the garden, the proposal still achieves a satisfactory, proportionate relationship between buildings and spaces and retains existing trees. It is concluded therefore that the siting and setting of the proposed development broadly respects the townscape of the locality and complies with the advice in Policy D4 by taking account of the features that characterise it and 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 quite generous and in keeping with the layout of surrounding development.

continued/

## **Design and External Appearance**

In the original plans that were submitted the height, scale and bulk and massing of the proposed building was considered to be too great and disproportionate in scale to other residential properties in the road. The proposal would have had an overbearing and obtrusive effect on the character of the streetscene.

Revised plans were submitted in which the height of the roof to the ridge line was lowered. The eaves line of the proposed development now aligns more closely with the pair of semi detached houses to the north of the site, 23 and 25 Roxborough Road, the proposed development has better articulation than before and it is more in keeping with the scale and form of buildings in the streetscene generally.

The design and appearance of the proposed development is in keeping with the late Victorian/Edwardian building style of the locality. The projecting gables, hipped roof lines, brick soldier courses over the sash windows and tile hung bays reflect the architectural vernacular of the area. The treatment of the fenestration is acceptable. Windows are aligned symmetrically and the glazing to solid ratio is proportionate. It is concluded therefore that this element of the proposal is consonant with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for development to take account of the 'urban grain' of the area in terms of building form.

## **2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

Of most concern is the effect that the proposal would have on the neighbouring houses on each of the common boundaries of the application site. On the southern boundary of the site is 17 Roxborough Road, a two-storey detached property. The separation on the boundary with that property would be a distance of 3.6m. Windows are proposed in the south facing flank wall of the proposed building to a bedroom and kitchen of flats at each floor. However no overlooking and loss of privacy would occur for the neighbouring property, because there are no corresponding windows in its flank wall.

This also true in terms of the relationship that the proposed development would have with the neighbouring property on the northern boundary, 23 Roxborough Road, a semi detached building. This property does not have any windows in its south facing gable end flank wall, but it also has a two storey rear wing and there are window's at ground and first floor level in that southern flank wall, that serve a sitting room and a bedroom. However, The only windows that are proposed in this elevation are three stairwell windows at ground, first and at second floor levels in the flank wall of the rear wing of the building. As these windows would not be serving habitable rooms in the proposed flats, it is concluded that they would not be a source of overlooking and would not cause loss of privacy for the occupiers of 23 Roxborough Road.

The applicants have also set the rear building line further forward than was originally proposed, to avoid infringing a line drawn at an angle of 45° from windows in the rear walls of habitable rooms to the respective neighbouring houses. It is concluded that both neighbours would not now experience deterioration in their sunlight and daylight conditions as a result of the proposed development.

continued/

Item 2/21 – P/1479/05/CFU continued.....

The A404 and a wedge of green space alongside it bound the rear of the site. Therefore there are no residential amenity considerations for this aspect of the proposal.

The proposal has an east-west orientation and the principal windows in the development are on the Roxborough Road frontage. There are houses directly opposite to the site on the west side of the road. However, they would be a distance of roughly 22m from windows to habitable rooms in the front façade of the proposed development. In such circumstances it is concluded that no loss of outlook would result for neighbours on the west side of Roxborough Road. Indeed, the extent of the front building line in the proposed development would be the same as that of the existing building.

No material change would therefore take place in terms of the relationship between the application site and the buildings opposite to it on the western side of Roxborough Road. As such it is concluded that the proposal complies with the advice in Policy D5; it advises that development should ensure that adequate separation is maintained between buildings and site boundaries so that the residential amenity and privacy of existing and new properties is protected. The proposal also accords with Policy D5 in that it is providing a reasonable amount of usable garden space in the development.

**3) Parking and Highway Considerations**

The Highways Engineer has advised that the proposal is acceptable provided that Resident Permit Restrictions are included in the planning permission. The site is close to Harrow Town Centre and is in an area that has good access to public transport. No conflict with Policy T13 would therefore arise.

**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.

CONSTRUCTION OF A 2 STOREY BLOCK OF 4 FLATS WITH PARKING

W J MACLEOD ARCHITECT for CLEARVIEW HOMES LTD

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 05/300U/1A, 2A, 3A 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 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 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 Levels to be Approved
- 5 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 6 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.
- 7 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.
- 8 Highway - Approval of Access(es)

Cont...

Item 2/22 - P/2084/05/CFU Cont...

- 9 Landscaping to be Approved  
10 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling  
11 Landscaping to be Implemented  
12 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.

**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 Standard Informative 27 - Access for All  
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:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D8)  
2. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)  
3. Housing Provision (SH1)  
4. Access and Parking (T13)  
5. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	6.4
	Justified:	6.4
	Provided:	6
Site Area:	1800 sqm	
Density - hrph:	22dph	67hrph
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- West side of St Brides Avenue at junction with Camrose Avenue
- Site has been cleared of buildings and was formerly occupied by a house for the groundsman at Prince Edward Playing Fields
- Playing fields to the rear of the site
- Detached house at 52 St Brides Avenue to the north-east with single storey garage on the boundary and single storey rear extension; bedroom window in upper flank wall but not protected as main window in front elevation
- Semi-detached property at 212 Camrose Avenue to the west, with entrance at the side
- Grass verge on highway, tall poplar in front corner adjacent to slip road to front of Camrose Avenue dwellings

### c) Proposal Details

- Provision of 2-storey block of 4 flats
- Each unit would have kitchen/lounge and 2 bedrooms
- 6 parking spaces to be provided to the front with access from Camrose Avenue service road

### d) Relevant History

P/1262/04/CFU	Pair of two storey semi detached houses with access and attached garages	GRANTED 08-JUL-04
---------------	--	----------------------

### e) Consultations

Thames Water:	No Objections
Environment Agency:	Unable to Respond

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	9	0	22-SEP-2005

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Character of the Area**

The surrounding area is characterised by a mixture of semi-detached and detached houses and maisonettes, and a bungalow sited in the rear of the plot previously occupied the application site. The previous permission P/1262/04/CFU permitted a staggered pair of semi-detached houses.

The houses to either side occupy very different sitings with the houses in Camrose Avenue set well behind those in St Brides Avenue. Due to the design of the block with a prominent front-hipped section adjacent to 52 St Brides Avenue, the proposal would respect the staggered pattern of development in the streetscene and the width respects the rhythm of the pairs of semi-detached houses. The design of the block is considered to be acceptable. Adequate space would be retained around the building and further planting would replace that which previously existed on the boundaries. The retention of the poplar and laurel to the front in particular would permit screening of the hardsurfaced area for parking. Levels fall from the road towards the centre of the site, and overall the proposal would have an acceptable appearance in the streetscene.

