
SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

1/01

FORMER PINNER TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, 73 MARSH RD, PINNER P/2434/05/CFU/DT2

Ward: PINNER SOUTH

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 4 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 38 FLATS, ACCESS AND BASEMENT PARKING

RIPPON DEVELOPMENT SERVICES for TELEREAL SERVICES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: S1.01; PH1.01, 02,03;A1.01, 02,03;A2.01, 02,03;A3.01, 02; BT 15611/03

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

- 1 The rear element of the proposed 'T' shaped block by reason of its excessive size and bulk would be visually intrusive and out of character with neighbouring properties. It would not respect the scale and massing of those properties to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties and the character of the area.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
 - S1 The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use
 - SD1 Quality of Design
 - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
 - EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land
 - 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
 - H5 Affordable Housing
 - H6 Affordable Housing Target
 - H7 Dwelling Mix

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Provision of Housing and density (H3, H4)
- 2) Affordable housing (H5, H6)
- 3) Reuse of previously developed land (EP20)
- 4) Standard of design and layout (D4)

Continued/...

- 5) Trees (D10)
- 6) Quality of design (SD1)
- 7) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Site Area: | 0.27 Ha gross, 0.25 net |
| Habitable Rooms: | 96 |
| Density - hrph: | 381 hr per ha |
| Council interest: | None |

b) Site Description

- This an irregular shaped site between Grove Avenue and Pinner Village Gardens currently occupied by a disused telephone exchange surrounded by car parking and outbuildings.
- The existing building is 3-storeys high with rooms in the mansard roof. The proposed building reflects this style.
- The proposed building has four floors within it with lower floor to ceiling heights. The proposed building is lower than the existing telephone exchange by a metre.
- It is intended to repair and keep the boundary fencing and all of the existing trees save five on the boundary with Pinner Village Gardens. This gap is to be replanted with small coniferous trees.
- A full tree survey has been made and eight new trees are within the landscaping scheme
- The distance to the three storey flats in Grove Avenue is a minimum of 30.5m (99ft) , 29.5m to a house called The Lodge and 14.7m to the flank wall of the flats 47/69 Pinner village Gardens facing Marsh Road. This flank wall has no windows except for those lighting the stairs.
- Car parking is provided with one space per flat for sale and 0.66 of a space for the affordable housing. A total of 37 spaces gives a provision of almost 100%. Provision is also making for cycle parking and waste disposal
- The site is close to Pinner Station (500m), local bus services and the District shopping centre.

c) Proposal Details

Demolish the telephone exchange and remove the hard surfacing and outbuildings around the site. Erect a 'T' shaped block containing 38 flats on four floors with 8 surface and 29 basement parking spaces. Landscape the land around the block with lawns, shrubs and trees. The building is to be finished in facing bricks with a slate roof.

Continued/...

d) Relevant History

The site has been used for telecommunication purposes since before 1939 and has been unused for several years since the operations relocated to another exchange. Minor applications have been made over the years to extend the car parking, erect telecom equipment at roof level and erect outbuildings.

e) Applicant's Statement

- Planning and Design Statement contains sections on describing the site, how the development fits within national planning guidance and the HUDP, and a design statement.
- The policy analysis shows compliance with PPS1-Delivering Sustainable Development, PPG3 – Housing and PPG13 – Transport. In respect of the HUDP consideration has been given to H3 New Housing on vacant land, H4 Residential Density not less than 150hrph, H5 Affordable Housing, H7 Dwelling Mix required on larger sites and EM15 Change of use of commercial sites outside of designated centres .
- The survey work shows all existing land levels. The design statement uses this information to show that the new block is lower than the telephone exchange and the distances to adjacent residential properties.
- Reference is also made to the council's 'Code of Practice for the Storage and Collection of Refuse and Waste Materials for recycling in Domestic Properties'. That the collection facility provided and the space for refuse vehicles to collect and manoeuvre are compliant with the Code.
- Concerning the rear element of the block the applicant's agent comments that there is a 7 metre high hedge within the curtilage of the adjoining residential property. Further that there is at 30m, adequate distance between the proposed block and the three storey flats in Grove Avenue. That the removal of the car park around the existing building, previously used by commercial vehicles of all sizes, will significantly improve living conditions. That the size, overall height, and design of the new building is well conceived and will not lead to any material loss of privacy or amenity of adjoining residential properties.

f) Consultations

- Engineering Services have requested that storm water run off be attenuated. Thames Water make similar comment.
- The Environment Agency has made no response.

Advertisements Major Development Expiry 17-11-05

Notifications Sent Replies Expiry
82 8 04-11-05

Continued/...

Summary of Responses: Existing traffic problems will be made worse, increased traffic flows, loss of privacy, density too high, building out of scale, services cannot cope, overdevelopment of site, risk of flooding, overspill car parking,

APPRAISAL

1) Provision of Housing and Density

This proposal represents an example of re using a vacant site. This application fits within policy H4. A mix of 11 x 1 bed, 26 x 2 bed and 1 x 3bed flats, making a total of 38 homes is proposed.

2) Affordable Housing

12 units are offered distributed through the block, with a mix of 4 x one and 8 x two bedroom flats on ground and first floor. These are to be provided in conjunction with a Registered Social Landlord (RSL). This party will be named in the S. 106 agreement but until permission is obtained the applicant needs flexibility to partner with a RSL with sufficient funds and the capacity to manage the affordable units thereafter.

3) Re-use of Previously Developed Land

This site is no longer required for telecommunications and it's reuse for housing accords with both national and HUDP policy.

4) Standard of Design and Layout

Pre-application reviews of plans and photographs have resulted in a reduction in the number of units proposed. This results in more amenity space being provided to the rear of the block and a reduction of the mass of the block. It now fits within the street scene as a reflection of the telephone exchange.

However there remains an issue regarding the rear part of the 'T' shaped block. In your officers' view the rear element should be subservient to that part facing the street. This can be achieved by reducing the depth and height of the rear element. The applicant is unwilling to make such reductions (see applicant's statement).

The tree survey reveals that the trees around the boundary are in reasonable health and may be retained. They will continue to give a strong visual 'edge' to the site and be complemented by a landscaping scheme.

5) Trees

As already mentioned these are retained except for 5 on the east boundary. These have to be removed to accommodate the building and are to be replaced within the landscaping scheme as are the other four trees to be removed being dead, dying or dangerous. The combination of tree surgery and planting will ensure the continued sylvian setting of the building is maintained.

Continued/...

6) Impact on Neighbours

The prime issues are overlooking of gardens of surrounding residential properties and the distance between windows serving habitable rooms. The applicant has dimensioned distances from the elevations in question to existing properties. Moving clockwise the east elevation faces the flank of flats at 47 to 69 Marsh Road which contains no windows to habitable rooms. Also at the rear windows give a view into the garden of The Lodge through the tree screen which is to be maintained on both sides of the boundary. The distance to the building itself is 29.5m (96ft). The south elevation faces some single storey non-residential buildings and beyond Pinner Village Gardens. The west elevation faces the flats on Grove Avenue, separated at the narrowest point by 30.5m. As with the east elevation this distance combined with tree retention maintains amenity.

7) Consultation Responses

Traffic – The head of engineering makes no comment on the traffic to be generated. The traffic generated from the operational telephone exchange would be comparable to that arising from this residential development. The number of parking spaces provided coupled with the site's location will make no greater impact on the highway network than the existing use.

Overspill parking – The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone which is an effective deterrent to such parking unless duly authorised.

Other issues - as discussed in report

CONCLUSION

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

Continued/...

EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE A 3 STOREY BUILDING, RESTAURANT (A3 USE) AT GROUND FLOOR AND 12 FLATS AT FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

DESIGN WEST ARCHITECTURAL SERV for SCAN CORPORATION LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site Location Plan 1:1250, 00-01, 00-02, 00-03 RevD1, 20-01Rev.E1 & 20-02 RevD

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 5 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:- 08.00 hours to 01.00 hours only, Monday to Sunday inclusive, without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 6 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 7 Water - Disposal of Sewage
- 8 The balcony areas to the rear of the building at 1st and 2nd floor shall only be used as a means of escape and not as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity

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

Continued/...

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

EP25 Noise

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D6 Design in Employment Areas

D7 Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres

D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments

T13 Parking Standards

H4 Residential Density

H7 Dwelling Mix

EM17 Change of Use of Shops - Secondary Shopping Frontages

EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

2 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Council's policy to encourage developers to provide facilities for the separate storage and collection of different colour bottles for the purpose of recycling. The applicant should also note that such collections are carried out free of charge by the Council. Storage arrangements should be agreed with the Council's Cleansing and Transport Services Manager.

3 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

4 INFORMATIVE:

Harrow Council has published a leaflet "ACCESS FOR ALL", containing design guidelines for the provision of safe and convenient access for all disabled groups. A copy is attached.

5 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
3. excavating near a neighbouring building, and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

Continued/...

6 **INFORMATIVE:**

The relevant traffic order will impose a restriction making residential occupiers of this building ineligible for residents parking permits in the surrounding controlled parking zone.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Retail Policy (EM17)
- 2) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D6, D7)
- 4) Housing Provision (SH1, H4, H7, SH2)
- 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5, EP25, EM25, D8, C16)
- 6) Parking & Highway Considerations (T13)
- 7) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Adopted 2004 UDP Key (SD1, SH1, SH2, EP25, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, T13, H4, H7, Policies: EM17, EM25, C16)
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Three storey building on corner of Station Road, Harrow and Bonnersfield Lane;
- Ground floor last used for retail unit with storage on part of first floor;
- Remainder of first floor previously used as offices;
- Second floor used for flats;
- Building is set back from adjacent small parade of shops to north with offices at first floor and flats at second floor level;
- Two-storey parade adjacent on Bonnersfield Lane: solicitors office at No.10, office and flat over at No.12, 2 flats at No.14;

c) Proposal Details

- Renovation and refurbishment of the existing building including extensions and alterations to the existing building to provide a restaurant at ground floor level and 12 flats overhead.

d) Modifications from Previously Proposed Developments

- Two prior schemes on site proposed a restaurant at ground floor with residential accommodation at the upper floors. However both applications were withdrawn before they were ultimately determined. As stated the schemes were similar insofar as they proposed a restaurant at the ground floor and residential at the upper floors. However the greatest difference between the schemes was in respect of an additional floor being proposed at roof level. This element that formed part of both prior restaurant/residential schemes has been deleted from the current application.

Continued/...

e) Relevant History

| | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------------|
| EAST/1407/02/FUL | Change of Use: Class A1 to A3 on ground & 1 st floors with new shopfront, fume extractor duct at rear & new windows | GRANTED 14-OCT-2004 |
| P/654/05/CFU | 1 st , 2 nd & 3 rd floor extensions including restaurant (A3) at ground floor, offices & 4 flats at 1 st floor & 12 flats on 2 nd & 3 rd floor | WITHDRAWN 03-OCT-2005 |
| P/1834/05/CFU | Extensions and alterations to provide a part 3/ part 4 storey building, restaurant (A3 use) at ground floor and 13 flats on 2 nd & 3 rd floor | WITHDRAWN 21-APR-2005 |

f) Consultations

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|
| Notification | Sent 61 | Replies 1 | Expiry 04-JAN-06 |
|---------------------|------------|--------------|---------------------|

Response: overdevelopment of property; too many residential flats; inadequate parking; inadequate refuse facilities.

| | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Advertisement | Major Development | Expiry 12-JAN-2006 |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy

The site is located in an area of secondary shopping frontages in Harrow Metropolitan Centre, thus Policy EM17 applies to the proposed change of use of the ground floor from retail to restaurant. A similar proposal for a restaurant (which also incorporated the first floor), was approved under EAST/1407/02/FUL. The merits of the change of use are considered to be the same as in that approved scheme, and as a restaurant would be an appropriate town centre use there is no objection to the loss of retail. The only difference is with respect of a new side entrance for the restaurant to the Bonnersfield Road frontage. Whilst this might increase activity along Bonnersfield Road, this is not considered to be a significant issue given the busy nature of Station Road and the transitional siting of the property from commercial uses along Station Road, and the residential areas further a field to the south.

2) Character of the Area

The proposed alterations to the building would involve extensions at the southeast corner (fronting Bonnersfield Road), extensions along the rear elevation at first and second levels (facing east) and new cosmetic elevation treatments to the facades of the building (including balconies, windows & materials).

Continued/...

It is noted that the existing building is currently in a state of disrepair and is in need of refurbishment. Although the facades of the building are to be extensively altered in appearance, it is highlighted that the proposed works predominantly utilise the building envelope of the existing building. The additional height of the corner element would create a feature of the building on the Station Road frontage given the important town centre corner location, yet would not cause detrimental impacts over any neighbouring property. Provided high quality materials and treatments are used as part of the proposed development, it would provide a positive contribution to the streetscene.

Although the relationship between the existing building and the smaller scale of the terrace buildings on the Bonnersfield Lane frontage is not ideal, the proposal has provided a creative solution with respect of the infilling of space between these buildings. Specifically a glazed external wall (housing an internal staircase) is proposed between the subject building and the adjoining building at 12 Bonnersfield Lane. The glazed wall would align with the front elevation of the neighbouring building and although would be taller than its neighbour, would sit below the parapet height of the subject building. With light weight material (glazed bricks) it is considered that this design solution would provide a positive transition in built form between the main building bulk of these neighbouring buildings.

4) Housing Provision

Broad policies within the adopted UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. In this respect the proposal for 12 flats is considered to provide a positive contribution. While the current proposal would involve the loss of the office (proposed in the previous scheme to replace the existing office) at first floor level, this is considered to be acceptable given the previous approval for a restaurant at first floor level and the existence of good quality office accommodation elsewhere in the town centre.

5) Residential Amenity

With respect to the amenity of the future occupiers of the new units, the lack of amenity space on site is not considered to be objectionable given the town centre location and the range of facilities nearby.

The nearest neighbouring residential properties are located at the flat over No.12 Bonnersfield Lane, the two flats at No.14 and 14A Bonnersfield Lane and the flats at the second floor level of 184 Station Road. With respect of the neighbouring properties at Bonnersfield Road, it is highlighted that the current interface between these properties and the subject site is less than ideal. Currently the pedestrian access to the existing upper floor offices/ flats is via the Bonnersfield Road frontage, where the open pedestrian stairs provide access to elevated balconies both at first and second floors. Apart from overlooking caused by the existing access balconies, the east facing windows have clear views towards the properties adjoining terrace properties fronting Bonnersfield Road.

Continued/...

The proposed development would remove the existing elevated balconies, thereby reducing the extent of existing overlooking impacts. Furthermore although it is proposed to provide an additional depth of 2.7 metres at the rear at both 1st and 2nd floors, the scheme has ensured that there would be no increase in overlooking. This is achieved by the height of the parapet wall at 1st floor being set 1.5 metres above the corresponding floor level (with the adjacent windows set 1.25 metres behind), thereby preventing downward views over properties to the rear. An alternate solution is proposed at 2nd floor where a glazed false balcony is proposed to be attached to the façade of the building. With a fascia height of 1.8 metres & depth of 1.0 m it would likewise prevent downward views over properties to the rear. A condition is proposed that would ensure that these balcony areas would only be used as a means of escape and not as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

With respect of the interface with the adjoining building at 182-186 Station Road, it is noted that the rear corner of the subject building does not comply with the 45-degree angle test. However to ensure that the proposed rear extension does not increase any detriment to this adjoining property, the corner of the building would accommodate an angled splay.

Lastly, with respect of refuse/ recycling arrangements for the site, the existing building does not provide for any such on site storage area. The proposed development as part of the ground floor layout provides for a dedicated refuse/ recycling area for the site, accessible from the Bonnersfield Lane frontage. This is considered to an amply sized area to accommodate the refuse/ recycling needs of the proposed development.

6) Parking & Highway Considerations

No parking provision is possible on site due to the size of the existing building and the location on Station Road. This is considered to be acceptable given the town centre location and the proximity to public transport routes. Furthermore, it is noted that the site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), thus to prevent further demand for on-street parking, an informative to be included on the planning permission will advise that occupiers of the building will be ineligible for residential parking permits.

7) Consultation Responses

Issues raised have been addressed within the 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 approval.

Continued/...

**COMFORT INN, 2-12 NORTHWICK PARK RD & 57 P/2842/05/CFU/RJS
GAYTON ROAD, HARROW**

Ward: GREENHILL

2 AND 3 STOREY BLOCKS TO PROVIDE 49 FLATS, SURFACE AND BASEMENT
PARKING

MORRISON DESIGN LTD for COMFORT INN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Job No.3654_res: Drawing Nos.: 002RevisionC, 003RevisionD, 004RevisionC,
006RevisionD, 007RevisionB, 008RevisionA, 100RevisionA, 101, 105, 106

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

- 1 The proposed building along the Manor Road frontage by reason of prominent siting, would not be unduly obtrusive in the street scene and would not provide a reasonable stepped setback between the proposed building and 2 Manor Road, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the occupiers of that property and the character of the area.
- 2 The proposed affordable housing blocks by reason of unsatisfactory siting and design, would provide for limited surveillance opportunities and would detract from the established pattern and design of development within the street scene and the character of the locality.
- 3 The proposed parking spaces located to the frontage of the affordable housing blocks facing Gayton Road would present an unacceptable level of hardsurfacing which is considered to be visually obtrusive and overbearing, & would not respect the character of the wider locality to the detriment of the amenities and appearance of the street scene and the character of the area.
- 4 The proposed affordable housing block would provide a poor layout and relationship between the flats and the communal garden areas to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers thereof.
- 5 The proposed 2-storey affordable housing block by reason of siting to the rear of the site would be visually obtrusive and over-bearing when viewed from the rear gardens of adjoining properties to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers thereof.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
ST2 Traffic Management
EP25 Noise

Continued/...

- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments
- T13 Parking Standards
- H4 Residential Density
- H5 Affordable Housing
- H6 Affordable Housing Target
- H7 Dwelling Mix
- H18 Accessible Homes
- R15 Hotels and Guest Houses
- C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Adopted 2004 UDP Key Policies: | (SD1, SH1, ST1, ST2, EP25, D4, D5, D8, T13, H4, H5, H6, H7, H18, R15, & C16) |
| Listed Building: | Not Listed |
| Conservation Area: | None |
| Town Centre | |
| Car Parking | Standard: 66 (maximum) |
| | Justified: 54 |
| | Provided: 54 |
| Site Area: | 719 m ² |
| Habitable Rooms: | 135 |
| Floorspace: | 0.43ha |
| No of Residential Units: | 49 |
| Dwellings per Hectare: | 114 |
| Habitable rooms per Hectare | 314 |
| Council Interest: | None |

Continued/...

b) Site Description

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

c) Proposal Details

- The proposed development scheme can be broadly broken down into the following components:
 - Demolition of all buildings on site;
 - Redevelopment to provide a 3 storey block of 34 flats (37 x 2 bed, 2 x 1 bed) orientated in an 'L' shape along the Manor Road and Northwick Park Road frontages;
 - 3 smaller 2/ 3 storey blocks proposed in a courtyard arrangement would be orientated to the Gayton Road frontage and would provide for 15 flats (5 x 2 bed, 10 x 1 bed) as affordable housing units;
 - The main apartment block building proposed along Northwick Park Road and Manor Road would predominantly follow the siting of the existing hotel buildings, incorporating a setback of between 1.7 to 8.0 metres along Manor Road and a setback of 6.5 to 7.5 metres along Northwick Park Road;
 - 2 of the 3 smaller blocks to the Gayton Road frontage would accommodate a similar siting to the existing buildings being replaced (the eastern part of the hotel and the dwelling at 57 Gayton Road. The two blocks would be set apart by a distance of 18 metres, (accommodating an area for parking), whilst the 3rd block would be sited behind within the site to complete the courtyard arrangement;
 - Buildings would have a varied roof forms consisting of a combination of hipped ends, projecting gable features and dormer windows;
 - Within the main block the ground floor flats would have patio/ gardens, whilst upper floor flats would have balconies located both on the front and rear elevations;
 - Basement car parking for 40 vehicles (including 3 disabled spaces) would be provided for the main block, accessed from Manor Road;

Continued/...