### **2. Visual and Residential Amenity**

The general siting of the block was accepted in principle in the previous permission for a pair of semi-detached houses. The scheme would comply with the 45° code in respect of both neighbouring properties, and all flank windows would be obscure-glazed and would serve as secondary openings or non-habitable rooms.

The communal garden area is considered to be acceptable in respect of providing adequate amenity space for the future residents.

### **3. Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the HUDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. The proposal would make good use of a previously developed residential site.

### **4. Access and Parking**

The parking requirement would equate to 6.4 spaces, with 6 to be provided to the front of the site. Given the availability of on street parking in the service road and the reasonable access to public transport on Camrose Avenue and at Queensbury, this provision is considered to be acceptable.

Cont...

**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.



---

**105 ELMSLEIGH AVENUE, KENTON**

**2/23**

**P/1888/05/DFU/RB3**

Ward: KENTON WEST

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY  
FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS; REAR DORMER

NU NE LAH CONSULTANTS for MR UMESH RAGHWANI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1290-01; 1291-01, 1292-01; -02; 1293-01; 1294-01; -02; 1295-01; -02

**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 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) 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.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

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

#### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

---

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

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

**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**

- site located on the south west side of Elmsleigh Avenue and contains a two-storey dwelling
- Elmsleigh Avenue is characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings of similar scale and design
- character of the surroundings is predominantly residential
- properties in the street are characterised by both single and two storey side extensions and front porch extensions
- there are a reasonable number of skylights inserted into roofs in the area
- adjacent property, No. 103, has a rear dormer, however both neighbours have no rear extensions
- there is an existing garage to the side of the property adjoining No. 103, which is to be removed as part of the proposal

**c) Proposal Details**

- the proposal includes a two-storey side extension which will extend to the boundary with No. 103 and replace an existing garage
- extension will be set back from the front of the house by 1m at first floor level and the roof will be stepped down
- proposal is also for a single storey front porch extension with a pitched roof and a single storey rear extension which will project by 3m from the original building line and that of the neighbours at No. 107 and will occupy the full width of the building
- also included in the scheme is loft conversion and rear dormer

**d) Relevant History**

None

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
3

Replies  
1

Expiry  
08-SEP-05

**Response:** Design of extensions will result in loss of light, combined effect of this and the recently approved (P/3234/04/DFU) and implemented development at No.103 will increase this effect.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Appearance and Character of Area**

#### **Front Extension**

The street contains a sizeable number of front porch extensions with pitched roofs. As the porch is separate from the original bay window and will not project forward of it, this aspect of the design is considered to comply with SPG A3. Its pitched roof is considered to be in keeping with the design of the original house and streetscene. Overall the design is considered to be in keeping with the character of the original house and streetscene and to comply with policies SD1 and D4.

#### **Single and Two Storey Side Extension**

The appearance of the two storey side extension with a stepped down roof and first floor set back from the front, is considered to be subordinate to the original building and reflective of its character. In this sense the proposal is considered to comply with SPG 2A. The roof treatment, which is pitched and uses tiles is considered to be appropriate and to comply with SPG B10. It is considered that it can be ensured that the roof tiles match the original building through the imposition of a condition. As the two-storey side extension is considered to be an appropriate design for the house and others exist in the area, the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental visual effect on the surroundings. In this sense the proposal is considered to comply with SPG 2.7.

#### **Single Storey Rear Extension**

The new doors on the rear elevation are considered to be an appropriate form of fenestration and to comply with SPG 2.5.

#### **Roof and Rear Dormer**

A loft conversion and rear dormer will be created within the enlarged roof. The proposed rear dormer would be set in from the edge of the roof by 1m, set back 1m from the roof eaves, and will be set in 500mm from the party wall. These dimensions are considered to comply with specifications in SPG D5. Additionally as the dormer is considered to be a subordinate feature within the roof, the proposal is considered to comply with SPG D3.

The roof, which is pitched and then flat is considered to reflect the design of the original house and to comply with SPG 2.6 and the proposed materials of matching tiles are considered to comply with SPG 2.4.

Overall the design quality of the scheme is considered to be acceptable and appropriate to the site and surroundings. In this sense the proposal is considered to comply with policies SD1 and D4.

continued/

**2) Residential Amenity**

**Single Storey Rear Extension**

The level of projection at 3m beyond the original building complies with SPG C2 and provides an acceptable influence on the neighbouring amenity.

**Single and Two Storey Side Extension**

The 45° rule shows that there will not be overshadowing from the side extension to the front or rear of the adjacent property at No. 103. With regards to the flank elevation there is considered to be a slight degree of overshadowing to the windows here. However due to the flank wall being approximately 2.2m away from the extension due to the existence of the garage, the potential for loss of light here is considered to be reduced. In this sense the proposal is considered to comply with SPG 3.11. Additionally the windows on the neighbours flank walls are not considered to be protected ones. Due to this the proposal is considered to comply with SPGs 3.9 and 3.10.

There are no windows proposed for the flank walls and therefore there are not considered to be overlooking issues in relation to the neighbour at No. 103. In this sense the proposal is considered to comply with SPG 3.4.

**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 grant.

---

**3 WELBECK ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/24**

**P/1055/05/DFU/OH**

Ward: WEST HARROW

CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL TO  
HEALTHCARE SERVICES (GP DIRECT) WITH ACCESS  
RAMP

HOWARD J GREEN FRICS for G P DIRECT

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 0429/PL01, 02, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107

Inform the applicant that: -

- 1) The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a variation of a Legal Agreement (relating to 5 & 7 Welbeck Road and to include 3 Welbeck Road) within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to: -
  - i) The number of general practitioners, qualified medical advisors and nursing staff seeing and consulting with patients within the Surgery at any one time shall be limited to 6.
  - ii) That the number of non-medical staff attending the Surgery on the course of their employment shall at any one time be limited to 8.
  - iii) That the total number of NHS or private patients eligible by virtue of registration to receive treatment within the Surgery shall be limited at any one time to 8,000.
  - iv) That all qualified medical practitioners practising within the Surgery will give written consent to the Harrow Primary Care Trust to provide every 6 months or on request, details of the latest group capitation figure for the practice, otherwise known as "the group list size", and details of individual practitioners' capitation figure if requested.
  - v) That on request of the Local Planning Authority each medical practitioner practising within the Surgery shall give details of their capitation figure otherwise known as "the patient list size" within fourteen days of request.
  - vi) That the Surgery shall only be open to patients between the hours of 8am to 8pm on Mondays to Fridays and 9am to 12 noon on Saturdays except in the case of emergencies.
- 2) A formal decision notice, subject to there being no further objections as a result of the extended period of notification and subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued upon the completion, by the application, of the aforementioned legal agreement.

continued/

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Completed Development - Buildings
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented

INFORMATIVES:

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

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - SC1 Provision of Community Services
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - H11 Presumption Against the Loss of Residential Land and Buildings
  - C8 Health Care and Social Services
  - C9 Doctors' Surgeries
  - C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
  - C17 Access to Leisure, Recreation, Community and Retail Facilities
- 4 The 1000mm corridor width, between the 'waiting room' and 'consulting room one' will prevent some wheelchair users from gaining access into these rooms, as the doors are scaled at approx 700mm. The opportunity should be taken to increase the door width to provide a minimum clear opening of 900mm.
  - 5 The proposal does not indicate provision of wheelchair accessible WC facilities. As toilet facilities are being provided, it is incumbent upon the service provider, in fulfilling their Disability Discrimination Act 1995, to provide an accessible toilet. The accessible toilet should be designed in accordance with the guidance given in BS8300. Although the existing bathroom measures 1500mm x 1600mm, the feasibility of extending the bathroom into its lobby area (the area between the bathroom and "door fixed shut") should be explored, as this will create an accessible toilet compartment measuring approx 1500mm x 2900mm.

---

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

- 1) Community Benefit (SC1, C8, C9)
  - 2) Loss of Residential Accommodation (H11, C9)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D9)
  - 4) Residential Character (D4, D9)
  - 5) Access (C9, C16, C17)
  - 6) Traffic/Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
- continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	3 (max)
	Justified:	3
	Provided:	3
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- semi-detached property located on southern side of Welbeck Road, opposite green 'island'
- part of a row of four semi-detached properties (nos. 1, 3, 5 and 7). Numbers 5 and 7 have already been converted into doctors' surgeries
- small single storey side extension, towards the rear of the property
- driveway up the side of the property
- on-street parking is available

### **c) Proposal Details**

- revised proposal for the conversion of a residential property into a GP surgery
- it is proposed to extend the doctors surgery practice (currently in numbers 5 and 7) into number 3 Welbeck Road (semi adjacent to number 5 Welbeck Road).
- the ground floor plan shows a consulting room, waiting room, reception and bathroom. The first floor plan shows two further consulting rooms (dietician and phlebotomy) along with a bathroom and staff toilet. The current 'box' room would be converted into a store.
- this application has replaced the previously unacceptable front ramp with a ramp to the side of the property, incorporating part of the curtilage of 5 Welbeck Road. It is considered that the siting and design of this ramp overcomes the previous reason for refusal in P/2654/04/DFU (see below).
- as in the previous application, the proposal would utilise residential accommodation, previously there was no evidence to support the need for the service.

### **d) Relevant History**

#### 7 Welbeck Road

LBH/42981	Change of use: Staff flat to additional surgery accommodation	REFUSED 02-JUL-91 APPEAL ALLOWED
-----------	---	---

continued/

5 Welbeck Road

WEST/723/97/FUL	Change of Use of No. 5; residential to doctors surgery (Class C3 to D1) and single storey extensions to both 5 and 7	GRANTED 05-MAR-99
-----------------	--	----------------------

3 Welbeck Road

P/2654/04/DFU	Change of use from residential to healthcare services (gp direct with ramp at front)	REFUSED 27-JAN-05
---------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed change of use would result in loss of residential accommodation, contrary to the relevant policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed change of use 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 property and be out of character in the locality.
3. The proposed access ramp in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the street scene, and result in unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.”

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

Extensive statement received from agent, summarised below:

- When your UDP policies are carefully considered it can be seen that this proposal is in accordance with the Strategic Health Authority and your policies to provide local healthcare facilities.
- What I accept was a valid criticism of the appearance of the scheme (the ramp) has been omitted. The residential character of the area of the area will not be compromised.
- Your authority recognises the difficulties local healthcare have in finding appropriate locations. I consider Nos. 3, 5 and 7 Welbeck Road are ideally situated and their use strikes the right balance between providing local facilities and protecting the amenities of residents.
- In order to accommodate ramped access it has been necessary to place part of it within the curtilage of no.5 Welbeck Road (which is in the ownership and control of the applicants). You would be able to attach a condition requiring the submission of this detail and be assured that it could be constructed,
- We also enclose Access Statement for the ramp prepared by our Access Consultant. In addition to the details of the ramp and steps, there is a section describing our initial thoughts on improvements to the building layout. This is not exhaustive and will be subject to further investigation and design development.

continued/



**f) Consultations**

Harrow PCT: The Harrow Primary Care Trust supports GP Direct's application for planning permission to develop 3 Welbeck Road as an additional surgery premises. The new GP contract encourages GP practices to provide a wider range of services for patients in their surgeries closer to home, obviating the need for patients to attend hospital. Many practices are restricted by lack of space and the proposed expansion will assist the practice to provide services for a rapidly expanding patient list.

<b>1st Notification</b>	Sent 10	Replies 1	Expiry 30-MAY-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** No objection

<b>2nd Notification</b>	Sent 10	Replies 0	Expiry 15-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Community Benefit**

The applicant has provided a supporting statement, which indicates that there will be qualitative as well as quantitative benefits to the new accommodation. The expansion into the new premises will ensure that waiting times for patients are reduced and will also ensure that the doctors can continue to provide services for their existing patients. The applicant has provided the LPA with the Strategic Health Authority Policy Statement (which supports improved local access) and a letter of support from the Harrow Primary Care Trust (which was not received on the previous occasion). GP Direct currently own five sites, three of which fall within the jurisdiction of Harrow Council. The applicant states that for a number of months they have been exploring different expansion options to alleviate pressure of the existing sites. It is considered that of the range of the existing sites within Harrow, this site is the most suitable. It is therefore considered, that in light of the new information the application satisfies the criteria of policies C9 and H11.

**2) Loss of Residential Accommodation**

It is considered that the negative impacts of the proposed expansion are outweighed by the community benefits of this proposal. Previously it was considered that the loss of this residential space would have been contrary to policy H11 of the adopted UDP. It is acknowledged that the LPA recognises that in exceptional circumstances it might be appropriate to locate certain community services within residential units or on land allocated for housing. In satisfying the criteria for policy H11, the onus is on the applicant to prove to the LPA that there is a need for the service and that the facility cannot be reasonably accommodated elsewhere. On the previous occasion the LPA did not receive any response from the Harrow PCT in support, however on this occasion the Harrow PCT have given their full support to this application- therefore demonstrating that there is a need.

continued/

**3) Residential Amenity**

It is acknowledged that the proposed change of use of number 3 would increase the daytime use of this property. There will be more comings and goings of patients and staff activity with consequential amenity impact. This impact is likely to be lesser at the weekends and during the evenings especially if controlled by condition as suggested. On balance of the reduced evening and weekend activity and the community benefit (i.e. in light of the new information) the level of activity associated with the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

The previous application for change of use of number 5 in 1997 was granted subject to a legal agreement stipulating the maximum amount of staff allowed on the site at any one time as well as a maximum patient list of 6,000. The reason this agreement was imposed was to limit the amount of activity within the area. Due to an ever-increasing population and pressures on the existing services, the purpose of extending the surgery into a further property would primarily facilitate extra patients. Due to the difficulty of obtaining sites (outside of residential areas) that are suitable for GPs it is considered that a marginal increase in the maximum patient list size and staff numbers would be acceptable and would be subject to a variation of a legal agreement.