- Surface car parking for 14 vehicles would be provided to the forecourt area of the 3 smaller affordable housing block of flats, accessed from Gayton Road;
- 420 square metres of communal rear amenity space would be provided for the main apartment block;
- 370 square metres of communal rear amenity space would be provided for the 3 smaller affordable housing block of flats;

d) Modifications from previously refused scheme;

- An overall decrease in the number of flats from 67 to 49;
- An overall decrease in the number of basement parking spaces from 64 to 40;
- Decrease in setback of the main apartment block fronting Manor Road so as to predominantly match the setback of the hotel building to be replaced;
- Increase in setback of main block to Northwick Park Road in order to predominantly match the setback of the hotel building to be replaced;
- Deletion of the third floor accommodation within the main block fronting Northwick Park Road, with a corresponding decrease in ridge height of the building by in excess of 1.0 metre;
- Deletion of second apartment block fronting Gayton Road and replacement with 3 small buildings in a courtyard setting;
- Deletion of parking area to the rear of the site and replacement with 14 forecourt parking spaces within the courtyard of the 3 small buildings;

e) Applicant Statement (summary)

- Density of scheme has been significantly reduced where the number of flats has dropped from 67 to 49. Gross floor area reduced from 8055m² to 5591m². Current proposal is less dense than earlier application P/1057/03/CFU that was recommended for approval by Planning Officer's by rejected by Committee. This earlier application proposed a gross floor area of 5900m² on a 0.4 ha site, whilst the current scheme proposes 5591m² on a 0.43 ha site;
- Size and bulk of scheme have also been significantly reduced, whereby third floor of the flats has been omitted. Affordable housing has been re-planned in a courtyard style with 3 storey units to Gayton Road frontage reflecting the scale of neighbouring houses, with a 2 storey block to the rear of the site. The two-storey element meets the 45-degree code, whilst the rear windows in have been angled to the northeast to avoid overlooking of properties on Gayton Road and Manor Road. Existing building line has been respected on the Northwick Park Road frontage, whilst there are increased setbacks on both Gayton Road and Manor Road;
- Parking to the rear of the site has been omitted. The bulk of the surface parking to the affordable housing is contained in the courtyard, with 3 spaces located at the back of the footpath off Gayton Road. All spaces are overlooked by the flats and parking in general has been reduced in line with the adopted 2004 UDP;

Continued/...

- The scheme represents a considerable “greening” of the site and it is considered that the proposal would enhance the appearance of the street scene. The existing hotel is completely surrounded by hard standing. The footprint of the hotel and 57 Gayton Road currently occupy 1665m² with surface an area of about 2600m² taken up with surface parking. The current proposal reduces the footprint to 1615 m². With surface roads and parking occupying only about 400m² of the site, leaving some 2285² for gardens/landscaped area;

f) Relevant Planning History

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

P/1057/03/CFU Redevelopment: 46 flats in 2x 2/3 storey blocks REFUSED
with access, basement and surface parking 16-OCT-2003

REASON FOR REFUSAL:

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

P/507/05/CFU Redevelopment: 1 x 3/4 storey block and 1 x 3- REFUSED
storey block to provide 67 flats, access and 19-MAY-2005
parking

REASON FOR REFUSAL:

1. The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of excessive density and inadequate amenity space, to the detriment of neighbouring resident’s amenity in the surrounding area.
2. The proposed development, by reason of excessive size & bulk would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
3. The proposed intensification of the parking area to the rear of the site by reason of unsatisfactory siting in relation to the neighbouring residential properties and associated disturbance and general activity would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of those properties and the character of the area.

g) Consultations

Environment Agency: Written notice was provided that they are unable to respond to the proposed scheme.

Thames Water Utilities: No objections.

Advertisement

Major Development

Expiry
22-DEC-2005

Continued/...

Notification

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---|-------------|
| 90 | 7 objections + Petition with 14 signatures + 2 nd Petition with 70 signatures | 13-DEC-2005 |

Response: scheme is substantially similar to the previous scheme proposed; reasons for rejection of the previous scheme are still valid; the area is scheduled as a hotel development; existing hotel is a successful hotel that serves the area; the recent application for hotel expansion is supported as there is a need for more quality bed spaces; proposed development is of a much greater density than existing development; visual bulk being out of character with the locality; increase traffic/ traffic noise and impact on parking; overdevelopment of area; inadequate amenity space proposed; plans are an improvement but do not go far enough; the proposed underground car park would cause disturbance to groundwater and would therefore impact on the stability of the water table and existing buildings in the area; traffic dangers of vehicles existing onto Gayton Road; if site is to be redeveloped it should be redeveloped for houses and not flats; overlooking and loss of privacy; existing services in locality are overloaded of which would be made worse if development proceeded; hotel should be retained in light of Wembley Stadium redevelopment.

APPRAISAL

1) Hotel/ Housing Policy

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

With respect of the recently refused scheme (P/507/05/CFU) the applicant stated that upgrades and enhancements of the existing premises have been undertaken and whilst trading has improved, the hotel does not have long-term viability in its present form. The applicant has sought to expand and upgrade the hotel complex via a prior planning application (P/272/05/CFU), of which is encouraged by Policy R15 a), however this application was refused due to specific issues with respect of design, layout and amenity impacts. With respect of another earlier prior refused residential scheme (P/1057/03/CFU), a submission at the time detailed financial forecasts for the long-term viability of the hotel. As such the loss of the hotel was not specifically resisted, nor was it included as a reason for refusal. On this basis the potential loss of the hotel is not specifically resisted.

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

Continued/...

2) Site Layout & Character of Area

Although it is noted that the scheme has been significantly reduced in scale with respect of bulk, siting and height of the proposed buildings, it would appear to be a case where to overcome a number of previously raised concerns, it has in turn created other issues.

Firstly it is noted that the siting of the main building block has not altered drastically along the Manor Road frontage from that proposed in the recently refused scheme (P/507/05/CFU). The siting of the building along Manor Road is considered to be unduly obtrusive in the street scene and would not provide a reasonable stepped setback between the proposed building and 2 Manor Road, that would be to the detriment of the visual amenities of the character of the area. Although it is noted that the proposed building generally aligns with the frontage siting of the hotel annex building to be replaced, this is not considered to be an adequate justification. With such a large-scale redevelopment of the site it is considered to be an opportunity to better address a stepped frontage setback between 2 Manor Road and the subject site. For example the earlier refused redevelopment scheme (P/1057/03/CFU), that received an officer's recommendation of support proposed a setback along Manor Road that matched the siting of the adjacent building at 2 Manor Road, then gradually stepping forward to the corner at Northwick Park Road. It is considered that this general principle for siting and layout should be adopted as an appropriate design solution for any residential redevelopment proposal fronting Manor Road. However as the current scheme does not achieve this, an objection on this basis is raised.

Apart for the scaling down of the main apartment block fronting Manor Road/ Northwick Park, the greatest change is with respect of the buildings fronting the Gayton Road frontage. In effect the prior proposed apartment block has been replaced with 3 smaller buildings sited in a courtyard arrangement where the courtyard and forecourt are given over to hard surfacing for the parking of motor vehicles. In broad assessment, this area of the subject site is a prominent corner junction of Northwick Park and Gayton Road that is visible from the A409 Sheepcote Road. It is considered that this represents an opportunity to reinforce the street scene and the junction with a significant corner building, however which has been missed by the current scheme. The integrity of the corner has been further reduced by the break in the buildings at this point and the poor articulation of the built form which does not frame the junction of Gayton Road. Furthermore the affordable housing blocks and courtyard are set back from the building line of this street and surround a parking courtyard which is considered to be undesirable as it fragments the street edge, breaks the building line and has a negative impact on enclosure. The visual intrusion of a large expanse of hardsurfacing to such a prominent corner position is considered to be detrimental to the streetscape. Furthermore the nominated bin storage facilities located within the courtyard appear to be of inadequate size to service 15 flats, which may result in the ad-hoc storage of bins within various locations within the courtyard, which would amount to a further visual intrusion on the street scene.

Continued/...

The courtyard arrangement provides an extremely poor level of visual surveillance from the 2 blocks accommodating flats 1a, 8a, 9a, 6a, 7a, 14a & 15a. Essentially the elevations of these blocks that face into the courtyard accommodate blank elevations at ground level, only small entrance lobby windows at first floor and only bathroom windows at upper floor. It is considered that this interface amount to a poor design solution and is inappropriate from a security & safety perspective. Similarly there are located footpaths between and around the buildings which lack the means for an appropriate level of surveillance.

The siting of the building to create a courtyard has similarly created a communal rear garden where access to is awkwardly sited between the buildings with an extremely narrow access point. This issue is considered to be symptomatic of a poor orientation and layout of the buildings proposed.

Additionally the roofline of the buildings within the courtyard do to reflect the gable features of surrounding building at the end of the housing on Gayton Road, whilst the ridgelines would be lower than the rooflines on this street. The change in built mass is considered to impair the integrity of the streetscape, and again highlights a missed opportunity to reinforce the prominent corner with a building that makes an appropriate statement within the street scene.

3) Amenity of Neighbours

The size and bulk of the facades of the proposed main apartment block along Northwick Park Road are consistent with that the existing hotel building, therefore there are no concerns with respect of this section of the proposed development being overbearing. However, the 2-storey building within the courtyard arrangement is sited in such a way that there would be concern of it detrimentally impacting upon the amenity of adjoining residents. It is considered that the siting of this block would be visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from the rear gardens of adjoining properties to the detriment of the occupiers. Furthermore, despite the proposed building fronting Manor Road, following the building line of the existing hotel, the building is considered to be overbearing when viewed from 2 Manor Road. Therefore, objections are still raised to the visual impact and intrusion of the building and their detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the character of the area.

4) Accessibility

If the development were to be considered acceptable for approval, a planning condition and informative could be utilised to ensure satisfactory levels of accessibility for the proposal. However at this point it is highlighted that the disabled parking bays in the underground garage are poorly located across the carriageway from the lift access point, the disabled person will need to use the vehicular path to access the upper floors. This is considered to be a poor design solution to provide for an appropriate level of accessibility for disabled occupants and should be addressed with any subsequent scheme.

Continued/...

5) Parking/ Highway Safety

For a proposal of 49 flats (including allocation for visitor parking), the scheme would generate a maximum requirement of 66 on site spaces, calculated in line with current parking minimisation policies of central Government and the adopted 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan. 54 on site spaces are proposed as part of the scheme, 40 spaces within a basement arrangement accessed off Manor Road and 14 within the forecourt area accessed off Gayton Road. Of the 54 spaces proposed, this is considered ample to service the parking requirements of the proposed apartments. Furthermore the site has good access to local bus networks and is likewise located a short distance from Harrow on the Hill bus/ train transport interchange. On this basis no objections to the application are raised on grounds of insufficient parking provision. Nevertheless an objection is still raised to the visual impact and intrusion of the parking spaces located to the Gayton Road frontage.

6) Consultation Responses

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

- *The proposed underground car park would cause disturbance to groundwater and would therefore impact on the stability of the water table and existing buildings in the area;*
The Environment Agency were consulted regarding the application of which they chose to nominate that they were unable to respond. Furthermore there are no development overlays (ie: floodplains etc) that would highlight such an issue for specific attention and consideration.
- *Traffic dangers of vehicles existing onto Gayton Road;*
The application and full details were referred to Council Transport Engineering Department, of which no objection was raised the proposed scheme with respect of parking access, layout and vehicular movements.

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.

PART 2 / PART 3 STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL BEDROOMS AND CONFERENCE FACILITIES; REARRANGED REAR CAR PARKING

MORRISON DESIGN LIMITED for COMFORT INN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Job No. 3654 Drawing Nos. 101 through 106 inclusive & Drawing Nos. 011

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

- 1 The proposed 3-storey rear extension by reason of excessive depth would be visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from the rear garden of the adjoining property at 2 Manor Road to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers thereof.
- 2 The proposed east facing rooflight windows within the rear extension would allow overlooking of the adjoining property and result in an unreasonable loss of privacy to the occupiers.
- 3 The first floor south east facing windows of the rear extension to be part fitted with obscure glazing, would give rise to direct or perceived overlooking of the rear of the adjoining property, causing a resultant loss of privacy, to the detriment of the occupiers thereof.
- 4 The proposed parking spaces 50 & 51 would extend that area of hardsurfacing to the frontage of the site to an unacceptable level, would be visually obtrusive and overbearing, would not respect the character of the wider locality to the detriment of the amenities and appearance of the street scene and the character of the area.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
ST2 Traffic Management
EP25 Noise
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments
T13 Parking Standards
R15 Hotels and Guest Houses
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Site layout, Character of Area & Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5, D6, D8, R15, C16, EP25)
 - 2) Parking/ Highway Safety (ST1, ST2, T13)
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Adopted 2004 UDP Key (SD1, ST1, ST2, EP25, D4, D8, T13, C16)

Policies:

| | | |
|-------------|------------|------------------------|
| Car Parking | Standard: | 3 additional (maximum) |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 3 additional |

b) Site Description

- 0.43 ha site on eastern side of Northwick Park Road between Gayton Road and Manor Road;
- site presently contains part 2/ part 3 storey hotel building fronting Northwick Park Road with 2-storey annexe fronting Manor Road ;
- building is setback from Northwick Park Road frontage which includes parking. There is also extensive parking at the rear accessed via Manor Road;
- Surrounding buildings include:
 - 2 Manor Road adjoining is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse;
 - 1B Manor Road opposite is a detached bungalow;
 - 14 Northwick Park Road opposite is a 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouse;
 - Hanbury Court, a 3 storey sheltered home lies opposite the junction with Manor Road
 - 51 Gayton Road opposite is a hotel (associated with the subject site), accommodated with a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse;
 - 50-60 Gayton Road opposite form pairs of 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouses;
- No 59 Gayton Road adjoining is a 2 storey detached dwellinghouse.

c) Proposal Details

- The proposed development scheme can be broadly broken down into the following components:
 - Demolition of single storey conference room/ kitchen/ plant accommodation attached to the rear elevation at the north east end of the site;
 - Demolition of the adjacent dwellinghouse at 57 Gayton Road;
 - Construction of a 3-storey extension to the rear of the hotel, oriented to the southeast corner of the site, whereby the extension would extend into the rear of the site as a rear wing. This extension would provide for a new rear entrance, conference facilities on ground floor and an additional 14 guest rooms at upper floors;

Continued/...

- Construction of a two-storey side extension over the footprint of the demolished building at 57 Gayton Road. The side extension would accommodate conference facilities at ground floor and 4 bedrooms at upper floor;
- A single storey rear extension, oriented to the south east corner of the site to accommodate conference kitchen and refuse store;
- Modification to the layout of on site parking, including new landscaping/ buffer screening scheme;
- The overall proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from 73 to 91;
- The overall proposal would increase the number of on site car spaces from 50 to 53;

d) Modifications from previously refused scheme;

- Decrease in the height, bulk & footprint of the proposed rear wing. The revised rear extension would take the form of a two-storey building with a crown roof (to provide accommodation within the roofspace). The overall height of the rear wing would measure 9.2 metres to the ridge. This would be lower than the main hotel complex to which it would be attached. The previously refused scheme proposed a height of 11.6 metres to the ridge. The depth of the rear extension has been decreased from the previously proposed 24.6 metres to 18.4 metres;
- The number of additional meeting rooms proposed has been decreased from 4 to 3;
- The number of additional hotel rooms proposed has been decreased from 27 to 18;
- The single storey rear extension accommodating the kitchen has been reoriented in order to comply with a 45 degree splay line measured from the rear elevation of 59 Gayton Road;
- The side extension proposed over the adjacent property at 57 Gayton Road takes the predominant appearance of a 2 storey detached & pitched roof dwelling. This extension is attached to the hotel building by means of a 2 storey flat roofed, glazed link, however this element is setback 6.6 metres from the front façade;
- The rearranged parking layout to the rear of the site now accommodates a landscaping buffer of 2.7 metres along the boundary with 59 Gayton Road;

e) Relevant History

The site has a long planning history establishing the hotel use, however there is only one application specifically relevant to this large-scale expansion of the hotel that is proposed.

Continued/...

P/272/05/CFU part single/ part 3 storey rear extension; 1/2 REFUSED
storey extension on site of 57 Gayton Rd; revised 22-APR-05
car parking

Reasons for refusal:

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

f) Consultations

Environment Agency: Written notice was provided that they are unable to respond to the proposed scheme.

Thames Water Utilities: Standard waste water comments were received, whilst no objection was raised with respect of sewerage infrastructure.

| | | | |
|----------------------|------------|---|-----------------------|
| Advertisement | | Major Development | Expiry 22-DEC-2005 |
| Notification | Sent 88 | Replies 5 Objections & 1 letter of support | Expiry 13-DEC-2005 |

Response: Objections: overlooking & loss of privacy; increase in traffic & demand for parking; increase in noise & disturbance; development plans may not be up to disabled standards; object to the endless number of applications being made on site; net loss of parking spaces but net gain of bedrooms and conference facilities; parking layout does not appear to be "bus friendly" therefore proposal is inadequate with regard to off street bus parking; parking layout does not appear to make adequate provision for HGV's. Existing drainage/sewerage problems will increase; overdevelopment of the area; out of character. Letter of Support: the area is scheduled as a hotel development; existing hotel is a successful hotel that serves the area; need for more quality bed spaces; will improve currently poor conference facilities; visual impact to street is minimal; a necessary and proper expansion of a successful local business; if passed parking restrictions opposite and adjacent to rear entrance in Manor Road should be made double yellow lines to assist coaches and service lorries.

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Site Layout, Character of Area & Residential Amenity

Although there are different forms and scales of buildings within the surrounding locality, the character of the area is clearly residential. More specifically there is a development theme involving buildings orientated to the frontage of their sites, with rear gardens behind.

The current application forms a proposal that has been scaled back and reduced in size in an attempt to overcome the reasons for refusal of an early hotel extension scheme (P/272/05/CFU). With respect of the streetscape it is noted that the side extension to the hotel-taking place on the adjoining property at 57 Gayton Road takes on the form of a detached 2 storey pitched roof dwelling. This extension is attached to the hotel building by means of a 2 storey flat roofed, glazed link, however this element is setback 6.6 metres from the front façade to provide an appropriate visual break. This proposed double storey side extension would provide appropriate visual relief whilst continuing the general form, design and façade building line of the existing streetscape. Therefore no specific objections are raised against this double store side extension on the site of 57 Gayton Road and it is considered that the revisions overcomes an objection previously raised. However it is considered that the interface of the extension with the residential character of the streetscape could be better improved by more emphasis being given to the 'front door' of the new building. Such an issue could easily be dealt with via a condition of approval if the overall scheme were deemed to be acceptable.

However with respect of the streetscape interface to Gayton Road, a concern is raised with respect of proposed vehicle parking spaces 50 & 51 that would be located to the frontage of the side extension. It is considered that the proposed parking spaces 50 & 51 would extend that area of hardsurfacing to the frontage of the site to an unacceptable level, would be visually obtrusive and overbearing, would not respect the character of the wider locality to the detriment of the amenities and appearance of the street scene and the character of the area. Therefore in order to minimise the extent of hardsurfacing proposed to the front of the hotel, and in order to maximise the amount of soft landscaping provided, it is considered that these spaces should be deleted and given over to aesthetic landscaping. Nevertheless as the development is not deemed to be acceptable on ground discussed below, an objection is therefore raised to the siting and location of these parking spaces.

Continued/...

With respect of the rear single storey extension, it is noted that its siting and layout have been amended and modified in order to comply with a 45-degree splay line measured from the rear elevation of 59 Gayton Road. This is considered to be an acceptable design solution to overcome an aspect of a previously raised objection. Likewise it is noted that the proposed 3-storey rear wing has been substantially reduced in scale from the hotel extension scheme that was previously refused (P/272/05/CFU). As such the decrease in overall height ensures that the rear addition would be lower than the main hotel complex to which it would be attached. This is considered to be an acceptable design solution to overcome an aspect of a previously raised objection. However it must be stated that the revised rear extension proposal has not overcome all previously raised objections. Although it is noted that the rear extension has been reduced in depth, the cumulative visual bulk impact when viewed from the rear garden of the adjoining property at 2 Manor Road is considered to be unacceptable, which would result in a development that would be overbearing and visually obtrusive to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers thereof. It is considered that the rear wing should be reduced a further 2.0-3.0 metres in depth in order to overcome such concerns.

Additionally the revised layout of the 3-storey rear extension has in part attempted to overcome concerns of overlooking, however has not entirely & satisfactorily addressed such objections. At first floor level the east facing windows are proposed to be fitted with angled bay window in an attempt to 'blinker' view over the rear garden of 59 Gayton Road. This has in part been done by proposing to fit the southeast facing panels with obscure glazing. Whilst this alternates to prevent actual overlooking, actual overlooking could still occur due to the full height windows and bay window design. Furthermore, there would still be an issue of perceived overlooking caused by the obscure glazed panels. With respect of the east facing rooflight windows at second floor level, these would have direct views over the rear garden of 59 Gayton Road, therefore an objection is raised on this basis as they would clearly cause detrimental overlooking impacts for the adjoining property, which is considered to be unacceptable.