**4) Residential Character**

Upon reconsideration of the site circumstances, when considering Welbeck Road as a whole, it is deemed that the predominant character of the road would remain as residential. This proposal would result in three out of the four properties on this part of Welbeck Road in non-residential use. It is proposed to retain the existing landscaped area within the front garden; therefore the appearance of the property would not change drastically in the street scene. The grass island directly in front of the property further mitigates the impact on the character here. It is considered that any remaining harm is outweighed by the benefit of providing this extra service to the community.

**5) Access**

The original submission has been revised to omit a proposed lift access, this type of access was considered to be unacceptable. The amended plans show a ramp that is located perpendicular to the street; in consultation with the Council's access officer this is found to make satisfactory arrangements for disabled persons access and is not considered to be unduly visually intrusive in this residential streetscene. Unlike in the previously refused application (P/2654/04/DFU) this arrangement ensures that the front garden of the property would be retained. The ramp would also be sited away from the adjoining residential occupiers at no.1 Welbeck Road therefore there would be no overlooking issues.

continued/

**6) Traffic/Highway Safety/Parking**

The existing Surgery at numbers 5 and 7 has provision for two parking spaces in the front garden and two parking spaces in the rear garden. It is proposed to facilitate part of the front garden of no.5 Welbeck Road for a disabled parking space, with two remaining spaces in the rear garden, giving a total of three parking spaces overall for the site. It is considered that although the scheme results in the loss of one parking space, the resultant three spaces do accord with the maximum provisions outlined in schedule 5 of policy T13. In accordance with policies C9 (criterion B3), C16 and C17 it is considered that the provision of a disabled parking space within the curtilage of the site is valuable in ensuring that the surgery is accessible to all users.

GP surgeries are generally sited within an area that is easily accessible to the catchment population, and mostly within walking distance of the site. The surrounding roads are not resident permit restricted. The Council's Transport Engineers have confirmed that there is on street parking facilities available. There are no objections in principle on parking grounds; therefore it is considered that a parking reason for refusal cannot be justified.

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**LAND R/O 71-83 CANTERBURY ROAD, NORTH HARROW**

**2/25**

**P/1712/05/CFU/DT2**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

TWO DETACHED THE STOREY BLOCKS TO PROVIDE 8 TERRACED PROPERTIES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for CLEARVIEW HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/2307/1C; /2A; /3

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacing
  - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Levels to be Approved
- 7 Water Storage Works

### **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

### **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

---

continued/

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Principle of Development
  - 2) Character of the Area
  - 3) Residential Amenity
  - 4) Highway/Parking
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	max. 12
	Justified:	max. 12
	Provided:	12
Site Area:	0.21 ha.	
Habitable Rooms:	32	
No. of Residential Units:	8	
Density - hrph:	40 dph 160 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- land formed by parts of rear garden of 71-83 Canterbury Road
- the site is irregular in shape and measures approximately 58m in width and varies in depth from 24m to 48m

### c) Proposal Details

- construction of 8 two storey houses in one terrace of 5 and one terrace of 3
- access would be via Allerford Court
- the houses would be of traditional design with pitched, tiled roofs
- rear gardens would vary in depth from 14m to 15m

### d) Relevant History

P/2652/04/CFU	Two detached two-storey blocks to provide 8 terraced properties with access and parking	REFUSED 14-JAN-05 APPEAL DISMISSED 17-JUN-05
---------------	---	--

The only reason for the dismissal of the appeal was that the inspector regarded the vehicular access to the site via Allerford Court as potentially unsafe and without a suitable traffic calming scheme the appeal could not be allowed.

continued/

**e) Consultations**

EA: No comments are necessary  
TWU: The applicants should make proper provision for the surface water drainage of the development to ground, watercourses or surface water sewers, ensuring that it does not drain to a foul water sewer, as this is a major source of flooding.

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 144	Replies 20 + 2 petitions	Expiry 05-AUG-05
----------------------	-------------	-----------------------------	---------------------

**Response:** Loss of privacy, parking problems, access difficulties, flooding

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Principle of Development**

The application site is not given any statutory protection in the adopted UDP. It comprises previously developed land as defined in PPG3 as it falls within the curtilage of existing buildings. In these circumstances consideration of the application depends upon the detailed impacts of the proposal.

**2) Character of the Area**

Allington Road and Allerford Court are made up of terraces of two storey houses. The form of the proposed buildings would be entirely in keeping with adjacent houses on Allerford Court. The garden areas of the proposed development would be more generous than those on Allerford Court. There would be sufficient space around the buildings to provide a good setting and adequate areas of amenity space.

The proposal would result in a density that is consistent with PPG3 and the 2004 Harrow UDP.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The proposed flank walls of Plots 1-5 of the development would be sited at a distance of 21m and 33m respectively from the rear elevation of houses on Canterbury Road and Kingsfield Avenue, and would be sited at a distance of between 2m and 4.5 from the rear garden boundaries. Proposed plots 6-8 would be sited in order to continue the run of houses on Allerford Court and would have little or no effect on the amenity of neighbours.

It is considered that the very limited additional number of vehicles entering the site would not prejudice the amenity of residents on the neighbouring roads.

continued/

**4) Highway/Parking**

A satisfactory level of car parking is proposed in a form that would not result in an excess of hardsurfacing nor would it impact on the amenity of neighbours.

NB: The previous application proposed the same development that is being considered in this application. It was dismissed on appeal; the only reason that the appeal failed was because the proposed access arrangements would have been harmful to highway safety.

The site is approached along Allington Road via Allerford Court, which is an open plan cul de sac that has a block of purpose built garages on the southern side of the site close to the entrance to the proposed development. The Inspector identified this block as a blind spot that could cause accidents if children are playing on street and in view of the fact that residents park their cars on street and not in the garages or on their driveways.

The Inspector recommended that this problem could be overcome by appropriate traffic calming measures. The applicants have therefore submitted revised plans in which the access road will have speed humps at either end of the road that would be tarmac surfaced, painted red and marked with the direction 'slow', three centre markings, a pedestrian guard rail adjacent to the highway and a manoeuvring area, hatched in white, in front of the existing off street parking bays, dedicated for residents.

**5) Consultation Responses**

- |                     |   |                 |
|---------------------|---|-----------------|
| Loss of privacy     | - | addressed above |
| Parking problems    | - | “ “             |
| Access difficulties | - | “ “             |
| Flooding            | - | see conditions  |

**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.

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/01**  
**P/2681/04/CFU/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

DEMOLITION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS, CONVERSION OF BARN TO DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ADJACENT BARN AS GARAGE, ERECTION OF NEW DWELLINGHOUSE WITH BARN AS GARAGE, EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, 98 MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/02**  
**P/2682/04/CLB/AB**  
Ward: PINNER

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: DEMOLITION, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONVERSION TO DWELLINGHOUSE AND USE OF BARNS AS GARAGES

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/03**  
**P/2683/04/CCA/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS ATTACHED TO AND WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF LISTED BUILDINGS

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

P/2681/04/CFU

**RECOMMENDATION I**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12E, 13E, 14E, 15E, 16E, WPC01R, WP04R, 05R, 06R, 07R, 12R, 13R, 14R, 15R, 16R, WPWC01, WP010A, 011A, 012, 013B, 014B, 015A, 016

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

- 1 The proposed new house to the north of Barn B would, by virtue of its design, form and appearance be inappropriate within the East End Farm Conservation Area and detrimental to the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 2 The proposed new house to the north of Barn B would, by virtue of its design, form and appearance, fail to respect the existing character of the Conservation Area and would appear at odds with it. It would compete visually with nearby listed buildings, to the detriment of their setting and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area.

continued/



3 The proposed pavilion building, by virtue of its flat roofed form, overtly modern appearance, size and raised floor level fail to respect the existing character of the Conservation Area and would be detrimental to the important view between Barn C and East End Farm Cottage.

4 The first floor front corner window facing No. 90 Moss Lane would give rise to overlooking of the adjacent property to the detriment of residential amenity and privacy.

INFORMATIVE:

1 INFORMATIVE:

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

EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas

H4 Residential Density

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D10 Trees and New Development

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings

D14 Conservation Areas

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

D16 Conservation Area Policy

D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance

D21 Sites of Archaeological Importance

D22 Sites of Archaeological Importance

SD1 Quality of Design

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

T13 Parking Standards

T15 Servicing of New Developments

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

The Committee agrees that the house within Barn A, as proposed within this scheme, and its associated use of Barn B for ancillary storage/garaging is acceptable. In addition, the use of the eastern end of the Orchard for a small garden building, to be linked to the main new house is considered acceptable in principle, subject to details, as it is considered that this would allow the new house to survey and be linked to its own garden.

---

P/2682/04/CLB

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12E, 13E, 14E, 15E, 16E, WPC01R, WP04R, 05R, 06R, 07R, 12R, 13R, 14R, 15R, 16R, WPWC01, WP010A, 011A, 012, 013B, 014B, 015A, 016

continued/

**REFUSE** Listed Building Consent for the works described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed new house and its pavilion to the north and attached to the listed Barn B, would by virtue of its design, form and appearance be detrimental to the special historic and architectural character of the listed barn and to its setting. It would also be detrimental to the setting of East End Farm Cottage and would affect the group of listed buildings comprising the former farm and be detrimental to their special character.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
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

## **RECOMMENDATION 2**

The Committee agrees that the house within Barn A, as proposed within this scheme, and its associated use of Barn B for ancillary storage/garaging is acceptable. In addition, the use of the eastern end of the Orchard for a small garden building, to be linked to the main new house is considered acceptable in principle, subject to details, as it is considered that this would allow the new house to survey and be linked to its own garden.

---

## **P/2683/04/CCA**

### **RECOMMENDATION 1**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12, 13E, 14E, 15E,16E

**REFUSE** Conservation Area Consent for the works described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed new structure to replace the existing buildings would, in the context of the overall scheme for the site, fail to preserve or enhance the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area.

continued/



**b) Site Description**

- historic barns and ancillary structures off Moss Lane, Pinner, part of former East End Farm; referred to by applicant as barns A-F
- barns A & B and barns C, D & E listed Grade II as “East Barn” and “North Barn” respectively
- application site includes access to Moss Lane, barn yard, orchard to rear of properties in East End Way and land to ‘rear’ of barns A & B (adjacent to Moss Lane)
- site entirely within East End Farm Conservation Area; neighbouring buildings Tudor Cottage and East End House also listed Grade II; East End Farm Cottage listed Grade II\*
- site surrounded by low density residential development in Moss Lane and East End Way
- premises understood to have been used for warehousing between 1960s and 1990s, varying in intensity; currently vacant

**bb) Listed Building Description**

- East Barn to East End Farm (applicant’s Barn B): late 16th century, timber framed, 3-bay barn with sweeping old tile roof over out-shot on west side, central wide-gabled wagon entrance, later projecting wing to south and weather-boarded. Roof construction of staggered butt-purlin and queen strut trusses
- North Barn to East End Farm (applicant’s Barn C): 18th century, timber framed, four bay barn with wagon entrance. High weather-boarded walls under steep pitched old tile roof. Roof construction of two collar and tie-beam trusses and one queen-post truss
- Barn A: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn B, an early twentieth century structure, extended to the east, of robust, agricultural style, with a long, plain tiled roof, and with quirky but considered detailing, including Crittal windows and glazed gablets
- Barn D: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn C is a courtyard infill between structures C and E. It is of little architectural merit, but is of a robust, functional, agricultural idiom which complements its setting
- Barn E: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn C & D, is a nineteenth century, brick built cattle shed. Interior fittings have been removed, but the remaining exterior brickwork is good. It forms the northern extent of what would have been a small secondary yard, or “fold enclosure”
- Barn F: unlisted but within Conservation Area – a three bay, Dutch Barn with corrugated sheet metal roofing, weather-boarded, timber framed walls to rear and sides, and brick piers to front – front now enclosed
- the Listed Buildings are set in the East End Farm Conservation Area, a rare surviving collection of agricultural buildings set around the farmyard, and adjoining the former farm residential buildings of East End House and East End Farm Cottage listed as Grade II and Grade II\* respectively. The farmyard is enclosed by the assemblage, and is both the focal point of the Conservation Area and a key element in the setting of all the Listed Buildings

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of Barns A and B from storage to house of 7 habitable rooms containing kitchen/breakfast room, living and dining rooms on ground floor of Barn A plus rear element of Barn B (1950's extension)
- garage use of original front element of Barn B
- 4 bedrooms with ancillary accommodation on first floor of Barn A
- demolition of existing lean-to to Barn B
- new windows, doors and rooflights proposed in rear element of Barn B (1950's extension)
- repair of Barn B including timber frame, roof repair, new doors
- alterations to Barn A including new front and rear dormer windows, 3 glazed roof ventilators, velux windows in southern roof slope, new rear windows and alteration to rear elevation
- development of new single/2-storey house including single-storey linked pavilion at eastern end of orchard, involving demolition of Barns D, E and F, with use of Barn C for ancillary garaging with provision of new WC
- living/dining, kitchen, study, reception room and 2 bedrooms at ground level
- 3 bedrooms with ancillary accommodation at first floor level
- gable-ended pitched roof over 2 storey and adjacent single storey southern element
- flat roof over linked element in the Orchard, with timber terrace in front

**d) Relevant History**

This site has been the subject of many planning applications over the years.