The rearranged parking layout to the rear of the site now accommodates a landscaping buffer of 2.7 metres along the boundary with 59 Gayton Road. This is considered to be reasonable to overcome the prior objections raised. Furthermore the revised layout of the main parking area provides an improvement to the interface of the parking area with the adjoining property at 2 Manor Road as it would provide for areas of landscape along the common boundary, of which currently the parking spaces directly abut up to.

2) Parking/ Highway Safety

The revised parking layout with the additional 3 on site parking spaces would meet current parking standard of Harrows adopted 2004 UDP. Furthermore it is noted that the site has good access public transport, given the site is located on fringe of Harrow Town Centre, which accommodates underground and main train lines and a bus interchange. Likewise parking restrictions apply in the locality surrounding the subject site, of whereby hotel staff and clients would be subject to such restriction. On the basis of the above, no objection to the application on grounds of insufficient parking provision.

Continued/...

3) Consultation Responses

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

- *increase in noise & disturbance*

It is considered that the extent of the expansion of the hotel would not amount to an unacceptable increase in noise and disturbance. Furthermore the rearranged parking layout would improve the extent of buffer landscaping to the boundaries of the site which would be an overall improvement.

- *development plans may not be up to disabled standards*

The current application provides for lift access to all levels of the building which achieves disabled access to the upper floor of the building. Notwithstanding the agent is obliged to ensure compliance Disability Discrimination Act, 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises), implemented on 1st October 2004.

- *object to the endless number of applications being made on site*

Council is obliged to assess all Planning Applications lodged. Furthermore the current proposal represents a revised and scaled down version of a prior refused scheme for the site.

- *parking layout does not appear to be "bus friendly" therefore proposal is inadequate with regard to off street bus parking; parking layout does not appear to make adequate provision for HGV's.*

The application and full details were referred to Council Transport Engineering Department, of which no objection was raised the proposed scheme with respect of parking access, layout and vehicular movement.

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.

Continued/...

**LAND TO THE NORTH OF KILN HOUSE, KILN P/1060/05/CFU/TW
NURSERY, COMMON ROAD, STANMORE**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

CONSTRUCTION OF 4 X 3 STOREY DETACHED BLOCK TO PROVIDE 48 FLATS
ACCESS AND PARKING

A J EMMANUEL for M GEORGE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 354/GM/01, /02, /03, /04, /05, /06, /07

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

- 1 The proposal would result in damage and disruption of features of geological interest which would prejudice the status of the site as a SSSI.
- 2 The proposal represents inappropriate development which would have a prejudicial impact on the openness and character of this part of the Green Belt and Area of Special Character.
- 3 The proposal vehicular access to the site would have a detrimental impact on highway safety.
- 4 The proposal would result in the loss of trees and vegetation which would prejudice the nature conservation interest of the site.
- 5 In the absence of a Flood Risk Assessment, the proposal would be likely to have a prejudicial impact on flooding within the area.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) SSSI
- 2) Green Belt/AOSC
- 3) Highway Safety
- 4) Nature Conservation
- 5) Flooding
- 6) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Green Belt

Area of Special Character

| | | |
|-------------|------------|----|
| Car Parking | Standard: | 48 |
| | Justified: | 48 |
| | Provided: | 48 |

No of Residential Units: 48

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Irregular plot of land measuring a maximum of 280m from east to west and 180m at its frontage on Common Road
- he site is located on the western side of Common Road, to the north of Kiln House and The Kiln Garden Centre.
- he site is identified as a SSSI, is within a large Site of Nature Conservation Importance, is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Special Character
- he site is wooded and contains no forms of development

c) Proposal Details

- Construction of 4 x 3-storey blocks each containing 12 flats
- The blocks would be of brick and render with a pitched tiled roof
- Car parking for 48 cars is proposed and additional space would be available along the proposed roadway

d) Relevant History

- None.

e) Consultation

Advert : Major Development

Expiry : 19-OCT-05

Notifications

Sent
9

Replies
41

Expiry
16-OCT-05

Comments: Inappropriate in Green Belt, out of character, highway safety

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

This application is considered to be fundamentally objectionable for the following reasons:

1) SSSI

The site is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest due to the particular geological interest of the site. The proposed development would inevitably damage and disrupt features of interest which would be contrary to policy SEPs.

2) Green Belt/AOSC

The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt as defined in PPG2 and Policy EP33 of the HUDP. There are no 'special circumstances' which would overcome the inappropriateness of the development.

The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the AOSC. Policy EP3 seeks to protect against damage to features which contribute to the Area.

3) Highway Safety

It is considered that the proposal would be self-contained in terms of car parking and would not give rise to overspill car parking.

However the proposal would provide an access onto Common Road at a point where visibility to the north would be compromised by the sharp bend to the east and to the south by the more gentle bend. It is considered that the proposal would, therefore, have a prejudicial impact on highway safety.

4) Nature Conservation

The site sits within a larger Site of Nature Conservation importance. It is clear that the proposal would result in the loss of a substantial part of the natural woodland of the site, and with it, the value of that part of the site to Nature Conservation.

5) Flooding

The application has not been accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment. Without such an assessment the Environment Agency raise an objection to the proposal due to the potential for the development to cause flooding.

6) Consultation Responses

Addressed above.

CONCLUSION

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

Continued/...

SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LAND REAR OF 71 & 73 WEST END AVE, PINNER

2/01
P/2767/05/DFU/OH
Ward: PINNER SOUTH

TWO STOREY DETACHED HOUSE WITH GARAGE (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

ADELAIDE JONES for MERCURY DEVELOPMENTS (UK) LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 71/WE/T1, 71/WE/101 rev.C, WE/73/102 rev.B, WE/73/103 rev.B, WE/73/104 rev.E

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 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 The window(s) in the first floor eastern 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.

Continued/...

5 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.

6 Disabled Access - Buildings

7 Water Storage Works

8 Landscaping to be Approved

9 Landscaping to be Implemented

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

SH2 Housing Types and Mix

T13 Parking Standards

2 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant is advised that any window in the flank elevation of the development hereby permitted will not prejudice the future outcome of any application which may be submitted in respect of the adjoining property.

3 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

4 INFORMATIVE:

Harrow Council has published a leaflet "ACCESS FOR ALL", containing design guidelines for the provision of safe and convenient access for all disabled groups. A copy is attached.

5 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
- and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Continued/...

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

6 **INFORMATIVE:**

The relevant traffic order will impose a restriction making residential occupiers of this building ineligible for residents parking permits in the surrounding controlled parking zone.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS & POLICIES (UDP 2004)

- 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

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

| | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------|
| Council Interest: | None | |
| Car Parking | Standard: | 1.8 (max) |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 3.0 |
| Number of Units: | 1 | |

b) Site Description

- Land at the rear of 71 and 73 West End Avenue, site fronting the northern side of the road adjacent to 79 West End Avenue
- Area characterised by pairs of semi-detached purpose built maisonettes opposite and large detached properties
- Area typified by hipped and pitched roofs

Continued/...

c) Proposal Details

- Construction of a detached two-storey dwelling and integral garage 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 79 West End Avenue
- The flank wall of the integral garage abuts the rear boundary shared with 73 West End Avenue, this garage is to a height of 3.2 metres with a flat roof, the two storey flank wall of the proposed house is sited 3 metres from this boundary
- The maximum height of the eaves is 5.2 metres and the maximum height of the proposal from ground level to the ridge of the roof is 9 metres
- Approximately three off-street parking spaces provided on the site curtilage (two on the forecourt and one within the integral garage) along with remedial landscaping
- The rear garden would be to a depth of approximately 22 metres

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|---------------|--|---------------------------|
| P/1836/05/DFU | Two storey detached house with front and rear dormers, balconies and attached garage | WITHDRAWN 26-SEPT-2005 |
|---------------|--|---------------------------|

Following withdrawal the scheme has been revised as follows:

- Proposed house has been handed to ensure that the two-storey flank wall is sited off the boundary shared with 73 West End Avenue, there is now a single storey flat-roofed integral garage along this boundary
- The roof form over the property has been revised from a gable end (which was considered to be bulky and out of character) to a pitched roof
- The eastern part of the house is set back and a subordinate roof is provided over
- The rear balconies and the front dormer have been deleted from the scheme
- The bin stores are now located away from any neighbouring boundaries

e) Applicant's Statement

- None

f) Notifications

| | | |
|------|---------|----------|
| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| 36 | 2 | 1-DEC-05 |

Summary of Responses: potential reduction of residents parking spaces, overlooking, increase in traffic, loss of trees, loss of outlook, elevation treatment out of character, noise and disturbance

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance in the Street Scene/Character of Area

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. 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 300m² and the depth of this area would be a maximum of 22 metres. In comparison, the remaining amenity areas for 71 and 73 West End Avenue would equal approximately 330m² each. The amenity space provision for the proposed house would therefore 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.

West End Avenue is a road that is characterised by a mixture of pairs of semi-detached purpose built maisonettes opposite and detached houses. In the surrounding roads, there is also a mixed pattern of semi-detached properties and detached houses. The predominant feature of a majority of these properties is the existence of steep pitched roofs and bay window features. 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 and pitched roof imitates the predominant character of this area.

A dense Laurel hedge to an approximate height of 2 metres currently covers the frontage of the site. A number of large Conifers and five fruit trees would be lost, however it is not thought that these trees warrant special protection and therefore there is no objection to their loss. A suggested landscaping condition has been attached to safeguard the appearance and character of the area (particularly the front boundary hedge) and to enhance the appearance of the development. In line with this, the proposed hard standing would be complemented, greening the development further in the street scene in accordance with policies D4 and D9.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

The proposal does not project beyond the rear wall of the adjacent property at 79 West End 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.

The proposal involves facilitating a ground floor flank kitchen window on the eastern elevation facing 73 West End Avenue. This window would be located a distance of 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.

Continued/...

There are two further windows on the first floor flank wall of the same elevation, and these windows serve bathrooms. It was considered that because these windows are at a higher level they have a greater potential for overlooking of the neighbouring gardens. These windows have been revised to guarantee that they are high level and obscure to ensure that they do not pose a threat to the privacy of the occupiers at 73 and 71 West End Avenue and they are now considered acceptable.

There are two further windows on the western flank wall; the proposed ground floor window is a secondary window to a dining room and the first floor window serves an ensuite. The position of these windows is considered to be acceptable. The ground floor window would face the blank flank wall of the integral garage belonging to 79 West End Avenue and likewise the first floor window would face onto the flank wall of the property, therefore there is not considered to be any unreasonable impacts with regards to overlooking.

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the area would be likely to increase through the movement of people and vehicles as a result of the proposal. However the site is located in an urban area where such activity is to be expected, therefore it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The submitted plans indicate details related to storage of refuse/recycling, which is now 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

This proposal seeks to introduce a dropped kerb adjacent to the dropped kerb at 79 West End Avenue. It is considered that the corner of the road is located a sufficient distance from the proposed vehicle crossover and as such it is considered that this location is acceptable in relation to the safety of the adjacent highway.

The proposed development makes the provision for two off-street car parking spaces on the frontage of the site and one space within the garage. 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.

Continued/...

On-street parking in this location is resident permit controlled and it is considered that due to the site being within a sustainable location (within walking distance of Pinner District Centre and all associated amenities), the Council can ensure that no undue pressure is introduced to the on-street parking situation, therefore through the Council's highway powers and the relevant residents parking traffic order, no permits will be issued to future occupiers. In these circumstances a parking reason for refusal could not be justified.

4) Consultation Responses

- Potential reduction of residents parking spaces – matter for the highways authority
- Increase in traffic, loss of trees, loss of outlook, elevation treatment out of character, noise and disturbance – issues dealt with in report above

CONCLUSION

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

Continued/...

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO BOTH HOUSES

K H HIRANI for N H HIRANI & K K HIRANI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 6-8LLC/NOV/05/01 (Revision 1), /02 (Revision 2), /03, /04 (Revision 3), /05 (Revision 3)

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Completed Development - Buildings

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:
 1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,and that work falls within the scope of the Act.
Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.
A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:
ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB
Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237
Textphone: 0870 1207 405
E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net
Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

Continued/...

- 3 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION -
HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION:
The decision to grant planning permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development – Amenity Space and Privacy

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Residential Amenities (SD1, D4, D5, Householder SPG)
- 2) Character of the locality (SD1, D4, D5)
- 3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Site to southern side of Languard Crescent, on corner plot adjacent to the entrance to the spur road.
- Site occupied by a pair of semi-detached dwellings (numbers 6 and 8).
- Number 8 has existing end gable and large rear dormer window. These were constructed after a Certificate of Lawfulness was obtained.
- Number 6, immediately adjacent to the corner has no rearward extension.
- Number 10, adjacent property to the west is built 2m further forwards than the application properties
- Number 10 has a single storey rear extension 3.6m in depth.
- The land slopes gently downwards towards the rear of the properties.

c) Proposal Details

- Construction of a single storey rear extension:
 - 3-metre depth from the main rear wall of both properties.
 - Width of 12.3 metres across the rear of both properties.
 - Height of 3.2 metres calculated at the mid point of the pitched roof
 - No flank windows proposed

Continued/...

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|---------------|--|------------------------|
| P/2427/05/DFU | Single storey rear extension at No.6 Langland Crescent | GRANTED 18-NOV-2005 |
|---------------|--|------------------------|

e)

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|
| Notifications | Sent 3 | Replies 1 petition (173 signatures) | Expiry 27-DEC-2005 |
|----------------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|

Summary of responses: Look of the entrance to the crescent will deteriorate; Conversion will change the character of the area; Depth of the conversions will block sunlight; Rear elevation is a gross mismatch to the character of the area; Development is not in keeping with the existing residential format of the area; Extension may breach restrictive covenants; Development will be disproportionate alongside other houses; Could set precedent for further developments; Scaffolding has been present for over one and a half years.

APPRAISAL

1) Residential Amenities

The depth of this proposal of 3m beyond the rear main wall of the property pays due regard to the relevant SPG and, considering its siting 4m from the nearest adjacent property is considered acceptable. Due to the sloping nature of the application site, the proposal will measure 3.5m high where the pitched roof adjoins the house and 2.9m in height at the roof eaves, with the height at midpoint of the pitch calculated to be 3.2m. SPG guidance states that a height of 3m is acceptable where such structures abut residential boundaries. Given this proposals distance 2m from the residential boundary and 4m from adjacent property No.10 Langland Crescent, the height of 3.2m is acceptable. Overall in view of the proposals distance from the nearest adjacent property, its modest scale and the particular site circumstances, it is not considered to cause any detriment to the nearby residential amenities.

2) Character of the locality

Whilst it is acknowledged that No's 6 and 8 Langland Crescent occupy a prominent position within the locality, the proportions of the proposal, being single storey in nature and incorporating a pitched roof are not considered to either be out of keeping with the character of the area or disproportionate with regard to the houses to which they will be ancillary.

Continued/...

3) Consultation responses

- **Could set precedent for further developments:** Each application is considered separately on its own merits against the Council's policies and guidelines.
- **Scaffolding has been present for over one and a half years:** Not material to the planning decision

CONCLUSION

For all of 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/...

CHANGE OF USE: TYRE/EXHAUST FITTING (CLASS B2) TO CAR RENTAL (SUI GENERIS)

PAUL WILLIAMS for ENTERPRISE RENT-A-CAR UK LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordinance Survey and Un-numbered Drawing

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:
Mon - Friday - 08.00 - 18.00hrs
Saturday - 09.00 - 12.00hrs (mid-day) and not at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays
REASON: to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents
- 3 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 4 Completed Development - Use

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SEM2 Hierarchy of Town Centres
SEM3 Proposals for New Employment-Generating Development
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
EM8 Enhancing Town Centres
EM18 Change of Use of Shops - Designated Shopping Frontages of Local Centres
EM22 Environmental Impact of New Business Development

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of Area (D4)
 - 2) Amenity of Neighbours (EM22)
 - 3) Council Policy (SEM2, SEM3, EM8, EM18)
 - 4) Access/Highway Safety
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

| | | |
|-------------------|------------|----|
| Car Parking: | Standard: | 0 |
| | Justified: | 17 |
| | Provided: | 17 |
| Council Interest: | None | |

b) Site Description

- Vacant flat roofed property with front parapet previously occupied by a tyre and exhaust (Class B2) business
- Applicant site faces Harrow and Wealdstone Station on The Bridge with the flyover bridge at George Gange Way running to the east of the property
- Site is situated at the designated southern part of Wealdstone Local Centre
- Surrounding area consists predominantly of ground floor commercial uses with residential above
- Adjoining open site to the east between the applicant property and the flyover bridge
- Properties adjoining the west of the site include offices and retail units with some premises currently vacant
- Change in ground levels between The Bridge and Masons Avenue, with single storey applicant property linking to two-storey building at No.14 Masons Avenue to the north
- Ground floor of No.14 Masons Avenue is currently used as a car repair premises and is separate to the applicant property
- Other properties on The Bridge are two to three-storey, with a mixture of flat roofs and setback pitches, with slope in ground level from application site to junction with Masons Avenue

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use from Tyre/Exhaust Business to Car Rental
- Internal alterations to accommodate this change of use

Continued/...

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|--------------|--|----------------------|
| LBH/3543 | Change of use from motor showroom to retail sale and fitting vehicle silencers | GRANTED 12-AUG-69 |
| LBH/11210/1 | Change of use from discount furniture warehouse to retail shop | GRANTED 15-JAN-76 |
| P/454/04/DAD | 96 sheet internally illuminated advertisement hoarding | REFUSED 03-NOV-04 |

e) Applicant's Statement

- Difference between applicants business and other car-rental firms is that it specialises in renting replacement cars to customers whose own cars are being serviced or repaired
- Deliveries and collections are made exclusively within the operating hours of 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am to noon Saturday while all branches are closed on Sundays
- Rental cars are 'valeted' on site but no repairs or mechanical maintenance are carried out
- Rental vehicles are not routinely carried by transporter, but once or twice a year one may bring a batch of new vehicles
- No more than 15% of rental vehicles should ever need to be stored on site at any one time – the parking spaces at this branch will therefore be more than ample
- In the unlikely event that more rental vehicles did have to be parked, they would be spread among other branches nearby or sent to the company's regional overflow parking facilities.

f)

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Notifications | Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| | 13 | 0 | 09-NOV-2005 |

APPRAISAL

1) Character of Area

The applicant unit is situated at the southern part of Wealdstone designated Local Centre and as such the character of the surrounding area is predominantly commercial. The applicant property represents the eastern most unit in a terrace of 7 separate commercial units. Some of these commercial premises are currently vacant while the remainder are in use as B1 offices, A2 services and A1 retail. All of the buildings within the terrace face Harrow and Wealdstone Station directly opposite the applicant site.

Continued/...

Properties on The Bridge are two to three storey with a mixture of flat roofs and setback pitches. The proposed change of use will not affect the external appearance of the building and therefore will not detract from the existing character and appearance of the immediate area. The applicant property is currently vacant and in a dilapidated state and its re opening as a commercial premise would enhance the terrace and add some vibrancy and vitality to the surrounding area. A granting of permission therefore would have a positive effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

2) Amenity of Neighbours

The proposed change of use is not considered to have a negative impact on local residential amenity levels. There are no residential units within the remaining properties on The Bridge. The upper floors of some buildings along Masons Avenue represent the nearest residential dwellings to the applicant site. A change of use from car repairs to car rental would be more amenity friendly in any case. A more office like use would replace the potential noise from machinery involved in a car repair workshop and as such the proposed change of use would impact positively on local residential amenity.

3) Policy Context

The applicant site is situated within a proposal site as designated by Harrow Councils 2004 UDP. The proposal site consists of the triangular development block bounded by The Bridge to the South, Masons Avenue to the North and the George Gange Way Flyover to the East. The Council is of the opinion however that as the current application relates to a minor part of the designated proposal site and involves a change of use, the granting of permission would not affect the development potential of the proposal area.

Harrow Council Policy SEM3 states that the Council will consider favourably proposals for employment generating uses in suitable locations with good public transport links. The applicant site is currently vacant and has been for some time. A separate car repair premises, currently in operation, is situated towards the rear of the applicant site and is accessed from Masons Avenue. This car repair unit is separate to the applicant site and as such, any granting of permission for a change of use would have no negative effect on its business while a car repair use would still remain within the immediate vicinity of the applicant property. A change of use to a car rental would guarantee a more effective use of the premises as well as creating a small number of new jobs. Its location directly opposite Harrow and Wealdstone train station also ensures that the proposal complies with policy SEM3.

The conversion of a vacant property to a commercial unit would also enhance the vitality and attractiveness of Wealdstone Local Centre as advocated by Harrow Council Policy EM8. The proposals positive effect on local residential amenity levels also ensures compliance with Harrow Council Policy EM22.