Relevant decisions to these current applications are as follows:-

The Orchard

LBH/37212	One 2-storey detached house with double garage, two parking spaces and access	REFUSED 22-FEB-90
-----------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The application site, by virtue of its openness, contributes to the character of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area and its loss would therefore be detrimental to the character of the area.
2. The proposed house by virtue of its size siting and detailed design would be inappropriate within East End Farm Conservation Area, and furthermore would be detrimental to the setting of the adjoining listed building, East End Farm Cottage.
3. The proposed house by reason of its relationship to adjoining properties would be subject to unacceptable overlooking and would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers in Dormer Cottage and East End Farm Cottage by virtue of overlooking and additionally would have an overbearing impact on adjoining rear gardens to the north of the site.”

continued/

Barns A-F

WEST/666/02/FUL Change of Use: Storage to residential (Class B8 to C3) and external alterations in association with conversion to 3 residential units REFUSED 21-JAN-03

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed change of use of the barns, which would involve interventions of harm to the special character of the listed buildings, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to Policy E34 of the HUDP.
2. The proposed alterations to the external envelope of the listed buildings, including the creation of new rooflights would detrimentally affect the appearance of the buildings thereby detracting from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
3. The proposed glazed wall to Barns A and B has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/667/02/CAC Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of agricultural building attached to and in the curtilage of listed building REFUSED 21-JAN-03

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed works of demolition, in the absence of an acceptable proposal for replacement extensions/buildings and works to make good the affected parts of the listed barns, would be inappropriate and detrimental to the character and appearance of the East End Farm Conservation Area.”

WEST/668/02/LBC Listed Building Consent: Demolition and internal and external alterations in association with conversion to 3 residential units REFUSED 21-JAN-03

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed physical interventions in the barns in the form of introduction of the gallery platform in Barn C and bathroom block beneath it, and introduction of new openings and lights into the external envelope of the buildings would have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings, to grant consent for which would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.

continued/

2. The proposed physical interventions to the fabric of the barns in the form of timber frame repairs; introduction of residential grade insulation; and treatment of internal finishes have not been satisfactorily demonstrated not to have a likely harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings: to grant consent for them would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.
3. The effect of the proposed introduction of the louvered wall to the east elevations of Barns A and B has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to not be likely to have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings: to grant consent for it would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.
4. The proposed change of use of the barns, which will involve interventions of harm to their special character, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to advice set out in PPG15, paras 3.7 – 3.19

Appeals against refusals dismissed 20-OCT-03

P/2678/04/CFU	Conversion of storage buildings to dwellinghouse and garage: erection of 2 new dwellinghouses, one with new gatehouse, one using storage building as garage: external alterations	REFUSED 18-MAR-05
---------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The orchard land, by virtue of its openness, contributes to the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area and to the setting of East End Farm Cottage and its loss would be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building.
2. The proposed new house and its ancillary gatehouse on the Orchard would, by virtue of their design, size and siting be inappropriate within the East End Farm Conservation Area and detrimental to the setting of East End Farm Cottage, and give rise to harm to neighbouring residential amenity, and the potential loss of trees on the site.
3. The proposed new house and its ancillary gatehouse on the Orchard, would, by virtue of their size, design and siting give rise to harm to neighbouring residential amenity and the potential loss of trees on the site.
4. The proposed new house to the north of Barn B would by virtue of its siting, design and form fail to respect the existing character of the Conservation Area and would appear at odds to it. It would compete visually with nearby listed buildings, to the detriment of their setting and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

continued/

5. The proposed enabling development would not meet the tests as set out in the English Heritage guidance and would crucially damage the asset which it seeks to preserve.
6. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the amount of development proposed is the minimum necessary to secure the repair of the barns, contrary to English Heritage's guidance in Enabling Development.
7. The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessive site coverage by buildings and hardsurfaced area and inadequate amenity space and space around the buildings to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character and appearance of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area.
8. The proposal could result in the loss of protected trees of significant amenity and landscape value which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area and give rise to harm to neighbouring amenity.

P/2679/04/CLB Listed Building Consent: Demolition, internal and external alterations in association with conversion to 2 no. residential units **REFUSED** 18-MAR-05

Reason for refusal:

"The proposed physical interventions in the barns in the form of the introduction of a toilet in Barn C would have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings, to grant consent for which would be contrary to the statutory duty of the Local Planning Authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15."

P/2680/04/CCA Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of storage buildings attached to and within the curtilage of a listed building **REFUSED** 18-MAR-05

Reason for refusal:

"The proposed new structure to replace the existing buildings would, in the context of the overall scheme for the site, fail to preserve or enhance the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area."

#### **Principle of Residential Conversion**

- Development Control Committee on 29th April 2003 considered a report on the principle of a conversion of the barns to residential use. The Committee resolved that:
  - (1) the Committee accept that, on current advice, the only viable use for the site is one which involves an element of residential use but that any residential use should be the minimum possible and located in the least sensitive part of the site; and

continued/



- (2) it be agreed to amend reason for refusal (1) of WEST/666/02/FUL and reason for refusal (4) of WEST/668/02/LBC to read “The proposed change of use of the two principally listed barns, which would involve interventions of harm to their special character, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to advice set out in PPG15, paras. 3.7 – 3.19.”

The Inspector’s decision on the previous scheme also addressed this matter and it was his view that the existing storage use did not generate enough income to ensure the long term well being of the buildings. He stated that “I conclude an element of residential use is required, and would be acceptable in land use planning terms, subject to considerations of numbers and effect on the buildings and their surroundings.”

The critical point however was where that residential use was located. The Inspector took the firm view that residential was required on the *site* but that the listed barns, as the most important and historic parts of the site, should be kept free of conversion. Conversion should be restricted to the less sensitive or ancillary buildings in the group.

- Development Control Committee on 15th March 2005 resolved that:  
The Committee, on current advice and recognising the Inspector’s conclusions in the recent appeal, accept that a 2 house development, one located within Barn A and the other on the site of buildings D, E and F, would provide a viable future for the site sufficient to secure the long term future of the barns, requiring the minimum number of dwellings located in the least sensitive parts of the site.

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: Pleased to see that the scheme has been reduced from three to two houses, which is a step in the right direction. However, the details still need a lot of work, as these are critical to delivering a good development.