Continued/...

4) Access/Highway Safety

The applicant states that all cars would be stored on site within the building and that there will be no need for cars to be parked outside the property. Any permission would be conditional to the applicant adhering to a condition restricting the storage of rental cars to within the building only and a condition stating that no parking will be permitted outside the property. The nature of the use proposed would also suggest that the clientele would not be car owners when availing of the service provided while the site's location ensures easy access to and from public transport facilities.

The proposal has been referred to the Councils Highways Department who have responded with no objection to the change of use.

CONCLUSION

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

Continued/...

150 ROXETH GREEN AVE, SOUTH HARROW

2/04

P/2743/05/DFU/PDB

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CONVERSION OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS;
FORCOURT PARKING AND BIN STORE

JAMES RUSH ASSOCIATES for R KANWAR

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 0284.1 Rev. A

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a metric scale drawing and specification detailing the hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt, to include screening of refuse storage, and rear parking area has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the landscaping works have been completed in accordance with the details so approved and shall thereafter be retained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure that the development makes a positive contribution to the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
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

Continued/...

2 **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant is advised that for the purposes of fulfilling the requirements of condition 4 the landscaping details should include: a schedule of plants and densities/numbers in relation to the soft landscaping areas, means of screening the refuse bins, elevations and materials details of the retaining walls, and the materials to be used in the hardsurfacing works. The drawing should also show the parking spaces to minimum dimensions of 2.4m wide x 4.8m deep.

3 **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

4 **INFORMATIVE:**

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
- and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Conversion Policy (H9) including Forecourt Treatment (D9), Disabled Persons' Access (H18) & Parking and Access (T13)
- 2) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

Continued/...

b) Site Description

- two storey mid-terrace dwelling on east side of Roxeth Green Avenue, South Harrow; dwelling unextended with retained front garden and detached garage at rear adjacent to service road accessed via Dudley Road
- both adjoining terraced dwellings unaltered and occupied as single family dwellings; all dwellings in this terrace (nos. 140-152 even) raised up from road with retained front gardens and no forecourt parking
- on-street parking in Roxeth Green Avenue not controlled but proposed CPZ extension would include adjacent stretch
- UDP designated Roxeth Green Avenue as a borough distributor road

c) Proposal Details

- Conversion to two self-contained flats: 2 x one bed
- alterations to forecourt to provide (as amended) one parking space and bin storage

d) Relevant History

- Plans amended to show forecourt layout of one parking space, 4 x bins, 2 x recycling boxes, landscaping and retaining wall. Further parking space shown at rear with access from service road.

e) Applicant's Statement

- None.

f) Notification

Sent: 9

Replies: 0

Expiry: 01-DEC-2005

APPRAISAL

1) Conversion Policy

Policy H9 of the replacement UDP undertakes to permit flat conversions subject to considerations of accommodation quality, sound insulation, amenity space provision, traffic/highway safety and forecourt treatment. In these regards, the proposal is assessed as follows:

- The proposal would form one flat on each floor, both comprising two habitable rooms (one bedroom) each; they would be accessed via the existing front door with a new communal hall/lobby.

Continued/...

- It is considered that the room sizes and layout of each of the flats would be satisfactory. The ground floor flat would have direct access to the garden and the general circulation arrangements within the communal area are also considered to be acceptable. The proposed arrangement of the flats secures vertical alignment of bedroom and non-bedroom uses throughout the building (between the flats) and this would, it is considered, help to secure optimum living conditions for the future occupiers.
- A condition requiring sound insulation details to be agreed and provided prior to first occupation is suggested.
- The rear garden would be accessed directly from the ground floor flat the occupiers of which would have sole use of it; although the first floor flat would have no private outdoor amenity space it is recognised that obtaining direct access via an external stair would raise separate concerns about disturbance/overlooking and it is not considered that access via Dudley Road/the service access would be reasonable, given the distance involved. It is considered that the area available to the ground floor occupiers is acceptable, both in quantitative and qualitative terms, to meet the reasonable needs of future occupiers of that flat.
- As a single family dwelling of more than five habitable rooms, the existing dwelling would generate a UDP maximum standard parking requirement of 2 spaces; one space is provided in the garage at the rear although it appears unlikely that this has been utilised for parking purposes for some years. The proposed flats would generate a combined maximum standard parking requirement of three spaces (rounded up) which includes an element of visitor provision. As amended two spaces are provided on the site and at a ratio of one space per flat such provision is considered to be acceptable in this location.
- As originally proposed two of the parking spaces were to be provided on the forecourt. At officer's request however the scheme has been amended so that only one parking space is provided on the frontage and with one space at the rear; the amended forecourt parking space measures 2.15m wide x 4.7m deep. Such dimensions fall below the standard minimum of 2.4m x 4.8m but it is considered that this minor discrepancy can be dealt with as part of the condition requiring the submission of forecourt details. The amended scheme shows that there would be adequate space for refuse storage on the forecourt (a total of 4 bins and 2 recycling boxes) and adequate screening to avoid detrimental visual impact in the streetscene can be secured by condition. Details have also been sought and provided to demonstrate that the forecourt parking space can be provided on a level threshold appropriate to the adjacent highway with retaining walls. Although there is no other forecourt parking in this particular terrace it is a common feature of Roxeth Green Avenue as a whole and it is not therefore considered that the provision of one space on the frontage, together with the associated interruption of the grass verge to form vehicular access, would so significantly affect the visual amenity of the streetscene as to be out of character with the locality.
- It is recommended that details of hard and soft landscaping on the forecourt – including control of the materials to be used in the retaining walls – be reserved by condition to ensure that the proposal makes an appropriate, positive contribution to the visual amenity and character of the locality.

Continued/...

In terms of the residential amenity of the surrounding neighbouring occupiers, including future occupiers of the new flats, it is considered that the proposal would lead to some increased residential use intensity on the site as expressed through additional comings and goings to the property, vehicular activity and general activity from two households within the building. However it is not considered that the degree of increase associated with two one-bed flats, from a three-bed single family dwelling, would so greatly affect the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers as to be of demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

Provision of Accessible Homes

Due to the change in levels that already exists between ground floor level and the highway it is not possible to gain satisfactory disabled persons' access between the front door and the pavement without substantial works to provide a ramp across the forecourt, which would prejudice the implementation of an acceptable forecourt layout with regard to parking, landscaping and refuse storage. In this unique circumstance and as only one, modestly sized flat would be lost from the potential supply of lifetime homes within the development (the first floor flat being accessed via stairs) it is not considered that the lack of disabled persons' access is unacceptable in this instance.

2) Consultation responses

None

CONCLUSION

For all of 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/...

TWO 2-STOREY SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES FRONTING STREATFIELD ROAD WITH FORECOURT PARKING

PHD CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS for HENRY HOMES PLC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site Plan, FO4.3946. 200, 201

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 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 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until there has been submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority, a scheme of hard and soft landscape works for the front garden which shall include a survey of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, indicating those to be retained and those to be lost. Details of those to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of the development, shall also be submitted and approved, and carried out in accordance with such approval, prior to any demolition or any other site works, and retained until the development is completed. Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans, and schedule of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and to enhance the appearance of the development.
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 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.

Continued/...

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) shall be installed in the east and west 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.
- 7 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 8 Disabled Access - Buildings

INFORMATIVES

- 1 INFORMATIVE:
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.
- 2 INFORMATIVE:
Harrow Council has published a leaflet "ACCESS FOR ALL", containing design guidelines for the provision of safe and convenient access for all disabled groups. A copy is attached.
- 3 INFORMATIVE:
The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:
1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
and that work falls within the scope of the Act.
Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.
A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:
ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB
Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237
Textphone: 0870 1207 405
E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net
Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>
- 4 INFORMATIVE:
The development hereby approved may be subject to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 which govern health and safety through all stages of a construction project. The Regulations require clients (ie those, including developers, who commission projects) to appoint a planning supervisor and principal contractor who are competent and adequately resourced to carry out their health and safety responsibilities. Clients have further obligations. Your designer will tell you about these and your planning supervisor can assist you in fulfilling them. Further information is available from the Health and Safety Executive Infoline on 0541 545500.

Continued/...

(Please note that any reference in this informative to "planning supervisor" has no connection with any Planning Officers within Harrow's Planning Services or with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

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

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

T13 Parking Standards

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| UDP Key Policies: | SD1, SH1, D4, D5, T13 | |
| Car Parking | Standard: | 3 |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 2 |
| Site Area: | 273m ² | |
| Habitable Rooms: | 6 | |
| No of Residential Units: | 2 | |
| Density - hrph: | 73 dph 220hrph | |
| Council Interest: | None | |

b) Site Description

- Land to rear of Nos.2, 4 and 6 Uppingham Avenue to form 11m wide building plot fronting Streatfield Road
- Western boundary abuts Nos. 1A, 1, 3 and 5 Morley Crescent East
- Detached double garage to rear of Nos. 1 and 1A Morley Crescent East fronts adjacent part of Streatfield Road; single detached garage to rear of No. 2 on part of application site also fronts Streatfield Road; triple width crossover serves all three

Continued/...

Item 2/05 : P/2850/05/DFU continued/...

- A further single crossover serves a gated access to the rear of No. 2; remainder of Streatfield Road boundary delineated by a 2m close boarded fence
- A street tree fronts the site in Streatfield Road
- Overall site area of 273m²
- On-street parking not controlled; Streatfield Road designated a Borough Distributor Road and served by local bus services

c) Proposal Details

- Pair of semi-detached houses in 2-storey building fronting onto Streatfield Road
- Each house would contain lounge and kitchen/diner on ground-floor with 2 bedrooms on first-floor
- Building would be sited between 4.8m and 5.7m from Streatfield Road frontage, 900mm passageway on each side next to adjacent rear garden boundaries, rear garden depths of 10.8m with areas of 56m² and 62m²
- Building shown with pitched, hipped roof and central porch serving both units.

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|--------------|--|----------------------|
| P/586/04/CFU | Two storey detached house fronting Streatfield Road with forecourt parking | REFUSED 22-APR-04 |
|--------------|--|----------------------|

Reason for Refusal:

"The proposal, by reason of the limited depth of the site at the rear, would appear as an overdevelopment of the site when viewed from surrounding gardens, would unduly limit the amount of amenity space for the development and would give rise to unreasonable overlooking of the adjoining garden at the rear, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the area, resulting in inadequate living conditions for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling."

An Informative was included on the decision notice, as follows:-

"INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that a revised application including the following amendments would be likely to be more favourably considered: expand the site to incorporate the rear part of the adjacent garden in Uppingham Avenue".

| | | |
|--------------|--|----------------------|
| P/430/05/DFU | Two Storey Detached House Fronting Streatfield Road With Forecourt Parking (Revised) | REFUSED 17-JUN-05 |
|--------------|--|----------------------|

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal would appear as an overdevelopment by reason of scale when viewed from surrounding gardens to the detriment of the residential amenities of the surrounding properties.
2. There is a limited amount of amenity space, which will be detrimental to the amenities of future occupiers due to the size of the site in proportion to the size of the property.
3. The proposal will give rise to overlooking to the detriment of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

Continued/...

e) Applicant's Statement

- Application designed in light of Inspector's findings and third party observations about discordant nature of detached dwellinghouse in an area dominated by semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses
- Properties set behind building line established by 2-storey flank walls of 2 Uppingham Avenue and 1A Morley Crescent West.
- Vehicular access from existing crossover from Streatfield Road
- One parking space for each house in same arrangement as accepted by Inspector
- One space per dwellinghouse would be adequate given locational advantages identified by Inspector, but additional space could be provided on opposite side of plot
- Will make effective use of under utilised urban land in location well served by public transport and accessible to range of community, education, social, retail, employment and other services
- Proposed building would accord with Council's space standards and would complement character and appearance of area
- Does not enlarge permitted building envelope.

f) Notifications

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 20 | 2 | 13-DEC-05 |

Response: Unacceptable increase in density, on-street parking, unsafe access onto Streatfield Road, overshadowing, loss of light, ugly side elevation, loss of trees, harm to other trees, loss of security, amendments should be made if granted, inadequate on-site parking, excessive size, height and scale of development

APPRAISAL

1) Character and appearance of area

The Inspector who determined the appeal proposal for 1 detached house on the site noted that the introduction of the proposed dwelling onto the site would be to a certain extent alien. However, he considered that on balance the appeal should be allowed because:-

- a) the architectural quality of the existing built environment of the area is not particularly distinguished;
- b) the uniformity of the layout of the area is not, in itself, especially worthy of protection;
- c) the basic urban grain of the area would not be significantly compromised by the proposal;
- d) the wider street pattern and arrangement would not be significantly harmed;

Continued/...

- e) the site in its present state and appearance contributes little to the quality of the local environment; and
- f) the appeal proposal is sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale and massing and would enhance the streetscene.

Given these comments there is no objection to this revised proposal for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposed pair of semi-detached houses would be more reflective of the local pattern and character of development than a detached dwellinghouse.
- (ii) The width and height of the proposed building replicates the appeal permission. Although the proposed design, which includes the new front porch structure, has changed slightly, the building would have no greater impact on the streetscene than the currently approved building.
- (iii) The provision of 2 parking spaces in the same position as currently approved, would allow planting elsewhere in front of the houses, to be the subject of a condition, and in this regard, the Inspector commented that he did not consider that there would be any significant loss to streetside greenness.
- (iv) In the light of these considerations it is considered that an acceptable impact would be provided on the character and appearance of the area.

2) Residential Amenity

In relation to this issue, the Inspector concluded that:-

- 1) the proposed dwelling would not significantly alter the prevailing situation with regard to privacy and overlooking
- 2) the impact on outlook would not be overbearing and would not be harmed to a significant extent, and
- 3) adequate rear garden amenity space would be provided.

Given the similarities in footprint, design and fenestration between this scheme and the appeal proposal, the impact on privacy, overlooking and outlook are considered to be comparable. In the light of the Inspector's comments, no objection is raised in relation to these issues. The major change relates to rear garden area. Whereas some 120m² would serve the approved dwelling in the appeal scheme, areas of 56m² and 62m² are shown for each dwelling in this scheme. However, these areas would be afforded a reasonable degree of privacy and as they serve small units of accommodation they are considered to be adequate. In addition Centenary Recreation Ground is only 400m from the site.

3) Parking and Traffic

The Inspector considered that the site constitutes previously developed land, in a sustainable area, with good access to local facilities and public transport. In the light of these comments it is considered that one parking space per dwelling would be adequate.

Continued/...

Although a third space could be provided elsewhere on the frontage (as mentioned by the applicant) this would reduce the scope for planting and is not considered to be a requirement in this location.

The Inspector raised no objection to the proposal in terms of traffic noise, manoeuvring or congestion, and it is not considered that this modest proposal would give rise to such problems.

4) Consultation Responses

- unacceptable increase in density – it is considered given the satisfactory impact which the scheme would provide as discussed above, that an excessive density of development would not be provided.
- Ugly side elevation – by the deletion of an approved 2-storey front gable feature the proposed side elevations would be less bulky than in the appeal proposal, but in essence otherwise are as previously approved
- Loss of trees, harm to other trees – the Inspector raised no concern in relation to this issue. In addition, there are no trees of significant amenity value within or adjacent to the site which require protection
- Other issues discussed in the 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.

REAR DORMER AND CONVERSION OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO THREE SELF CONTAINED FLATS (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

DAVID R YEAMAN & ASSOCIATES for MR P SHAH & MR M SHAH

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Plan Nos: 001; 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 on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scaled drawing detailing the hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt, to include access to and screening of refuse storage, disabled persons' access to the property and boundary treatment, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats hereby approved shall not be occupied until the forecourt has been laid out in accordance with the details so approved and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure that the development makes a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the streetscene and in the interests of disabled persons' access.
- 5 The bathroom window in the rear dormer hereby approved shall be obscure glazed and fixed closed below height of 1.8m above internal finished floor level.
REASON: In the interests of the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
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

Continued/...

H18 Accessible Homes

T13 Parking Standards

2 INFORMATIVE:

The relevant traffic order will impose a restriction making residential occupiers of this building ineligible for residents parking permits in the surrounding controlled parking zone.

3 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

4 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
3. excavating near a neighbouring building, and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

5 INFORMATIVE:

Notwithstanding the note on your submitted plan(s), this decision has been made on the basis of measurements scaled from the plan(s), unless a dimensioned measurement overrides it.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Amenity and Character of Rear Dormer (SD1, D4 & D5)
- 2) Conversion Policy (H9) including Forecourt Treatment (D9), Disabled Persons' Access (H18) & Parking and Access (T13)
- 3) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

Continued/...

b) Site Description

- two storey mid-terrace dwelling on north-east side of Welldon Crescent, Harrow; forecourt part soft-landscaped and enclosed by low-level brick wall; no off-street parking
- dwelling has substantial gable fronted two storey front projection, common to other dwellings in this road, giving a streetscene appearance of semi-detached dwellings; rear garden depth in excess of 25m but the property is on the inside bend of the crescent such that the garden boundaries taper at the rear
- rear garden bounded both sides by close-boarded timber fencing; rear garden contains a number of mature/semi-mature conifer trees
- both attached terraced properties are unextended single dwellinghouses
- site bounded at rear by flank gable wall of no. 55 Wellesley Road
- area characterised by mixed flat conversions and single family dwellings; on-street parking resident permit controlled

c) Proposal Details

- extension of roof to form rear dormer 0.5m from the party boundaries and 1m from the eaves measured externally along the roof slope
- conversion of extended property to three self contained flats: 2 x two-bed and 1 x one-bed

d) Relevant History

No. 80 Welldon Crescent

- P/2664/05/DFU: Single Storey Side/Rear Extension; Rear Dormer; Conversion to Five Self Contained Flats; refused 9th January 2006; reason:
 1. The proposal, by reason of inappropriate internal layout, would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the flats and would constitute an unsuitable conversion of the property.

No. 90 Welldon Crescent

- P/2713/04/DFU: Conversion of Dwellinghouse to Five Self-Contained Flats (Resident Permit Restricted); granted 9th December 2004

No. 64 Welldon Crescent

- P/2734/04/DFU: Single and Two Storey Rear Extension; Alterations; Conversion to Five Self-Contained Flats (Resident Permit Restricted); granted 26th November 2004

e) Notification

Sent: 12

Replies: 4

Expiry: 08/12/2005

Response: noise and disturbance from increased occupation and construction work, no parking provision for residents, visitors or construction vehicles, loss of privacy from dormer windows, siting of refuse bins would cause further loss of privacy and trespass; measures should be taken to ensure construction/completion within a reasonable time period; not notified (no. 53 Wellesley Road), noise from open windows of flats with no garden in summer; area already overcrowded/overdeveloped; converted properties often unkempt appearance; bins untidy and will end up on the frontage; residents' parking bays already over-subscribed; – all in contravention of UDP Policies (cited)

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and Character of Rear Dormer

The proposed rear dormer complies fully with the Council's guidelines for such developments. It is considered that the dormer would appear adequately contained within the rear roofslope and would not have an unduly overbearing visual impact in views from neighbouring gardens. Whilst the siting of this site in relation to Wellesley Road is such that the dormer would be more readily perceptible in the public realm than is conventionally the case with rear dormers, it is nonetheless considered that the appearance of the property in this nearby streetscene would remain satisfactory.

The rear gardens of property in this terrace are already overlooked by first floor windows and it is not considered that the dormer windows would so significantly add to the degree of overlooking as to be detrimental to the privacy amenity of the adjoining occupiers. With specific regard to the irregular side garden boundary with no. 101, it is noted that the nearest dormer window on this side would serve a bathroom and would therefore be obscure glazed. In relation to no. 55 Wellesley Road at the rear a distance in excess of 25m would be maintained and this is considered to be sufficient to also safeguard the privacy amenity of the occupiers of that neighbouring property.

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 flats would be accessed via an existing communal entrance – thereby retaining the appearance of a single dwelling in the streetscene - but otherwise each unit would be fully self-contained. The flats are considered to be satisfactory in terms of their size and circulation arrangements; in particular it is noted that the expanse of original roofspace in conjunction with the rear dormer allows for the provision of a conventional one-bed flat in the roofspace. The layout of the flats within the building secures broad vertical alignment of room uses and with a suitable scheme of sound-proofing, that can be secured by condition, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to substandard living conditions for future occupiers of the development.
- The existing rear garden would be retained in its entirety but would only be accessible from the ground floor flat. In view of the difficulties of securing garden access from upper flats in the conversion of terraced property balanced against the contribution of the conversion to housing supply, however, such a situation is not considered to be unacceptable in this instance. Future occupiers of the development could access public open space at Harrow Recreation Ground on Hindes Road, within a reasonable walking distance of the site, and accordingly it is not considered that the lack of garden access from the upper floor flats would disadvantage future occupiers.

Continued/...

- Application of the replacement UDP parking standard to the development results in a maximum, combined figure of 4 spaces. Despite its extensive size, when applied to the property as a single dwellinghouse the standard would give a maximum figure of just 2 spaces. No on-site parking is proposed and it is considered that its provision on the forecourt would be visually undesirable in the streetscene. However, given the sustainable location of the site occupiers would not be disadvantaged by non-car ownership (local shops and public transport services within a reasonable walking distance) and subject to resident permit restriction additional on-street parking stress can be prevented.
- Subject to a scheme for the detailed finish of the hard and soft landscaping works on the forecourt, to include access to and the housing of the wheelie bins, boundary treatment and disabled persons' access, it is considered that the amended proposal would have a satisfactory appearance in the streetscene. Such details could be required by condition in the event of an acceptable, revised proposal.

It is acknowledged that the conversion would increase residential activity on the site, expressed through comings and goings to the property and internally generated noise/disturbance (though not through use of the rear garden as this would only be available to the occupiers of the ground floor flat). However, taking into account general background noise levels in this location and as resident permit restriction of the development will eliminate much vehicular activity associated with the occupation of this property, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the residential amenity enjoyed by 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.

3) Consultation Responses

- noise and disturbance from increased occupation and construction work: construction noise/disturbance controlled by Environmental Health though considerate contractor informative suggested; otherwise dealt with above
- no parking provision for residents, visitors or construction vehicles: parking for residents & visitors dealt with above; construction vehicle parking arrangements a matter for Highways control
- loss of privacy from dormer windows: dealt with above
- siting of refuse bins would cause further loss of privacy and trespass: it is not considered that their siting would be detrimental to privacy but control of details by condition suggested to secure *inter alia* satisfactory access
- measures should be taken to ensure construction/completion within a reasonable time period: not a planning matter
- not notified (no. 53 Wellesley Road): will notify of any future application/appeal
- noise from open windows of flats with no garden in summer: dealt with above
- area already overcrowded/overdeveloped: additional units considered acceptable in this sustainable location

Continued/...

Item 2/06 : P/2803/05/DFU continued/...

- converted properties often unkempt appearance: observation noted but not considered to justify refusal
- bins untidy and will end up on the frontage: condition suggested to control the provision of satisfactory arrangements
- residents' parking bays already over-subscribed: dealt with above
- all in contravention of UDP Policies (cited): as appraised proposal is considered to comply with relevant UDP policies

CONCLUSION

For all of 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/...

303-305 STATION RD, HARROW

2/07

P/1679/05/DFU/RM2

Ward: GREENHILL

CHANGE OF USE: FIRST FLOOR FROM FITNESS AND SLIMMING CLUB (CLASS D2) AND OFFICES (CLASS B1) TO ADVICE AND COUNSELLING CENTRE (CLASS D1)

LEES LLOYD WHITLEY for MR GARY DAINES

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 02-03 & 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 on Full Permission - Three Years

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- ST1 Land Uses and the Transport Network
- T13 Parking Standards
- C8 Health Care and Social Services

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of Area (SD1 & ST1)
 - 2) Town Centre Uses (SD1, ST1, T13 & C8)
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member. The application was first reported to the Committee on 11th January 2006 but was deferred to secure clarification of the proposal and to allow additional consultation of social service providers.

Continued/...

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- 303-305 Station Rd is first and second floor offices above an A1 shop
- The building has access from the rear from a side road of Greenhill Rd
- The neighbouring properties are A1 Retail uses with ancillary uses or B12 office uses above

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use of the first floor from Fitness and Slimming Club (Class D2) to Advice and Counselling Centre (Class D1)

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------|
| WEST/662/93/FUL | Change Of Use: Part First Floor from Class A1 to Class B1 (Retail to Offices) and New Ground Floor Entrance | GRANTED 27-01-1994 |
| EAST/718/96/FUL | Change Of Use: Office to Fitness and Slimming Club (Class B1 to D2) at First Floor | GRANTED 25-02-1997 |

Further history not considered relevant.

e) Applicant's Statement

- The purpose of the premises is to provide advice and counselling for young people on both a drop in and appointment basis
- Confirmation that the second floor is not to be used by the applicants, at present there is no access to this floor and the applicants

f) Consultations

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 7 | 0 | 24-Nov-05 |

APPRAISAL

1) Character of Area

The client base would be young people visiting through a 'drop in' facility as well as by appointment.

The area is predominately shop front usages (A1-5) at street level and office use above ground floor. The access to the Advice and Counselling Centre will be from the existing shop downstairs. The centre will operate both appointments and a drop in centre. This will somewhat limit and control the number of people entering and leaving the premises however there may still be people who wish to wait for the drop in service.

Continued/...

2) Town Centre Uses

Policy C8 of the UDP recognises the need for Health and Social Services and facilities in the Borough to cater for the needs of the community. The site is located in the Harrow Metropolitan Centre. The site is within comfortable walking distance to a variety of public transport options including Harrow on the Hill Station with London Underground and Chiltern Line trains as well as bus services from Harrow Bus Station. These provide a variety of transport links. There are also public car parking facilities nearby. As the building is to be from the rear from the alley at the end of Havelock Place it is considered that there will not be an adverse level of impact on Highways. These are in accordance with the policies T13 and C8 of the UDP

Being close to the shopping centres in Harrow as well as the Library on Gayton Rd and other Town Centre facilities, this change of use will increase the variety of services and Town Centre facilities in the Harrow Metropolitan Centre thus assisting in reducing the number of trips required as stated in Policy ST1.

The proposed use is considered to have an overall similar impact on the neighbouring occupiers and to the Town Centre as the existing and so there is no reason why in principle the change of use to a D1 Counselling and Advice Centre should not be granted.

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/...

DEMOLITION OF DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT BUILDING TO PROVIDE 4 FLATS;
PARKING AT FRONT AND REAR

B J WOODFORD for ALBION HOMES

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: E0704TP, E0704F, 00/2239/4 Rev. C, 05/132/01 Rev. B

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt of the property, and to make good the areas adjacent to the parking spaces from Churchill Court at the rear, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied until the hard and soft landscaping works have been implemented in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: In the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality, and to secure satisfactory off-street parking space, in the interests of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the convenience of future occupiers of the approved development.
- 6 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.

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:

Continued/...

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

2 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

3 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
- and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Demolition and Replacement of Dwelling (SD1, D4 & D5)
- 2) Amenity and Character of Extensions (SD1, D4 & D5)
- 3) Conversion Policy (H9) including Forecourt Treatment (D9) & Parking and Access (T13)
- 4) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

Continued/...

b) Site Description

- two storey pebble dashed end of terrace dwelling on wedge shaped site to north-east side of Eastcote Avenue, South Harrow; original net floor area of 75m² but with lean-to conservatory at rear providing a further 16m²
- dwelling has current useable rear garden area of 108m²; front garden hardsurfaced but no crossover
- land adjacent to flank wall of existing dwelling last used to form construction access to three storey residential flatted development on land at rear; site separated from side boundary of no. 53 by footpath
- flatted development at rear now completed and occupied; separated by 1.8m close-boarded fence; nine spaces provided (two more than approved) with boundary landscaping
- adjoining mid-terrace dwelling to north-west, no. 57, has single storey extension adjacent to boundary at rear (3m deep approx)
- neighbouring end-of-terrace to south-east, no. 53, has single storey extensions to front, side and rear and landing window in facing first floor flank elevation
- on-street parking controlled and capacity limited by narrow carriageway width
- no. 66 on opposite side of road has two storey side extension with no set back but with gap between flank wall and side boundary

c) Proposal Details

- demolition of existing dwelling and replacement with two storey side/rear and single storey rear extensions
- formation of four flats within replacement building: 4 x one-bed

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|---------------|--|----------------------|
| P/611/05/DFU | Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Rear Extension and Conversion to Four Self-Contained Flats with Parking at Front and Rear | GRANTED 26-APR-04 |
| P/2206/03/DFU | Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Rear Extension and Conversion to Two Self-Contained Flats | GRANTED 12-NOV-03 |
| P/1326/03/DFU | Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Rear Extension | GRANTED 05-AUG-03 |

e) Notification

Sent: 24

Replies: 1

Expiry: 14/12/2005

Response: proposal basically welcomed; upheaval of construction traffic using road and Churchill Court; damage to car park/garden/fences should be made good at developer's expense; loss of garden and fence to allow parking access; noise and disturbance from extra parking; loss of value to Churchill Court flats; alternative arrangements should be made for car parking

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Demolition and Replacement of Dwelling

It is not considered that the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement would be detrimental to the amenity or character of this established residential locality.

2) Amenity and Character of Extensions

The proposal comprises a two storey side to rear extension, continuing the front main wall to a width of 3m and for a depth of 4.7m, then projecting further sideward by 0.8m and to a depth of 2.7m beyond the rear main wall. The main hipped roof would be extended over the side extension with a subordinate hipped element out to the rear. The flank wall would contain a bathroom window at first floor level.

A replacement single storey rear extension would have a depth of 3.3m and a height of 3m with a flat roof, to span the width of the original house and the extension. Due to the irregular side boundary the southeastern flank wall would be sited 0.9 and 1.6m from the side boundary and further separation from no. 53 is afforded by an adjacent footway. In relation to no. 57 the extension would be sited adjacent to the common boundary but its impact would be mitigated by the presence of an existing neighbouring rear extension. A rear garden depth of approx. 29m would be maintained.

The extensions fully replicate that originally approved under P/1326/03/DFU and again under subsequent applications P/2206/03/DFU and P/611/04/DFU, in accordance with the Council's guidelines for such developments. There has been no material change in circumstances. The proposal would be of no detriment to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality and subject to the conditions suggested remains acceptable.

3) Conversion Policy including Forecourt Treatment, Disabled Persons' Access & Parking and Access

Policy H9 of the replacement UDP undertakes to permit flat conversions subject to considerations of accommodation quality, sound insulation, amenity space provision, traffic/highway safety and forecourt treatment. In these regards, the proposal is assessed as follows:

- As approved under P/611/04/DFU the conversion would form four flats; each flat would now have two habitable rooms (one reception, one bed room) and would be of satisfactory size and circulation. The plans show living spaces at the rear and bedrooms at the front on both floors therefore securing an acceptable vertical layout.
- A condition requiring sound insulation details to be agreed and provided prior to first occupation is suggested.

Continued/...

- After the proposed extensions and rear parking spaces, the property would have a restored rear garden area of some 236m² and this is considered to be acceptable for four flats of the size proposed. Although there would be no direct access down to the garden from the first floor flats it would be possible for its occupiers to use the pedestrian access at the side.
- It remains, therefore, to consider the parking and highway safety implications. The existing dwelling would generate a UDP maximum standard parking requirement of 1.8 spaces; the proposal generates a combined maximum requirement for 4.8 spaces. As approved two parking spaces are proposed at the rear, utilising the existing access through Churchill Court. Although this would involve the loss of two spaces already provided for that development it is not considered that a refusal in terms of parking convenience/availability for the occupiers of Churchill Court is justified or could be sustained. Manoeuvring space would be satisfactory, and it is not considered that the degree of additional parking/vehicular activity associated with two spaces would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of Churchill Court. Loss of landscaping would be negligible and again, not considered to be unacceptable; any impact on adjacent landscaping within Churchill Court could be made good under the suggested landscaping condition. In addition to the two spaces proposed at the rear, the applicant has suggested that two could be accommodated on the hardsurfaced forecourt. With the crossover and street tree/verge fronting the premises, it is not considered that two spaces could be accommodated on the forecourt as shown on the submitted drawings. Although one space per unit is considered to be a suitable applicable ratio, in view of the proximity of the site to South Harrow district centre and its associated bus/rail links, it is not considered that a reason for refusal based on a shortfall of one space would be reasonable or sustainable.
- A condition seeking submission and approval of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt, as suggested, can be used to secure the satisfactory provision of one space on the forecourt. The submitted plans show refuse storage arrangements at the rear.

In terms of the residential amenity of the surrounding neighbouring occupiers, including future occupiers of the new flats, it is considered that the proposal would lead to some increased residential use intensity on the site as expressed through additional comings and goings to the property, vehicular activity and general activity from two households within the building. However it is not considered that the degree of increase associated with two one-bed flats, from a three-bed single family dwelling, would so greatly affect the living conditions of future and neighbouring occupiers as to be of demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

4) Consultation Responses

- upheaval of construction traffic using road and Churchill Court: not material to the planning decision
- loss of value to Churchill Court flats: not material to the planning decision
- All other matters addressed in the main report above.

Continued/...

CONCLUSION

For all of 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/...

18 BROOKSHILL AVE, HARROW

2/09

P/2973/05/CFU/RJS

Ward: HARROW WEALD

TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

B TAYLOR for MR & MRS HOOPER

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: AO/2836, AO/2882/1, AO/2883

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 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 plan no.AO/2883 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 **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:
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
SD1 Quality of Design
EP33 Development in the Green Belt
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant is advised that any window in the flank elevation of the development hereby permitted will not prejudice the future outcome of any application which may be submitted in respect of the adjoining property.
- 3 **INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Metropolitan Green Belt
Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Semi-detached property on cul-de-sac off Brookshill Avenue;
- Second last property in the row with open land to the north;
- The original dwelling has previously been extended by means of a single storey sun lounge and a large garage to the side, with caravan parked to the front;
- Significant number of single and two storey extensions to other properties in Brookshill Avenue, most notably Nos. 22 and 24 opposite.

c) Proposal Details

- Construct a double storey side extension to replace the existing garage and sun lounge with single storey utility to rear;

d) Revisions from Previous Scheme

- The approved development proposed a double storey side extension that extended from the front elevation to the rear of the building, with a single storey extension extending further behind. The side to rear extension had an overall depth of 11.2 m x 3.4 metres;
- The current application proposes a similar format of development except the extension has been greatly reduced in depth. Specifically the two storey extension would be attached only to the rear corner of the building and would have an overall depth of 5.7 x 3.4 metres;

e) Relevant Planning History

| | | |
|---------------|--|----------------------|
| P/1080/05/CFU | two storey side and single storey rear extension | GRANTED 12-OCT-05 |
|---------------|--|----------------------|

Continued/...

f) Consultations

| | | | |
|---------------------|------|---------|----------|
| Notification | Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| | 5 | 0 | 4-JAN-05 |

APPRAISAL

1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character

With respect of the extension of dwelling houses, Green Belt polices aim to restrict the increase in size of dwellings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard the openness of it. It is noted that the property has been previously extended, by means of a sun lounge infilling the rear corner of the building, and a garage to the side. Both the garage and sun lounge are to be removed as part of this application proposal.

With respect of the recently approved side to rear extension (P/1080/05/CFU), its overall size was deemed acceptable and was not considered to be disproportionate or detrimental to the Green Belt given the siting of the property in relation to the neighbouring properties and the size of approved extensions to other properties in Brookshill Avenue.

As the current application proposes a side to rear extension that has been drastically reduced in size, therefore there are no concerns with respect of Green Belt issues. Overall, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not to be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, given the siting in respect of the flank boundaries and neighbouring properties, and the similar size and bulk of the extensions with respect of other neighbouring extensions. Furthermore the additions actually reduce the size of buildings on site given the sun lounge and garage are to be demolished.

| | Original | Existing | % over original | Approved (P/1080/05/CFU) | % over original | Proposed | % over original |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Footprint (m ²) | 60.72 | 79.63 | 31% | 85.62 | 41% | 69.72 | 14.82% |
| Floor Area (m ²) | 111.24 | 130.15 | 17% | 157.93 | 42% | 128.24 | 15.28% |
| Volume (m ³) | 340 | 412 | 21% | 528 | 55% | 385 | 13.23% |

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed side extension would be sited away from any neighbouring property and would, therefore, not have any effect on them by way of overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy. The flank wall of the two-storey element would be sited 0.9m from the rear garden boundary of No.16 and a total distance of approximately 11m from the rear of that dwelling. A condition has been imposed on the flank wall to ensure no additional window would be installed at a later date. The proposed single storey bathroom/ utility room to the rear would away from the boundary with the attached property.

Continued/...

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.

Continued/...

ALTERATIONS TO ROOF OF 2 STOREY OFFICE/DISPLAY BUILDING TO PROVIDE GABLE ENDS, 2 X FRONT DORMERS, ROOF WINDOWS

A1 LOFTS LTD for LAWSONS

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site Plan, Three A1 plans referenced as P114/05 (rev P00A) received 20-JAN-06

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 The window(s) in the rear roofslope wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
 - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glassREASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

Notwithstanding the note on your submitted plan(s), this decision has been made on the basis of measurements scaled from the plan(s), unless a dimensioned measurement overrides it.
- 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
D7 Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of Area and Quality of Design (D4, SD1)
- 2) Context and Impact on Adjoining Properties (D4, D7)
- 3) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Site located near to the corner of Burnt Oak Broadway and Bacon Lane, opposite the Edgware Community Hospital.
- Timber yard use established before 1998 when site was redeveloped.
- Social club to north, commercial parade to south of site.
- Semi-detached residential properties located to rear of site, fronting Vancouver Road.
- Site contains a stand-alone shop/office/display building (subject of this application), timber storage building and racks, and a two-storey warehouse adjacent to the road frontage. The majority of the rest of the site is paved for vehicle access.

c) Proposal Details

- The application involves roof alterations to the existing shop/office/display building located inside the front entrance to the site, as follows:
 - Gable-ending both sides of the roof, creating a ridgeline parallel to the front boundary of the site.
 - Two pitched-roof dormers, in front roofslope
 - 3 velux windows in rear roofslope
 - window in north facing gable end
 - Chimney raised in height.
- The use of the first-floor of the subject building is to be retained as offices, with this use also extending into the proposed new floor in the loft space.

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------|
| EAST/710/97/FUL | 'Demolition of existing buildings, construction of warehouse, covered store, shop extension, racking and crossover'. | GRANTED |
| | This application established the site in its current form as a timber yard. | 30-Dec-97 |

e) Applicant's Statement

- None

Continued/...

f) Notifications

| | | |
|-------|----------|------------------|
| Sent: | Replies: | Expiry: |
| 17 | 4 | 21 December 2005 |

The proposal would result in overlooking of neighbouring properties in Vancouver Rd reducing privacy and character; the height would result in unacceptable visual amenity; suggested removal of rear windows; inadequate parking on site and in the area; the timber yard has breached conditions of previous permissions in the past; more office space will mean more staff which will result in on street parking in an already heavily parked area; over-development of the site; highway safety impacts from reversing onto road; the yard does not operate within the law; the roof extension will be overly bulky and be an eyesore.

APPRAISAL

1) Character of Area and Quality of Design

The pattern of existing development in the area is varied with a mix of retail and community uses in this section of Burnt Oak Broadway, with residential immediately behind. It is considered that this section of Burnt Oak Broadway is characteristically busy, particularly in terms of traffic.

The alterations to the building comprise of extending the ridgeline of the roof, and gabling the ends to provide a greater degree of internal usable space. The layout shown on plans indicates office use of this level consisting of approximately 37m² including the stairs area, and a maximum head height of 2.2m.

The proposed front dormers have a pitch corresponding to the slope of the existing roof. The dormers will be small in size and centered for the internal area, and will be symmetrically placed when viewed externally, so as to provide a satisfactory design and scale of roof extension.

As the building is set back from the road by just over 10m, and buffered from the north and south by 1.5 to 2 storey buildings, the additional bulk to the structure will be visible from Burnt Oak Broadway directly in front of the site. However, given its location away from the frontage, subordinate scale in relation to the adjacent warehouse and its acceptable design, it is considered that an acceptable impact would be provided on the appearance and the character of the surrounding area.

2) Context and Impact on Adjoining Properties

A previously proposed rear balcony has been deleted in revised plans thereby resolving an original objection to the proposals.

Continued/...

The proposed 3 velux windows in the rear roofslope consist of 2 high level and 1 at a lower level so that overlooking will not normally be possible. Obscure glazing is however suggested to obviate any perception of overlooking by neighbouring residents.

It is considered that the general bulk of the roof extensions will be sufficiently set away from the rear boundary so as not to cause any unreasonable impact on adjacent properties. The proposed window in the northern gable end would face towards the adjacent Social Club and can therefore be accepted.

3) Consultation Response

- Inadequate parking on site and in the area, more office space will mean more staff which will result in on-street parking in an already heavily parked area, highway safety impacts from reversing onto road.
 - Consideration of traffic and parking matters is not considered to be necessary in the context of the proposed development, as there is no unreasonable change to the intensity of the activity on site, and the surrounding area is very well serviced by public transport.
- The timber yard has breached conditions of previous permission in the past, the yard does not operate within the law.
 - The suggested non-compliance of the timber yard operation with prior conditions of approval is irrelevant to the subject application and is being dealt with through the appropriate channels.
- Other issues discussed in report.