The proposed house adjacent to the orchard looks too ‘Alpine’ and 1960s/1970s in design. The design needs to either be more strongly traditional or more strongly contemporary. At present, it is too gimmicky with no concept or logic behind it. The submitted photographs are good for inspiration, but it is not evident from the current plans that a high-quality development would be delivered in line with these images. The pavilion concept is fine, as it helps to open up the orchard. However, it does not link well with the design of the main house.

continued/

Concerned about impact of orchard building when looking from Moss Lane as the new building would close off the view at the end of East End Farm. The low pitch of the roof of the new main building is also alien and uncharacteristic of the area. New development should look like a barn with a contemporary twist. The end elevation is also too busy in design and should be simpler to look more like a farm outbuilding.

There is no consistency or harmony with the current design – there are too many styles thrown in together. As the context is very sensitive the design needs to be much more low key.

TWU: No objection  
 EA: No objection  
 EH: Objects

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area, Alteration/ Extension of Listed Building, Setting of Listed Building, Demolition in Conservation Area		Expiry
			11-AUG-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
<u>P/2681/04/CFU</u>	330	49	01-AUG-05
<u>P/2682/04/CLB</u>	352	50	01-AUG-05
<u>P/2683/04/CCA</u>	316	50	01-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Overdevelopment, damage to local heritage, barns should be used for light storage, should be no building on orchard, loss of agricultural setting, harm to East End Farm Cottage, unsuitable design of new house, rooflights and ventilators would be obtrusive, barns should be repaired, loss of privacy, overlooking, harm to character of Conservation Area, harm to character and integrity of listed buildings, harm to farmyard appearance.

**APPRAISAL**

A site plan is appended indicating what each building is referred to in this report and identifying the Orchard.

continued/

**1) Impact on the Listed Buildings, their Settings and the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area**

**New House on the site of D, E and F**

The principle of residential use in this part of the site

The Inspector's decision on the previous scheme stated that residential use was required but that it should be located in the least sensitive parts of the site or in less important ancillary buildings and not within the principally listed barns. D, E and F, where a former pig sty and some 1970s sheds exist, is considered on balance to be less sensitive to change. Building E is attractive and does comprise a former open fronted cow shed, dating from the late 19th century, which represents a remnant of the former use of the farm, although it has been roofed over and altered. Buildings D and F are late 1940s and late 1970s respectively. They are of no architectural or historic merit and have at best, a neutral impact on the character of the area. Whilst the site itself is in a sensitive location, within the settings of both Barn C and East End Farm Cottage, on balance, the principle of a residential use here is considered acceptable.

Demolition of the Existing Buildings

It is considered that buildings D and F do not make a positive contribution to the character of the area and that their demolition would not be objectionable in principle, subject to suitable proposals for the replacement building.

In terms of Building E, which is more attractive and has more historic merit but has been substantially altered, any replacement building would need to be of a high standard of design in order to outweigh the loss of the cow shed, if it is not to be retained and restored.

Design, Form and Location of Proposals

There are a number of concerns with the detailed design of the proposed new house.

The Conservation Area is characterised by two storey, steeply pitched and tiled buildings, having a vertical emphasis with similar traditional forms and sizes. The proposed house is at odds with this established character because of its deep form and shallow pitched roof. This does have the benefit that it keeps the height of the building lower, but because of its shape, it actually makes the building appear more prominent and overbearing on the others in the group. It is considered that the stepping down to single storey towards Barn C, and space being left about Barn C is of benefit, but this does not outweigh concerns outlined above. Also because the building runs in one long continuous form, from the garden pavilion to the single storey element at the south end, it appears overly bulky and dominant in the Conservation Area.

continued/

The proposed building does not sufficiently reflect the semi rural/agricultural traditions of the buildings around it. The proposals are not considered to comply with Policy D15 of the HUDP as the proposed house would not relate well to surrounding buildings, the materials and detailing are considered inappropriate in this context and the proposed development would not be in scale or harmony with the existing character of the area.

Whilst a modern architectural style could be appropriate in this location, acting as a foil to the listed buildings, it is considered that the proposed house is of poor design quality in its context and the house fails to be either low key and subservient or intrinsically outstanding. It would replace buildings with a neutral impact with one that would cause harm to the character of the area and settings of the barns and II\* farmhouse.

#### Linked Garden Pavilion

The previously refused scheme sought to erect a new house and gatehouse on the orchard and was strongly resisted because the Orchard is considered a key space in the Conservation Area which contributes to the special character of the area. This element has been removed from this scheme which is a significant step forward in resolving the future of this site. However, a linked garden pavilion is proposed at the eastern end of the Orchard, as part of the house on D, E and F. Although this would mean some new building on the Orchard, the principle of this is considered acceptable because without it, the house on D, E and F would have a poor relationship with its best asset – its garden, which is what the Orchard would become. This would make the house less marketable and would have an impact on the financial situation regarding the repair of the barns. Furthermore, it is considered that by linking the house and the orchard in this way it would ensure the long term maintenance and future of the Orchard, provide surveillance of the land, be likely to substantially reduce the pressure for development on the Orchard, and provide an attractive “end stop” to the views between Barn C and East End Farm Cottage. The building proposed, as part of this application however, is not considered acceptable in terms of its design, e.g. its flat roofed form is inappropriate in this location. It is suggested that something which appears much more like a small, agricultural shed type building, which one would expect to see in the context of barns and the farmstead, would be more appropriate. There are also concerns about the size of the pavilion and that it is set at the same floor level as the main house, despite the change in levels in the Orchard, which increases the perception of bulk of both the pavilion and the main house, to the detriment of the character of the area.

continued/

### New House within Barn A

The appealed scheme was similar to that currently proposed in respect of Barn A. The inspector was broadly happy with the proposals. The current scheme differs in that there is no internal garaging, which would now be housed within Barn B. This is considered an improvement, both in terms of the external appearance of the dwelling and because it would allow the quaint petrol pump feature to be left in situ. Furthermore, the residential accommodation includes the 1950s extension to the east of Barn B and some alterations to the east elevation of Barn A. The more contentious items such as the glazed roof ventilators, scale and number of dormers and numbers and locations of rooflights are the same, or smaller than the appealed scheme. Even though these are not considered ideal, given the Inspector's acceptance of the proposals, it is not considered that objections can be sustained.

### Works to the Listed Barns

The barns are on the English Heritage register of Buildings at Risk and are in poor and worsening condition. The proposed repairs are welcomed and indeed follow the recommendations of the Council's consultants as part of the research for the public inquiry in 2003.

In common with the previously refused scheme, this proposal does include the provision of a toilet in Barn C. This was considered unacceptable in the previous scheme, but more information has been submitted which shows that the toilet would essentially be a very low key feature in a contained part of the barn. As a reversible modern intervention, it is considered that it would be an acceptable minor alteration.