CONCLUSION

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

Continued/...

THIRD FLOOR EXTENSION TO BOTH SIDES AND CONVERSION FROM ONE TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS (RESIDENT PERMITT RESTRICTED)

MR PAUL PARSONS for MR ROY SIPPY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: HA13QP/01-Rev. A & 02-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 on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 The development works hereby approved shall not take place outside of the following hours:-
Monday - Friday 8am-6pm
Saturday 8am-1pm
Sunday and Bank Holidays - No works unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupiers of the 2nd floor flats.
- 4 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 5 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 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.
- 6 The rear facing bathroom window to flat 13, shown on the approved drawing HA13QP/02-Rev A shall be obscure glazed and fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above internal finished floor level.
REASON: In the interests of the privacy amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring flat.
- 7 No windows or other openings, including any for fume extraction, shall be installed in the rear extension wall of approved flat 14 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: In the interests of the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring flat.

Continued/...

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

2 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

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

H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats

T13 Parking

3 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
 2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
 3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
- and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

4 INFORMATIVE:

The relevant traffic order will impose a restriction making residential occupiers of this building ineligible for residents parking permits in the surrounding controlled parking zone.

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
 - 2) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
 - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5, EP25)
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

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

| | | |
|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| Car Parking | Standard: | 2.6 |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 0 |
| Council Interest: | None | |
| Number of Units: | 1 additional | |

b) Site Description

- Three and four storey block of fourteen flats located on north-east side of Sheepcote Road, Harrow
- As currently arranged, there are two flats in the front half and two flats in the rear half of the building on the ground, first and second floors
- On the third floor there are only two flats – one each towards the front and rear respectively
- By reason of the reduced width of this storey, these top floor flats have roof terraces to both sides
- The south-eastern terrace to the rear flat has been fully enclosed by the addition of a conservatory and the north-western terrace to the front flat contains a greenhouse
- Neighbouring site to north-west, Kensington Heights, occupied by three and four storey flatted redevelopment (three storey element adjacent) with secondary windows in facing flank wall and balconies to adjacent part of rear
- Neighbouring site to south-east, Shepherds Court, occupied by four storey flatted development with main room windows and balconies in facing flank elevation; single and two storey building at rear occupied by Red Cross
- Four and five storey residential blocks 'Nightingale Court' on opposite side of Sheepcote Road
- Chester Court and Shepherds Court separated by spur road (onto Sheepcote Road) serving rear parking areas of Kensington Heights, Chester Court, Shepherds Court and Tempsford Court; gardens to Northwick Park Road dwellings beyond rear
- Sheepcote Road designated a London distributor road with no on-street parking; bus stop outside site

Continued/...

c) Proposal Details

- Proposal relates to the front flat on the third floor and seeks to extend out onto the terrace on each side
- The proposed extensions are set back from the front main elevation by 1.5 metres (preserving the remaining external space as a terrace)
- Proposal to the same roof height as original building
- On the north west side, the proposed extensions are 6.8 metres deep and contains 3 windows serving a habitable room and a kitchen
- On the south east side, the proposed extensions are 5.5 metres deep and contains 2 flank windows serving a bedroom and an ensuite window to the rear facing elevation
- The extended flat would be subdivided to form 2 separate flats but these are appraised separately below

d) Relevant History

- P/2255/04/CFU: Redevelopment to Provide Detached Two Storey Block of Four Houses with Replacement Parking Spaces (Rear of Chichester Court); refused 31st January 2005; reasons:
 1. The proposed development would look incongruous and out of place on this backland site, relate unsympathetically in visual terms to neighbouring properties, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area.
 2. The proposed development, by virtue of its location, would provide an unsatisfactory form of development with an unacceptable level of amenities for the intended occupiers and a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents.

An appeal against this decision is undetermined.

| | | |
|------------|--|----------------------|
| LBH/2129/4 | Erection of 14 Flats and 14 Garages with Access Road (in Compliance with Conditions 1, 1A, 1B, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 & 10 of Planning Consent 3/10/67) | GRANTED 12-AUG-68 |
| LBH/2129/1 | Erection – 14 Flats and 14 Garages with Access Road (Outline) | 03-OCT-67 |

e) Applicant's Statement

- None

f) Notifications

| | | |
|------|---------|-----------|
| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| 118 | 2 | 12-DEC-05 |

Continued/...

Summary of Response – Noise, disturbance, inconvenience, parking, pollution, appearance of the building, freeholder has had no representation put to them, any such request for extensions will be denied.

+ 1 Petition containing a total of 13 signatures objecting to the proposed development
– noise, restrictions on lease (no alterations without permission of freeholder), parking

APPRAISAL

1) Conversion Policy

Policy H9 of the replacement UDP undertakes to permit flat conversions subject to considerations of accommodation quality, sound insulation, amenity space provision, traffic/highway safety and forecourt treatment. In these regards, the proposal is assessed as follows:

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

Access to the flats would be via the existing internal communal lobby and stairs, though internal alterations would be required to form an additional opening onto the third floor landing. The flat to the southeast side of the split would comprise two habitable rooms (one bedroom) whilst that on the northwest side would comprise three habitable rooms (two bedrooms). In terms of their size and circulation the flats are considered to provide satisfactory living conditions for their future occupiers.

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

The flat to the south-east side of the split would stack inconsistently with the existing second floor flat below, in terms of the vertical arrangement of bedrooms and living rooms. However, in respect of new-build additions to existing flatted property, this issue was recently considered at appeal (Churchill Court, APP/M5450/A/05/1180300); the Inspector concluded:

“9. With regard to the potential problem [of noise] I identify in paragraph 7, the explanatory text to Policy EP25 states that development should be designed to minimise domestic noise through sensitive layout, good sound insulation, landscaping etc. However there is no indication in that policy that sound insulation should be relied on only in combination with other matters such as layout, and in this case subsequent changes in internal layout could not be controlled effectively”.

Continued/...

“10. Furthermore the risk of harm through noise is controlled by the Building Regulations 1991 which impose requirements for sound insulation between dwellings and which have been extended to cover sound insulation between converted flats. Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning & Noise, states that the Government considers that the Building Regulations are the most appropriate means of control for sound insulation in such cases. In this case there is no evidence to indicate that it would not be practical to install sound insulation to Building Regulations standards. Bearing in mind the purpose built nature of existing building, I am satisfied that there would be scope to resolve the potential problem by that means”.

In view of the above it is considered that the amenity of future and existing occupiers, in terms of noise and vibration between the flats, can be adequately safeguarded under the Building Regulations.

- **The level of usable amenity space**

The existing block benefits from communal amenity space of approximately 200m² to the rear and side, and the proposed flats would each have a private balcony area of 5m². In view of this town centre location and the established character of communal/balcony amenity space provision of developments in this part of Sheepcote Road, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

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

No alterations to the existing forecourt are proposed nor would any be likely to arise. Details of the additional refuse storage requirements could be controlled by condition.

- **Traffic and Highway Safety**

Application of the replacement UDP parking standard to the development results in a maximum, combined figure of 2.6 spaces. When applied to the existing flat the standard would give a maximum figure of just 1.6 spaces. The application forms state that there is no existing car parking and that none is proposed (though it was noted on site that there is an extensive garage block to the rear and further surface parking to one side). Again, however, in view of the proximity of the site to the town centre it is considered that the flats occupy a sustainable location where future occupiers would not be disadvantaged by non-car ownership. Occupiers would have access on foot to a range of shops and services within the town centre and there are good links for local bus and regional train services. In view of established controls in Sheepcote Road there would be no detriment to the free flow and safety of traffic using the adjacent London distributor road.

Continued/...

2) Character of Area

It is considered that the extensions are well designed in character with this original 1960's building. The setback from the front helps to preserve the profile and proportions of the front elevation, providing an appropriate degree of visual articulation to the building when viewed both face-on and obliquely across the spaces either side of the site. The design of the windows/doors are considered to be acceptable and the use of render to the extension walls would provide welcome visual contrast to the existing brick faces, particularly on the flank walls. (It can be noted that there are horizontal bands of render to the front elevation so its use on the extension would not be out of character). A matching material condition is suggested.

Subject to the condition suggested it is not therefore considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity or character of the locality.

3) Residential Amenity

A distance of 17.5m would be maintained between the flank wall of the proposal and that facing at Kensington Heights. As the proposal would reach a height of only 11m above ground level it can be noted that an upward 45° line from the facing windows – which are not believed to be protected – would nonetheless be maintained. Similarly as a distance of 20m would be maintained between the flank wall on the other side and the facing elevation of Shepherds Court an upward 45° line from facing windows – some of which are believed to be protected, would also be generously cleared. Accordingly it is not considered that the proposal would detrimentally affect light to neighbouring residential windows. Neither would the proposal appear unduly overbearing or obtrusive in the outlook of the neighbouring windows and balconies.

In terms of overlooking, it is not considered that the proposal would materially exacerbate existing relationships between properties in this location, given the separation distances involved. Specifically it can be noted that there are existing full-size windows in the three-storey flank wall facing Kensington Heights and the third floor balcony already provides for overlooking opportunity at third floor level. On the southeastern side – where there is greater separation – overlooking already occurs from the flank conservatory to the rear third floor flat and again the subject flat already has a balcony on this side. The retained balconies at the front would face Nightingale Court obliquely across a distance of approx. 35m, so no change from the existing arrangement. The proposal's siting towards the front of the building is such that it would not affect property beyond the rear in Northwick Park Road. The en-suite window in the rear elevation would face the conservatory to the existing rear flat at a distance of only 2.5m but this would serve a bathroom and can therefore be obscure glazed and fixed shut below eye level – conditions suggested.

Continued/...

In relation to the rear third floor flat the north-west extension would extend sideward immediately adjacent to that property's terrace on this side, whilst the south-east extension would (as established above) have a separation of 2.5m from that property's conservatory addition. However the extensions would have a height of just 2.7m above third floor level and the use of a flat roof would further limit the degree of bulk as viewed from the rear flat's demise. In these circumstances it is not considered that the degree of lost light of the extent of visual bulk as viewed from the neighbouring rear flat would be so significant as to warrant refusal. Neither is it considered that there would be any substantial impact on light to the flank communal stairwell window.

Subject to the condition suggested it is not therefore considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the privacy or amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

It is acknowledged that the conversion would increase residential activity on this side expressed through comings and goings to the property, use of the amenity space and activity within the communal lobby/stairs etc. However, taking into account general background noise levels in this location, activity generated by existing flats within this block and as on-street parking controls will eliminate much vehicular activity associated with the occupation of this property, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the residential amenity enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

4) Consultation Responses

- Freeholder has had no representation out to them: Notice No.1 reserved
- Any such request will be denied: noted but this is outside the planning process
- Pollution: it is considered that the proposal would not materially increase pollution
- All other matters dealt with 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.

Continued/...

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION;
CONVERSION TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

MEL-PINDI for BISON LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 25Hawt/1, 2E, 3C, 4D, 5, 6A, site plan

GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:-

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 4 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) – 4
- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing the forecourt layout, to include screened refuse storage, disabled persons' access to the front door and soft-landscaping arrangements, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the forecourt has been laid-out and planted in accordance with the details so approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
Reason: To ensure a satisfactory forecourt layout, in the interests of the amenity of future occupiers and the character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES

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

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Extensions (SD1, D4 & D5)
 - 2) Conversion and Related Policy (H9, D4, D9, EP25)
 - 3) Parking and Access (T13): Previous Reason for Refusal No. 1
 - 4) Residential Amenity (H9): Previous Reason for Refusal No. 2
 - 5) Consultation responses
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to the Committee as a petition opposing the development has been received and the recommendation is for grant. A Members' site visit in connection with the previously refused application on this site was carried out on 4th September 2004. The application was deferred from the meeting on 11th January 2006 for clarification about the revisions to the proposal.

a) Summary

| | | |
|-------------------|------------|-----------|
| Car Parking: | Standard: | 3 maximum |
| | Justified: | 2 |
| | Provided: | 2 |
| Council Interest: | None | |

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached dwelling on south side of Hawthorn Drive, North Harrow; dwelling has attached garage and forecourt parking with single-width vehicle crossing and planting bed across remaining front boundary
- attached semi to west, no. 27, unextended to adjacent part of rear
- neighbouring property to east, no. 23B, is a semi-detached bungalow with fully hardsurfaced forecourt; facing flank wall has obscure-glazed window and main entrance to the property
- on-street parking not controlled but capacity limited due to narrow carriageway width and crossovers serving existing property
- electricity power-lines pass over the existing gap between nos. 23B and 25

c) Proposal Details

- extensions to dwelling as follows:
 - single storey rear, 3m deep and with flat roof over; due to slight fall in levels at rear flank walls would vary in height between 3m and 3.4m
 - two storey side extension 2.4m wide up to boundary with no. 23B and with 1m set-back at first floor front; subordinate hipped roof over with recessed eaves/gutter detail
 - single storey front extension projecting 0.4m forward of the front main wall and with lean-to roof over returning to recessed first floor front wall

Continued/...

Item 2/12 : P/1556/05/DFU continued/...

- conversion of extended dwelling to two flats, as follows:
 - ground floor: 1 x three-bed (four habitable room) flat
 - first floor: 1 x two-bed (three habitable room) flat
 - access from front via shared lobby and single front door
 - access to rear garden direct from ground floor and via internal staircase from first floor
- rear garden area of 171m² retained
- proposed alterations to forecourt to provide two parking spaces, refuse storage and disabled persons' access and retain an area of planting

This application is a reconsideration of that previously refused under P/921/04/DFU in the light of parking survey data and a Committee decision in the interim.

d) Relevant History

P/921/04/DFU Two Storey Side, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension; Conversion to Two Flats REFUSED 09-SEPT-2004

Reasons:

1. The proposed under provision in parking would give rise to overspill parking on this busy and narrow road to the detriment of highway safety and to the loss of residential amenity.
2. The proposed development would give rise to increased noise and activity which would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

e) Notification

Sent: 8 Replies: 7 + petition (17 names)

Expiry: 25/07/2005

Response: road narrow, traffic uses as shortcut to Imperial Drive, congestion at school times, blockage to emergency vehicles, overdevelopment, out of character with single family houses, no under provision of parking should be accepted, noise transmission, rear extension will exceed 3m high contrary to guidelines, overbearing upon adjacent bungalow's front door, flats contrary to covenant, nothing changed since previous refusal, loss of light, add to parking by shoppers/commuters, no. 25 only 27'8" wide inadequate for parking and bins, disturbance, concern about building close to power lines (EDF Energy should be consulted), loss of green view/openness, overpowering appearance, circumstances of extension differ from others in street, loss of/damage to trees, precedent, will disrupt symmetry of houses/bungalows, overshadowing/loss of light (bathrooms still need light even though non-habitable), loss of amenity during construction, proposal differs from flats at no. 14, tenants of bad attitude will affect street.

CEGB PowerGen: No response

Continued/...

f) Applicant's Statement
None

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and Character of Proposed Extensions

The extensions remain, in all respects, as those proposed under P/921/04/DFU and to which no objection was raised. They would comply with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for such developments and there has been no material change in circumstances. Nonetheless, for the avoidance of doubt and in response to objector concerns, it can be noted that:

- The two-storey side extension would sit within 45° lines drawn, on plan, from the adjacent front and rear corners of the neighbouring bungalow no. 23B. No windows are proposed in the flank wall and as flats there would be no permitted development right for their future insertion. The facing bathroom window is not 'protected' for the purposes of the Council's guidelines and therefore, whilst regrettable, loss of light to it does not justify refusal of permission. Neither is it considered that the visual impact on the facing door is unacceptable.
- The single storey front extension would project only marginally beyond the front building line, but would remain behind the bay window and detached from it. Again, this accords with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines and there would be no unacceptable impact in the streetscene.
- The depth of the single storey rear extension would comply with the Council's guidelines for such developments to semi-detached property and, as amended, its height of 3m above adjacent ground level would also comply. In these circumstances it is not considered that the extension would unduly affect the amenity of the occupiers of no. 27; the impact on no. 23B would be further mitigated by that dwelling's siting off the boundary and further back in its plot.

Subject to the use of matching materials it is considered that the proposal would preserve the appearance of the dwelling when viewed in the streetscene and from neighbouring gardens. Overlooking from front and rear windows would be at an ordinary, oblique angle and at a proximity that is not out of character in this locality. Accordingly it is not considered that the degree of overlooking would be detrimental to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

2) Conversion and Related 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:

Continued/...

Item 2/12 : P/1556/05/DFU continued/...

- The units would be of a reasonable size and make satisfactory arrangements for circulation through the building.
- 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.
- It is considered that the rear garden area of 171m², left-over after the extensions, would meet the reasonable needs of future occupiers of the flats in terms of both quantity and quality. Access arrangements to the garden from both flats would also be satisfactory.
- In view of the history parking and access issues are considered separately below. It is considered that there would be sufficient space left on the forecourt, after the provision of two parking spaces, for a combined scheme of refuse storage and remedial landscaping works to be provided in a manner that would preserve the character of the streetscene and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It can be noted that the previous application was not refused for this reason and it is not considered that there has been any material change in circumstances.

Details of disabled access to, and egress from, the building have been indicated on the ground floor plan. Subject to further details, that could be required by condition, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in this respect.

3) Parking and Access : Previous Reason for Refusal No. 1

Policy T13 expects new development to make appropriate provision for car parking, within the Council's maximum standards, and sets out the factors that developers need to consider in deciding the appropriate parking level. These relate to the nature and location of the proposal, the availability of alternative parking, access to other transport modes, measures to promote sustainable development, the potential to create significant on-street parking problems, and the potential for highway/traffic problems.

The existing dwelling, of five habitable rooms, generates a maximum standard requirement for two spaces (rounded up). Even if the garage is discounted due to its narrow width, this is met in the form of forecourt provision. The proposed ground floor flat (4 habitable rooms) would generate a standard maximum figure of 1.6 and the first floor flat (3 habitable rooms) of 1.4, giving a combined maximum requirement of 3 parking spaces (this includes visitor provision). The submitted drawings indicate the provision of two spaces on the forecourt and these are considered to be acceptable in terms of their size and layout. To justify refusal on the basis of a shortfall of one space below a maximum standard which includes visitor provision there must, therefore, be strong justification.

Continued/...

Turning to Policy T13 criteria:

- The proposal would form residential accommodation suitable for occupation by families or sharing households, and Hawthorn Drive is located within a suburban enclave equidistant from North Harrow and Rayners Lane district centres.
- A survey of Hawthorn Drive carried out on 26th September at 2pm found that five parking spaces were available on the opposite side of the road, fronting dwelling nos. 10-22A (evens). A further survey that day, at 8pm, found that three parking spaces were available to the return side of 60 The Ridgeway and outside no.1 Hawthorn Drive.
- Local bus services operate on The Ridgeway (H11) and Imperial Drive (H10). In addition both Rayners Lane and North Harrow district centres are served by London Underground stations.
- No measures for the promotion of sustainable travel choices are proposed.
- From the survey data it is evident that on-street parking capacity in Hawthorn Drive is limited, particularly in the evenings. However, the proposal would provide one space per flat with a 'shortfall' of only one space below the maximum and representing - in part - the visitor element of the standard. In these circumstances it is not considered that the proposal, in terms of the maximum parking standard, would unacceptably create (or exacerbate) on-street parking problems. Neither is it considered that the degree of overspill parking from the two flats proposed would be materially greater than that associated with the occupation of the existing house (or as could be extended) as a single family dwelling.
- Taking into account the narrow carriageway width of Hawthorn Drive and the number of crossovers it is recognised that conditions for the free flow and safe passage of vehicles are already constrained, and it is likely that conditions are exacerbated at school times. Nonetheless there is no evidence to demonstrate that the parking and access activity associated with the proposed flats would so significantly exacerbate these poor conditions as to justify withholding planning permission and it is therefore recommended that permission be granted.

4) Residential Amenity : Previous Reason for Refusal No. 2

Paragraph 6.51 of the reasoned justification to Policy H9 recognises that the size of a property will influence the number of units which can be created and the consequent impact of conversions on surrounding properties. In the subject instance two units within the extended, semi-detached property would be created and each would be capable of accommodating a family or shared household.

In recent years there have been many instances of permission granted for conversion, with or without extension, of inter-war semi-detached dwellings to two flats. One such example, reported to the Committee in July this year, involved the conversion of a semi-detached dwelling with existing extensions on a corner site to two flats each of three habitable rooms at 12 Warham Road, Wealdstone (P/634/05/DFU). In recommending approval, the Chief Planning Officer's report concluded that:

Continued/...

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

The Committee agreed to grant planning permission in accordance with the recommendation.

It is not considered that the subject property, with the extensions proposed, is capable of conversion to provide two independent households of the size proposed. Two households in lieu of one would be likely to intensify comings and goings associated with the property at the front, activity within the building and use of the rear garden. However, there is no evidence to sustain the conclusion that, in this case, the associated increase in noise and general disturbance would exceed that normally considered to be acceptable in the conversion of such property to two flats. Accordingly it is not considered that the impact on neighbouring residents would be so unreasonable as to warrant refusal.

5) Consultation Responses

- blockage to emergency vehicles: it is not considered that the proposal would materially exacerbate emergency vehicle access
- out of character with single family houses: it is not considered that the conversion of this dwelling would materially change the overall character of the street as one of single family dwellings
- rear extension will exceed 3m high contrary to guidelines: amended to comply
- flats contrary to covenant: not a material planning consideration
- nothing changed since previous refusal: see report
- concern about building close to power lines (EDF Energy should be consulted): CEGB PowerGen consulted but no reply received; matter to be resolved between applicant and the statutory undertaker concerned
- loss of green view/openness: not considered to be so significant as to warrant refusal
- circumstances of extension differ from others in street: extension as previously considered and acceptable
- loss of/damage to trees: no protected trees on site and none considered to be of significant amenity value
- precedent: each application to be considered on its own merits
- will disrupt symmetry of houses/bungalows: extension as previously considered and acceptable
- loss of amenity during construction: not a material planning consideration
- proposal differs from flats at no. 14: noted
- tenants of bad attitude will affect street: not a material planning consideration

Continued/...

CONCLUSION

For all of 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/...

2 STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION

ANTHONY J BLYTH AND CO for MR & MRS V ARTHUR

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: PMB/05/182

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 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.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.
- 3 **INFORMATIVE:**
Notwithstanding the note on your submitted plan(s), this decision has been made on the basis of measurements scaled from the plan(s), unless a dimensioned measurement overrides it.

Continued/...

- 4 **INFORMATIVE:**
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION -
HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION:
The decision to grant planning 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
- 5 The applicant is informed that the prior commencement of the development hereby approved will invalidate the Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development (ref: P/2696/05/DCP) for a single storey rear extension.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Site, Setting, Open Space and Public Realm (SD1, D4, D5)
- 2) Scale and Character (SD1, D4)
- 3) Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
- 4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

This application is reported to Committee at the request of a nominated member.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Detached dwelling located on corner of Kelvin Crescent and an access road (for garaging).
- Site irregular in shape, with a wide front boundary tapering off towards the rear.
- Properties at 6 and 4 Kelvin Crescent contain similar houses, set at angles to the road creating a stepped building line.
- Across the adjoining access road are a three-storey block of flats orientated toward the subject property.

c) Proposal Details

- Two storey side extension set flush with the main front and rear walls of the existing dwelling, to contain an upstairs bedroom/en-suite, and a ground floor living area, and utility/store-room.
- The side extension will have a gable end roof retaining the character of the existing roof.

Continued/...

- Single storey front extension to the living room projecting 1.6m from the front wall of the two storey side extension, of a slightly lesser scale than the existing front extension on the left hand side of the frontage.

d) Relevant History

P/2969/05/DFU Certificate of proposed lawful development for GRANTED
single storey rear extension alongside 4 Kelvin Crescent 13-DEC-2005

e) Notifications

| | | |
|-------|----------|-----------|
| Sent: | Replies: | Expiry: |
| 11 | 1 | 30-DEC-05 |

Permitted development (garage) has already been undertaken on site; the proposed development ignores planning guidance and will represent over-development; the perspective from the flats will be altered; two trees at 4 Kelvin Crescent are not accurately described; consultation letter arrived late.

APPRAISAL

1) Site, Setting, Open Space and Public Realm

The proposed development of a two-storey side extension reflects the character of the existing dwelling by maintaining the existing building lines. The side existing will be up to the front and rear walls of the existing dwelling, and the roof line will be continued using the same pitch, finishing in a gable end. The resultant flank wall will have only one set of windows in the upper level, relating to an en-suite bathroom.

Although the side extension will occupy a current area of open space alongside the dwelling, the extension will be set a distance of between 0.5 and 5m from the boundary. Therefore the development will still retain a large area of open space alongside the dwelling. The access road between the property and the flats opposite also provides a large area of open space.

The height of the side extension with gable end above will result in slight dominance toward the street, however the road alongside is an access road for rear garages, and the only footpath is on the far side of the access way in front of the flats opposite. The flats themselves are three storeys in height, with a flat roof, and are at a slightly reduced level due to a slight slope in the land. Consequently, the height of the gable will be comparable to the height of the flats, but will be perceived as being less bulky than the flats.

Continued/...

The single storey front extension will not unreasonably reduce the amenity of the front of the site or any open space. The low flat roof and setback from the property boundaries will ensure views around the site are mostly retained, and also, that the front extension will not result in dominance toward the public realm.

2) Scale and Character

The two-storey side extension will retain the character of the existing dwelling by the use of existing building lines from the existing dwelling.

In terms of character, the properties at numbers 6, 4 and 2 Kelvin Crescent contain very similar dwellings which have been established at the same time, being of the same/similar design, with the same skewed location within their sites. The character of these dwellings is essentially a rectangular footprint with two storey dwelling, and the roof above consisting of a long ridgeline and gabled ends.

The proposed side extension will continue this character with the proportions of the proposed extension matching the proportions of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling (when viewed from the front) is set out with two windows in the upper level, and two windows and a centred door in the lower level. The proposed extension will be adding a third set of windows alongside which are placed to match the style of those existing, and the extension will also retain the existing proportions.

The front extension will be in line with the new flank wall, and will be set forward 1.6m from the front building line. The proposed front extension will imitate the flat roof above the existing front entrance/study, and will also be of a similar size and scale, but reduced depth. The depth will be in line with the front entrance door, and therefore the design of the proposed extension has taken considerable cues from the established single storey front extension and will therefore match the established character.

As the character of the dwelling will be retained, with existing lines used to guide the size, scale, design and layout of the proposed extension, it is considered that the proposed development will retain the character and layout of the area, with no unreasonable effects regarding bulk or dominance toward the streetscape.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposed extensions will be set away from any adjoining properties, with the extensions being on the opposite side of the subject dwelling from 4 Kelvin Crescent, and separated by an access road from the nearby flats. For reasons discussed above, the extension will retain the character of the existing dwelling, and will therefore, not impact on residential amenity.

Continued/...

4) Consultation Responses

- **Permitted development (garage) has already been undertaken on site -**
Although permitted development may have been undertaken on site already as a result of the existing side garage, this does not stop the property owner from undertaking further permitted development, which can include 'reallocation' of existing building bulk (ie, removal of previous permitted development bulk, and establishment elsewhere).
- **The perspective from the flats will be altered –**
The perspective from the flats will not alter greatly, as given the orientation of the subject dwelling, the flats will look 'along' the length of the development, and the proposed bulk will appear similar to that already established.
- **Two trees at 4 Kelvin Crescent are not accurately described -**
The trees on 4 Kelvin Crescent are not considered to be a material consideration given the substantial distance between the side extension and the trees.
- All other matters are addressed in the appraisal 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.

**21 - 40 CANONS PARK CLOSE, DONNEFIELD AVE, P/2545/05/CFU/DT2
EDGWARE**

Ward: CANONS

ADDITIONAL FLOOR ON BUILDING TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS, ONE DETACHED HOUSE,
FRONTAGE PARKING & REMOVAL OF GARAGE & ALTERATIONS

DAVID KANN ASSOCIATES for EMBER HOMES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: EHL/CPC/20, 21, 22, 23, 30C, 31C, 32B, 33C, 34C and 35C

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

- 1 Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 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:
 - 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.
- 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 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

Continued/...

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
- D10 Trees and New Development
- D14 Conservation Areas
- D18 Historic Parks and Gardens
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix
- H7 Dwelling Mix
- H10 Maintenance and Improvement to Existing Housing Stock

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Residential Character (SD1 D4 D9 D10)
- 2) Effect On The Conservation Area
- 3) Neighbouring Amenity (D5 D10 D14 D18)
- 4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|--------------|
| Conservation Area: | No; Adjoins MOL and Canons Park Estate Conservation Area. | |
| Car Parking | Standard: | |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | Residential: |
| Site Area: | 0,317ha. | |
| No of residential Units: | 9 | |
| Habitable rooms | 31 | |
| Council Interest | None | |

Continued/...

b) Site Description

- Part two, part three storey purpose built block of flats on the east side of Donnefield Avenue at the junction with Canons Park Close comprising eighteen flats, five lock up garages, a store and front and rear communal gardens, concrete paved footpaths and a variety of trees. The site has twin flat-roofed two storey wings arranged in two staggered rectangular blocks behind parapets and a central three-storey section that has a hipped roof. The two wings have curved bays at intervals along the front elevation. The property is built in raised Fletton bricks and has a tiled roof. The five garages and an external store are on the northern boundary of the site. 'End House' is also on this boundary. It is a detached property that has a splayed configuration with the northern boundary. It has a distinctive curved roof with green tiling and is part of the conservation area.
- Thirty-two metres to the south of the site is an identical building, 1-20 Canons Park Close. To the rear of the site the pavilion and the playing fields of Arnold House School extend eastwards, the Bowling Green and tennis courts adjoin the rear of the site towards the northern end. The car park for Canons Park London Underground Station is on the opposite side of the road to the site.
- The site has no specific designation in the UDP, but it adjoins the Canons Park Conservation Area (Article 4 Direction), that extends to the north and west of the site. Canons Park is also designated as a Historic Park.

c) Proposal Details

- A single storey roof extension to provide an additional eight self contained flats is proposed along with the erection of one x two storey detached house.
- Retention of garages.
- Secure cycle storage area for 8 cycles.
- New vehicular access at the southern entrance to the building.
- Two off street parking space for proposed detached house and new bin storage areas.
- Provision of thirteen new trees, four replacement trees, removal of seven existing species. and replacement hedges, shrubs and planting.
- New boundary walls, fencing and paving.
- New bin storage areas.
- New garden furniture.
- New lighting.
- Replacement of existing windows in the front elevation by new UPVC windows.

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|
| P/797/05/CFU | Additional floors on building to provide 8 flats, 2x3 storey detached houses, removal of garages, parking area in front garden. | REFUSED 17-JUNE-05 |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|

Continued/...

The previous proposal was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of a disproportionate relationship between buildings and spaces that would have an unacceptable effect on the symmetry of the two buildings forming Canons Park Close and would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the area.
2. The proposed development by reason of unsatisfactory design and excessive scale would detract from the character and appearance of the adjacent Canons Park Estate Conservation Area.
3. The proposed hard surfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene.
4. The proposed detached house on the northern boundary of the site, by reason of its height, scale, bulk, massing and siting would cause overshadowing and would have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property.

e) Applicant's Statement

Conclusions of Supporting Statement

- The extension is designed to be in keeping with the form and appearance of the building and has resulted in the literal raising of the building height by one storey.
- Elevational treatment matches closely that of the existing building with new brick detailing in the form of soldier and stretcher banding.
- The landscaping of the site at both the front and the rear of the site is undistinguished and in a poor condition. The changes that are proposed will enhance it but will retain the existing layout and open character.
- Hard and soft landscaping will be of a high standard, replacing neglected and dead planting and supplementing it with new and similar planting and attractive and varied paved areas.

f)

Notifications

Sent
75

Replies
3

Expiry
14-NOV-05

Conservation: Site is outside the conservation area, but is surrounded by development that would affect its setting. Flats form an attractive streetscene by virtue of articulated facades, curving shape and abundant landscaping to the front. They typify the 1930's development that is common in the borough. The 'End House' that adjoins the site is of architectural merit. The two buildings and the landscaping around them give an open aspect to the streetscene that counterbalances the car park opposite.

Continued/...

The revised proposal is a significant improvement on the original scheme. The deletion of the house that was proposed on the northern boundary with the 'End House' is welcomed, as it will help to retain the openness about the building. An additional floor on the block can be accommodated without damaging the character of the adjacent conservation area because from the main points within the park, it is only seen at some distance and then with screen planting and other development between it. The retention of the soft landscaping and its improvement will enhance the streetscene and hence the appearance of the conservation area.

Thames Water: Advice is given on surface water drainage provision.

London Underground Ltd:

Response:

- Loss of amenity and views due to the proposed extension and the front garden becoming an off street parking area.
- Additional storey will result in the destruction of the symmetry between the two buildings
- Increase in traffic congestion and parking problems
- Loss of daylight and sunlight for the 'End House'.

APPRAISAL

1) Residential Character

The revised proposal is considered to have overcome the objection to the previous proposal where an unsatisfactory relationship would have resulted with the adjoining twin building immediate to the south of the site, 1-20 Canons Park Close. The unbalancing effect and the destruction in the symmetry between the two buildings has been overcome by a more sympathetic design approach.

This is because the proposed extension would be built in facing brick that matches the existing structure, whereas in the previous proposal cedar boarding was proposed. The existing building parapet would be raised to the new sill level and decorative brick banding courses, in lines horizontal to the window apertures, would be introduced. These changes would have the effect of breaking up the massing and height of the additional storey and creating more visual interest.

Furthermore, the banding provides for a more proportionate solid to glazing ratio in the proposed extension that reflects that of the rest of the building, enabling a more seamless transition to take place. This is consonant with the advice in Policy D4. It states that buildings should respect the form, massing, composition, proportions and materials of the surrounding townscape. The proposal achieves such a relationship.

Continued/...

The deletion of a detached house on the northern boundary of the site in the revised submission has removed the harmful effects on the end house that was a notable feature of the previous scheme. The overbearing effect that the earlier proposal would have had on the End House has been removed and it is considered that the revised proposal now complies with the advice in Policy D5, which says that all new development should ensure that adequate separation between existing and proposed buildings is maintained so that the amenity of existing and proposed occupiers is guaranteed.

Moreover, the final element of the previous scheme that was the source of objections, the replacement of the soft landscaping and vegetation in the front garden by hardstanding to provide additional car parking space and an additional crossover, has been deleted from the current scheme. The spaciousness that distinguishes the setting of the site has been retained and the mass of additional parking spaces and hardstanding has been deleted from the proposal. This would be consistent with the advice in Policy D9. It stresses that proposals involving the loss of landscaped areas that form a setting to flatted developments should be resisted.

Some new tree planting is proposed and the site is not the subject of a Tree Preservation Order. Two new off street parking spaces and a new vehicular access are proposed at the southern end of the site where the proposed detached house would be located. But these changes are considered to be acceptable and in line with Policies D4 and D9.

In addition, the conflict that the previous proposal had with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for development to have regard to the Public Realm has also been removed: The existing building is screened from the highway by a semi private front garden, This provides a transition between the main road and the building frontage and in the previous scheme this would have been sacrificed to provide extra parking and an additional means of vehicular access, resulting in a diminution in the privacy that existing occupiers enjoy along with increased noise and disturbance from road traffic and vehicle movement within the site. This is no longer the case.

2) Effect On The Conservation Area

The applicants have submitted a Townscape Assessment of the site, which has overcome satisfactorily the objections in terms of the effect of the proposed extension on the two buildings that form Canons Park Close and provide an entrance to the Conservation Area and a focal point in the streetscene and how the symmetrical relationship between the two buildings would be affected. Photographic long views of the site taken from each direction were able to show that either only oblique views of both buildings as an entity were possible, or views taken at such long distances that any appreciable change in the relationship between the two buildings would not be possible. The extensive vegetation bounding both buildings for a substantial part of the year also makes clear, uninterrupted views of both buildings extremely difficult.

Continued/...

It is concluded that the overall effect of the revised extension, in terms of the evidence given in the Townscape Assessment and the changes to the elevational treatment that was referred to earlier, have removed the objections that were made to the original scheme. It is considered that the revised proposal would not be contrary to the advice in Policy D16. It says that development should only be allowed when it would contribute to the preservation or enhancement of the conservation area and the scheme recognises this.

3) Neighbouring Amenity

The harmful effect on the 'End House' has been removed by the deletion of the detached house on the northern boundary. Although the increase in the height of the building would cause limited overshadowing of the house and its garden, this is substantially less than would have otherwise been the case in the previous proposal.

It is not considered that the extension in the height of the building would cause substantial material harm to the residential amenity of the 'End House'. The property would still receive uninterrupted daylight and sunlight and the proposal is not considered to be in conflict with the advice in Policy D5. It says that development should ensure that adequate separation is maintained between buildings and distances between site boundaries so that the privacy and amenity of future occupiers is protected. The proposal is able to achieve such a relationship.

4) Consultation Responses

As addressed in the 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 approval.

Continued/...

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

FORWARD ARCHITECTURE for MRS E GLASSMAN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: OS Map, Drawing 266-02-102A, Drawing 266-02-104A

GRANT listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following

- 1 Listed Building - Making Good
- 2 Time Limit on Listed Building Consent - Three Years
- 3 Listed Building - Demolition by Hand
- 4 Detailed drawings, specifications, or samples of materials as appropriate in respect of the following shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
 - a) Method of fixing cloakroom wall to existing wallsThe works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

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:
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
D14 Conservation Areas
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
D16 Conservation Area Priority

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character and Appearance of Listed Building and Conservation Area (D4, D11, D15)
- 2) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:

Area of Special Character: Special Char & Adv

Listed Building: Grade II

Conservation Area: STANMORE:LITTLE COMMON

Green Belt

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- End of terrace of four cottages, all of which are listed
- Dwelling situated in Metropolitan Green Belt and Little Common Conservation Area

c) Listed Building Description

- Circa 1860-70 complex built to house staff and to stable horses for Stanmore Hall.
- Red brick composition overlooking Spring Pond, with barge boarded gables and elaborate chimney stacks.
- Bracketed eaves and single-storey bays with gabled porches. Some blue brick drapering and dressing. Tile roofs

d) Proposed Details

- New window on the rear elevation, glaze existing opening on the front elevation, Internal alterations to include a spiral staircase at 2nd floor leading into attic space

e) Relevant History

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| EAST/972/98/FUL | Single storey extension | GRANTED 16-MAR-99 |
| P/3255/04/CLB | Listed Building Consent: Replace window with door at first floor | GRANTED 18-MAR-05 |

f)

| Notifications | Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|---------------|------|---------|-----------|
| | 1 | 0 | 29-DEC-05 |

Responses: None

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Character of the Listed Building

The proposals are for internal alterations at ground floor level to include the removal of the existing shower room and partition wall, and to form a new cloakroom.

The proposed cloakroom will fall in line with an existing wall and as such will not noticeably sub divide the room in any way. Positioning the additional room in this location will have limited effect on the integral special interest of the building. As the new room will not be noticeable, the character and appearance of the building is preserved.

The removal of the shower room in this location is historically accurate and as such will enhance the appearance and historic value of the listed building.

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 application is recommended for approval.

Continued/...

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: NEW WINDOW ON REAR ELEVATION, GLAZE EXISTING OPENING ON FRONT ELEVATION & INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

FORWARD ARCHITECTURE for MRS E GLASSMAN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: OS Map, Drawing 266-02-103A, Drawing 266-02-105A

GRANT listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following

- 1 Listed Building - Making Good
- 2 Time Limit on Listed Building Consent - Three Years
- 3 Detailed drawings, specifications, or samples of materials as appropriate in respect of the following shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
 - a) roof lights
 - b) spiral staircase
 - c) windows
 - d) brick arch above new windowThe works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- 4 Listed Building - Demolition by Hand
- 5 Listed Building - Protection of Interior

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:
 - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
 - D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
 - D14 Conservation Areas
 - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
 - D16 Conservation Area Priority

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character and Appearance of Listed Building and Conservation Area (D4, D11, D15)
 - 2) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Area of Special Character: Special Char & Adv
Listed Building: Grade II
Conservation Area: STANMORE:LITTLE COMMON
Green Belt
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- End of terrace of four cottages, all of which are listed
- Dwelling situated in Metropolitan Green Belt and Little Common Conservation Area

c) Listed Building Description

- Circa 1860-70 complex built to house staff and to stable horses for Stanmore Hall.
- Red brick composition overlooking Spring Pond, with barge boarded gables and elaborate chimney stacks.
- Bracketed eaves and single-storey bays with gabled porches. Some blue brick drapering and dressing. Tile roofs

d) Proposed Details

- New window on the rear elevation, glaze existing opening on the front elevation, Internal alterations to include a spiral staircase at 2nd floor leading into attic space

e) Relevant History

| | | |
|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| EAST/972/98/FUL | Single storey extension | GRANTED 16-MAR-99 |
| P/3255/04/CLB | Listed Building Consent: Replace window with door at first floor | GRANTED 18-MAR-05 |

f) Consultations

| | | |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Advertisement | Extension/alteration of listed building | Expiry: 11-JAN-06 |
| Notifications | Sent 5 | Replies 0 Expiry 29-DEC-05 |

Continued/...