To summarise this part of the appraisal, it is considered that the principle of a two house scheme, located as proposed is acceptable. Furthermore, the works to the listed buildings and to Barn A are considered acceptable. The problems lie solely with the new house on D, E and F where the proposed house and the garden pavilion are considered to have significant flaws and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and would detrimentally affect the setting and character of listed buildings within the Conservation Area. As such it would be contrary to Policies D11, D14, D15 of the HUDP and those within the adopted conservation area study SPG for the area.

### The Way Forward

While the current application is considered unacceptable, it is moving in the right direction in that the scheme has been reduced to two houses and it is considered that these 2 houses are in the least sensitive parts of the site. This is in line with the development scenario which Members considered and agreed as a broad principle as part of the consideration of the previous, refused, scheme.

continued/

During the course of this application, detailed discussions about how to resolve the problems with the new house have taken place between Officers, English Heritage and the applicant. Outline sketches have been developed but it was considered inappropriate to revise this application a third time and re-consult on it, which would be very confusing for members of the public. Instead, it was decided that the current application be reported to Members to allow them to agree the position in relation to the current scheme and to agree the broad principles for the site. This is in part to give some succour to the owners, in advance of them letting the contract for the much needed restoration works.

Therefore, it is considered that the 'problem area' with this application is purely with the design and form of the house on D, E and F and its linked pavilion. The other parts of the scheme are considered acceptable. Members have already agreed that 2 houses on these sites are acceptable, but the pavilion building is a new element and it is considered important that the principle of a small building, linking the house and garden together be agreed. It is also considered important that Members realise that the amount of development required on D, E and F is likely to be similar to that shown in this application. However, it is considered that its impact can be much better mitigated to reduce the sense of bulk and allow the building to blend in with its surrounding much more.

**2) Employment and Housing Issues**

The Inspector considered that the previous storage use did not generate sufficient funding to ensure the long term well being of the buildings. He concluded that an element of residential use is required, and would be acceptable in land use planning terms, subject to considerations of numbers and effect on the buildings and their surroundings.

**3) Archaeology and Underground Works**

English Heritage have previously advised that the proposed works might affect below ground archaeology and have recommended a written scheme of investigation be secured by condition. Similarly the provision of underground services to the proposed residential units could be controlled in detail by condition. The applicants have submitted a useful desktop analysis of archaeology including a programme of works which would appear appropriate.

**4) Residential Amenity**

The house proposed in Barns A and B is fundamentally the same as the appeal scheme and as included in application P/2678/04/CFU. No objections were previously raised to this aspect of the proposals and they are therefore supported as part of this application.

In terms of the new house including Barn C, the 2-storey element would be sited beyond the rear boundary of No. 92 Moss Lane along which is located a thick row of 5m high leylandii.

continued/

Although the building would rise about 3m above this neighbouring vegetation, it would be sited at least 20m from the rear wall of No. 92 so that it is not considered that it would appear obtrusive or overbearing. High level windows and rooflights only are shown in the elevation facing No. 92 so that, notwithstanding the existing screen, privacy would not be prejudiced. The northern 2-storey flank wall is adjacent to the far end of the southern boundary with No. 90.

Barn F is presently in this position hard onto the boundary so that, although higher, the proposed new house would provide a comparable relationship to the adjacent property, the house of which would again be sited 20m from the new dwelling.

Again high level windows are shown facing the garden apart from one first floor window which looks over the rear garden boundary. Were the scheme acceptable this element could be revised but as shown would give rise to overlooking.

Proposed first floor windows would not directly face existing windows in East End Farm Cottage.

Intervisibility between 2 facing ground floor windows would be prevented by a proposed front fence.

In terms of the linked pavilion on the orchard, this single storey structure, while close to the rear boundaries of 90 Moss Lane and Iron Gates in East End Way, would be sited at least 25 and 30m respectively from the rear walls of those properties.

Given these separation distances, the single storey character of the building and the presence of some intervening vegetation it is not considered that the proposed pavilion would be detrimental to neighbouring amenity.

**5) Access and Parking**

Each house would be provided with 2 indoor parking spaces within each historic barn, with additional capacity for outdoor parking. While this provision is over the current maximum standard it is not considered objectionable given the disposition of the spaces around the site and the unusual nature of the proposals.

A satisfactory access in terms of vehicle movements is shown.

**6) Trees**

While a small number of trees on the orchard would need to be felled to accommodate the linked pavilion, this is not objected to given that the verdant nature of the area would predominantly remain.

Neighbouring trees around the site should not be prejudiced by the proposals, subject to acceptable foundation design.

continued/

**7) 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 refusal.



## SECTION 4 - CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

---

**ST JOHNS SCHOOL, POTTER STREET HILL, NORTHWOOD** **4/01**  
**P/2174/05/CNA/SC2**  
Ward: Adj.Auth – Area 2(W)

CONSULTATION: GROUNDWORKS TO FORM AN ALL-WEATHER HOCKEY PITCH AND 2 RUGBY PITCHES, DRAINAGE AND ANCILLARY WORKS.

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2230-01(Rev.c); -02 (Rev.b); 90362/001(draft); /003 (draft); /007; 87922-4

**RAISE NO OBJECTIONS** to the development set out in the application.

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on London Borough of Harrow
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Council Interest: None

#### b) Site Description

- site forms part of the grounds of St. Johns School on Potter Street Hill
- Potter Street Hill forms the western boundary of the school and also represents part of the boundary between the London Boroughs of Harrow and Hillingdon
- site represents part of the school grounds to the south of St. Johns School and west of Potter Street Hill

#### c) Site Description

- application proposes ground works involving the movement and levelling of earth in order to construct a proposed all weather pitch, a new rugby pitch and the re-levelling of an existing rugby pitch
- the all weather pitch sought in the application has been constructed. Work as not begun on the remainder of the scheme proposed.
- all works sought in the current application are designated for the large south sloping field at the south western section of the schools grounds
- all weather sports pitch located at the northern edge of this field with the proposed new rugby pitch directly south of this. Two existing pitches can be found at the southern end of the field with the pitch proposed for re-levelling located in the south western corner of the field.

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
16

Replies  
0

Expiry  
22-SEP-03

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Impact on London Borough of Harrow**

The proposed works are not considered contentious and would not impact negatively on the amenity levels of nearby residents within the London Borough of Harrow. The scheme would improve existing sports facilities within St Johns Schools, many of whose pupils reside in the borough of Harrow. Furthermore, an existing field owned by the school, separates the applicant field and Potter Street Hill, the boundary between both boroughs. The works therefore would be located a sufficient distance away to eliminate any possible negative impact on local amenity levels. Accordingly it is considered that the proposed works would have no impact on the London Borough of Harrow.

**2) 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 Council has no objection.