Responses: None

APPRAISAL

1) Character of the Listed Building

The building sits within a listed group, built in the late Victorian era to house staff to cater for Stanmore Hall. The architecture is slightly decorative in an Arts and Crafts style, and on a domestic scale that expresses the functional and historic interest of the properties. The special interest value is also derived from that of the grouping effect, and as such all the buildings within the group are listed. Therefore any work done to a building within the group will potentially affect the integral qualities of others.

The proposals are for listed building consent for a new rear elevation window, to glaze an existing front elevation opening, and to create a spiral staircase, which will lead from the 2nd floor into the attic space.

The proposal is to glaze an existing opening on the front elevation. This will match the architecturally similar neighbouring property and will provide an element of continuity, which is important in helping to retain the special interest of the group. Glazing this small area would be attractive and therefore is not detrimental to the appearance of the property.

The building's cottage-like asymmetrical design provides a welcome irregularity in window size and positioning, which is reflected in the proposal. The new double casement window proposed at 3rd floor level on the rear elevation matches those existing in terms of design and detailing and as such is considered to preserve the building's character and appearance. However, a smaller single casement window would be preferred in this location.

Although the shapes within the design tend to be right-angled, the circular window intended above the end elevation door is relatively discreet and as such would preserve the architectural character of the building.

The proposed roof lights are triangular in form and as such compliment the shape of the eaves and dormers. Although there is decorative tile detailing within the roof, the rooflight installation does not compromise this pattern and in this way preserves the character and appearance of the building.

A spiral staircase has been proposed in order to provide access from the 2nd floor into the 3rd floor. Loft access already exists in this location and as such limits the amount of intervention required. The joists predominantly date from the 1930s and are therefore relatively modern and will be strengthened or replaced as required, however where older items exist these will be retained in situ to ensure retention of integral historic fabric. Much of the plasterboard is also 1930s and as such any original lath and plaster will be similarly retained wherever possible.

Continued/...

Although not originally a common feature within such a building, there is sufficient space in which to hold the staircase and due to the openness of its design it does not significantly interfere with the room's original layout. The nature and positioning of the staircase makes it a reversible intervention and as such can be allowed in this location without impinging on the integral qualities of the building.

In conclusion, the new works assimilate the historic Victorian cottage-like paradigms by matching existing materials and design, and as such provide acceptable detailing and continuity. The special group value is sufficiently retained with respect to new works and it is considered that the historical and architectural values are preserved.

2) Consultation Responses

None

CONCLUSION

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

EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER

2/17
P/2953/05/CFU/TEM
Ward: PINNER

CONVERSION OF BARNs A AND B TO FAMILY DWELLINGHOUSE WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS

FOUNDATION ARCHITECTURE for MR & MRS B LEAVER

EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER

2/18
P/2954/05/CLB/AB
Ward: PINNER

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CONVERSION OF BARNs A AND B TO SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGHOUSE WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE AND EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS TO BARN C

FOUNDATION ARCHITECTURE for MR & MRS B LEAVER

P/2953/05/CFU

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: WPloc, WP010, WP011, WP012, WP013, WP014, WP015

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) occupation of the house hereby permitted shall not take place until all repairs in the schedule of repairs accompanying the application have been completed to the satisfaction in writing of the Local Planning Authority.
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 on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until all the works detailed in the application have been completed in accordance with the permission granted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

Continued/...

- 3 The demolition shall not commence before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and all the approvals required by the conditions attached to the approval have been obtained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority, a scheme of hard and soft landscape works which shall include proposals for the hedgerow and a maintenance plan for the future maintenance of the hedgerow boundaries. Soft landscape works shall include: planting plans, and schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area and to enhance the appearance of the development.
- 5 No relevant part of the works shall commence until detailed drawings to an appropriate scale, specifications or samples of materials, as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in respect of the following, and works shall not be completed other than in accordance with the details so approved:
- a) details of the dismantling and re-erection of the Petrol Pump and Lych Gate Shelter
 - b) all boundary treatments
- REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development in the interests of the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of listed buildings.
- 6 No physical subdivision of the site shall take place without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
REASON: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the character of the Conservation Area.
- 7 The windows in the south elevation of Barn A (south barn) shall:
- a) be of purpose made obscure glass, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority
 - 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.
- 8 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development which would otherwise fall within Classes A-F in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the character of the Conservation Area and the amenity of neighbouring residents
- 9 No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, as recommended in the Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust Specification for Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (13.6.02), in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
REASON: To secure the provision of archaeological works and subsequent recording of the remains in the interests of national and local heritage.

Continued/...

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until there have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority, detailed drawings of all underground works, including those to be carried out by statutory undertakers, in connection with the provision of services to, and within, the site.
REASON: In order to safeguard the integrity of the listed building.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 INFORMATIVE:
The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.
- 2 INFORMATIVE:
The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:
1. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
2. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
3. excavating near a neighbouring building,
and that work falls within the scope of the Act.
Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.
A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:
ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB
Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237
Textphone: 0870 1207 405
E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net
Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>
- 3 INFORMATIVE:
The development hereby approved may be subject to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 which govern health and safety through all stages of a construction project. The Regulations require clients (ie those, including developers, who commission projects) to appoint a planning supervisor and principal contractor who are competent and adequately resourced to carry out their health and safety responsibilities. Clients have further obligations. Your designer will tell you about these and your planning supervisor can assist you in fulfilling them. Further information is available from the Health and Safety Executive Infoline on 0541 545500.

(Please note that any reference in this informative to "planning supervisor" has no connection with any Planning Officers within Harrow's Planning Services or with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)
- 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:

Continued/...

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
 - SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and
 - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
 - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
 - D5 New Residential Development – Amenity Space and Privacy
 - D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
 - D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings
 - D14 Conservation Areas
 - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
 - D16 Conservation Area Priority
 - D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance – Field Evaluation
 - D21 Sites of Archaeological Importance – Land Use Management
 - D22 Sites of Archaeological Importance – Archaeological Investigation
 - T13 Parking Standards
 - T15 Servicing of New Developments
-

P/2954/05/CLB

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: WPloc, 01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12E, 13E, 14E, 15E, 16E : WP05R, 06R, 10R, 11R, 12R, 13R : WP010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015
Schedule of Repairs

GRANT listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following

- 1 The works hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.
REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 2 Written notification of the intended start of works on site shall be sent to the local planning authority at least seven days before the works hereby approved are commenced.
REASON: In order that the local planning authority may be given the opportunity of monitoring the progress of works on site to ensure the preservation of the special interest of the building effected by the works hereby approved.
- 3 The approved works shall not be occupied or used until all the works detailed in the application have been completed in accordance with the consent unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.

Continued/...

- 4 The demolition hereby permitted shall not commence before a contract for the carrying out of these works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and planning permission has been granted for the development for which the contract provides.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.
- 5 No development shall take place until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, as recommended in the Hertfordshire Archaeological Trust Specification for Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (13.6.02), in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
REASON: To secure the provision of archaeological works and subsequent recording of the remains in the interests of national and local heritage.
- 6 Suitable precautions shall be taken to secure and protect the interior features against accidental loss, damage or theft during the building work. No such features shall be disturbed or removed temporarily or permanently except as indicated on the approved drawings
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.
- 7 If previously unknown evidence is discovered about historic character which would be affected by the works hereby granted, an appropriate record, together with recommendations for dealing with it in the context of the scheme, shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.
- 8 No relevant part of the works shall commence until detailed drawings to an appropriate scale, specifications or samples of materials, as appropriate, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in respect of the following, and works shall not be completed other than in accordance with the details so approved;
- a) The new roof lanterns and dormers to Barn A
 - b) New internal and external doors to all barns
 - c) New windows to all barns;
 - d) All proposed new materials and finishes including sample panel of new brickwork to Barn C extension.
 - e) Repairs to flint plinths
 - f) Details of glazed draught lobbies in extension to Barn C.
 - g) Full information relating to the timber frame repairs including specific information on joints, where traditional carpentry or other methods would be used to repair them, details of any straps/ties, details of any replacement timbers and additional support mechanisms.
 - h) Full information regarding the repairs to the internal finishes

Continued/...

- i) Details of extent in plan and section, construction, and handling of the junction between glazed and tiled areas for the valley rooflight to Barn B.
- j) New garage doors
- k) New steps to north of Barn B.
- l) New valley gutter between Barn C and new glazed courtyard.

REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.

9 The position, type and manner of installation of all new and relocated services and related fittings shall be adequately specified in advance of any work being carried out, and the written approval of the local planning authority must be obtained wherever these installations are to be visible or where ducts or other methods of concealment are proposed.

REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic appearance of the listed building.

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE:

The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements in the attached Considerate Contractor Code of Practice, in the interests of minimising any adverse effects arising from building operations, and in particular the limitations on hours of working.

2 INFORMATIVE:

The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 requires a building owner to notify and obtain formal agreement from adjoining owner(s) where the building owner intends to carry out building work which involves:

- 3. work on an existing wall shared with another property;
- 4. building on the boundary with a neighbouring property;
- 5. excavating near a neighbouring building,

and that work falls within the scope of the Act.

Procedures under this Act are quite separate from the need for planning permission or building regulations approval.

A copy of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister booklet "The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet" is available free of charge from:

ODPM Free Literature, PO Box 236, Wetherby, LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236 Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: odpm@twoten.press.net

Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

3 INFORMATIVE:

The development hereby approved may be subject to the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 1994 which govern health and safety through all stages of a construction project. The Regulations require clients (ie those, including developers, who commission projects) to appoint a planning supervisor and principal contractor who are competent and adequately resourced to carry out their health and safety responsibilities. Clients have further obligations. Your designer will tell you about these and your planning supervisor can assist you in fulfilling them. Further information is available from the Health and Safety Executive Infoline on 0541 545500.

Continued/...

(Please note that any reference in this informative to “planning supervisor” has no connection with any Planning Officers within Harrow’s Planning Services or with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.)

4 **INFORMATIVE:**

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
- D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings
- D14 Conservation Areas
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- D16 Conservation Area Priority
- D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance - Field Evaluation
- D21 Sites of Archaeological Importance - Land Use Management
- D22 Sites of Archaeological Importance - Archaeological Investigation
- T13 Parking Standards
- T15 Servicing of New Developments

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on the Listed Buildings, their settings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D11, D13, D14, D15, D16)
- 2) Archaeology and Underground Works (D20, D21, D22)
- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
- 4) Access and Parking (T13, T15)
- 5) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: SD1, SD2, SH1, D4, D5, D11, D13, D14, D15, D16, D20, D21, D22, T13, T15

Listed Building: Grade II

Continued/...

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Conservation Area: | PINNER EAST END FARM | |
| Car Parking | Standard: | 2 |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 3 minimum |
| Site Area: | 0.35ha | |
| Habitable Rooms: | 7 | |
| No of Residential Units: | 1 | |
| Council Interest: | None | |

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

Continued/...

- 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

c) Proposal Details

Barn A

- change of use of Barn A from storage to house of 7 habitable rooms containing kitchen/breakfast room, living and dining rooms on ground-floor, 4 bedrooms on first-floor
- alterations to Barn A in connection with the change of use from storage to residential including 3 glazed roof ventilators, 1 new dormer to west elevation and 1 to east elevation, 2 new rooflights, replace existing roller shutter doors with glazing, alterations to existing doors and windows on north and west elevations.
- demolition of existing lean to on east elevation and small replacement extension

Barn B

- change of use of Barn C from storage to residential garage in connection with new adjacent house of 7 habitable rooms – details as described above
- repair of Barns B including timber frame, roof repairs, new doors
- demolition of lean-to to Barn B
- new windows and doors and rooflights to Barn B in 1950s extension in connection with the change of use from storage to house

Petrol pump feature

- demolished and rebuilt on same site but turned through ninety degrees

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:-

- **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, inter alia:

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.

- The Inspector in considering appeals in 2003 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”.

Continued/...

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.

P/2681/04/CFU Demolition of storage buildings. Conversion of REFUSED
barn to dwellinghouse with adjacent barn as 15-NOV-05
garage; Erection of new dwellinghouse with barn
as garage, External alterations.

Reasons for Refusal:

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.
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.

P/2682/04/CLB Listed Building Consent: Demolition, internal and REFUSED
external alterations in association with conversion 15-NOV-05
to dwellinghouse and use of barns as garages

Reason for Refusal:

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 Conservation Area and would affect the group of listed buildings comprising the former farm and be detrimental to their special character.

P/2683/04/CCA Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of REFUSED
storage buildings attached to and within the 15-NOV-05
curtilage of listed buildings

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.

- In determining the above 3 applications the Development Control Committee made the following resolution for each application:-

Continued/...

“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.”

e) Notifications

Advertisement :

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Character of Conservation Area: | Expiry |
| Extension/Alterations of Listed Building | 23-FEB-06 |

CAAC: The repair of Barn B is welcomed. There are concerns over the roof ventilators and as such ensuring a condition on the detail of these would be preferred. A condition stating that the ventilator should be moved away from the existing dormer would see that these were more comfortably seated within the design.

| | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| Notifications | Sent | Replies | Expiry |
| | 142 | Awaited | 30-JAN-06 |

APPRAISAL

- (i) These applications are brought before the Committee in advance of the expiry date of the advertisements in order to allow an early decision so that urgent repairs to the barns may be expedited.
- (ii) A site plan is appended indicating each building referred to in this report and identifying the Orchard.

1) Impact on the Listed Buildings, their settings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

The Committee is advised at the outset that these proposals are identical to those found acceptable by the Committee in November 2005 as referred to in the resolution made at that time.

Continued/...

Barn A

This structure, listed by virtue of its physical connection with Barn B, is, nevertheless, a significant component of the historic group and dates from the mid twentieth century. It encloses the southern boundary of the farmyard; and in its long, tiled roofline complements the structures and appearances of the adjoining barns; and in its robust style complements its historic working setting. Its eastern elevation too is simple and workmanlike, and complements the character of the adjoining listed buildings on their Moss Lane frontages. While having a barn type form, it already has more domestic features, such as small paned windows and a large dormer on its southern roof slope.

During the appeal of the 2002 applications, the Council did not object to the principle of its conversion to residential use, in order to fund the repair of the listed barns, and the Inspector was broadly happy with the proposals. Since then, Development Control Committee has made two clear resolutions accepting the principle of a residential use in Barn A. It is therefore suggested that this residential use is acceptable as it will allow the repair of Barn B.

The current scheme in respect of Barn A is very similar to that considered under the appeal. The current scheme differs in that there is no internal garaging, which would now be housed within Barn B. This is considered an improvement in terms of the external appearance of the dwelling.

The more contentious items in respect of this building at the appeal were the roof ventilators, roof lights and new dormers. With regard to the roof ventilators, the applicants have produced the original architect's drawings for this building which show similar roof ventilators and therefore the Council, before the appeal, accepted the principle of this form of lighting. The roof ventilators in the appeal scheme were considered larger than those in the original architect's drawings which was a concern however. In the current scheme, the roof ventilators have been reduced in length from 2.2m to 1.7m. They would have the same height and projection above the ridgeline as the appeal scheme ventilators. In any event, the Inspector stated that:

"I acknowledge the provenance of this proposal (the ventilators) and consider that within the plain, rather utilitarian structure of the building, these features would appear of interest and would not detract from the appearance of the building or the surrounding conservation area".

Given these comments, and the reduction in size of the ventilators, it is considered that objections to them are not sustainable.

In terms of rooflights, the Inspector stated that these would be relatively minor works which could be incorporated satisfactorily without harm to the building or area. In comparison with the appeal scheme, a rooflight has been relocated to position it in the corner of Barn A, so that it is in part hidden by Barn B's roof, although the rooflight on the southern elevation remains the same. Again, given the amendments and the Inspector's position, it is considered that objections to the scheme are not sustainable.

The dormers were considered acceptable in the appeal scheme in terms of appearance and these remain the same in this scheme. The concerns related to amenity issues which are addressed later in this report.

Continued/...

The remaining external alterations are considered acceptable, as they would not significantly change the appearance of the building. The internal alterations proposed to this building are considered acceptable because it is not particularly historic and already has a partial first floor and office space within it.

Barn B

The impressively proportioned, open interior, visible timber framed structure and wealth of historic interior finishes are vital components of the special interest of this building. On the exterior its largely unbroken weather boarded cladding and plain tile roof also assert the monumentality of the structure. The main barn dates from the late 17th/early 18th century.

There is an extension to the east, dating from the 1950s which is of no particular architectural or historic merit, but it does appropriately complement the main body of the building in terms of size, simplicity of design and construction, and character as a working building. There is also a later lean to extension on the northern elevation, which is of no historic or architectural merit.

The proposals consist of the repair of the historic barn, and its use as garaging/ancillary storage to the house in Barn A. Alterations are proposed in the later 1950s extension, in order for this to become part of the residence in Barn A.

Dealing with the repairs first, the barn is on the English Heritage register of Buildings at Risk and 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. This barn is considered to be at greater risk than Barn C, as not only is water getting into the structure, but the front gable is structurally unstable. The applicants are therefore prioritising the repair of this structure, for this reason, and because the proposals to Barn A are less complex than the plans for a new house on the site of D, E and F. In order to secure the repairs, it is proposed to sign a legal agreement with the owners stating that the repairs to the historic barn must be completed before house is occupied.

In terms of the alterations, the lean to on the northern elevation is proposed to be demolished and this is considered acceptable, as it has no historic or architectural merit. In the 1950s part of the building, the scheme has been reduced from that proposed in the appealed scheme. Rather than two storeys of accommodation, the scheme now comprises just a lounge/dining room space on the ground floor. This reduces the need for additional natural light, the manifestation of which was considered unacceptable by the appeal inspector. Instead, the two existing windows are slightly enlarged and altered and a new door is proposed to be created on the northern elevation. The valley rooflight has been reduced in size too from the appeal scheme and would be hidden from view from the street in any event. The internal alterations are considered acceptable as they would not affect historic fabric.

The change of use and alterations of the 1950s part of the building would help to facilitate the much needed repairs to the historic parts of Barn B and are considered, on balance to preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Continued/...

The petrol pump feature is proposed to be retained, which is considered acceptable as this is a quirky remnant of the area's industrial past. It is proposed for it to be removed and rebuilt in a similar position but turned through 90°. An acceptable siting is proposed which would not undermine the setting of the listed buildings or the character of the Conservation Area.

2) Archaeology and Underground Works

English Heritage have previously advised that the proposed works might affect below ground archaeology and have recommended that a written scheme of investigation be secured by condition. Similarly the provision of underground services to the proposed residential unit could be controlled in detail by the suggested condition. The applicants have previously submitted a useful desktop analysis of archaeology including a programme of works which would appear appropriate.

3) Residential Amenity

In terms of 96 Moss Lane to the south, the proposed house contains existing ground-floor windows which overlook the garden of that property. A condition requiring obscure glazing is suggested to obviate overlooking.

It is also suggested that a first-floor dormer facing the garden is obscurely glazed, albeit that its height above floor level would prevent direct overlooking in order to obviate the perception of a loss of privacy. A first-floor west-facing dormer is proposed some 13m from an open garden which contains the vehicular access to 'Woodpeckers'. In amenity terms this is not considered to be harmful to neighbouring privacy.

A new east-facing first-floor dormer is shown which would overlook the open area within the site next to Moss Lane, but has no impact on amenity. In all other respects it is considered that the proposal would respect neighbouring residential amenity, and provide satisfactory levels of amenity for the intended residents.

4) Access and Parking

The proposed house would be provided with 2 indoor parking spaces within Barn B, with additional capacity for outdoor parking. While this provision exceeds the current maximum standard it is not considered objectionable given the layout of the site and the nature of the proposals.

5) Consultation Responses

To be completed

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/...

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

20 THE AVENUE, HARROW WEALD

3/01

P/2373/05/DCO/TEM

Ward: HARROW WEALD

RETENTION OF SINGLE/TWO STOREY DWELLINGHOUSE ATTACHED TO NO.20 THE AVENUE

A R P ASSOCIATES for MR C PATEL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: ARP/VP/01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07A, 12

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

- 1 The new dwellinghouse represents overdevelopment of the site by reason of a cramped and inappropriate form of development with restricted rear garden areas which is out of character with the form and pattern of development in the area, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the streetscene and residential amenity.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
SH2 Housing Types and Mix
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
T13 Parking Standards
- 2 The Director of Legal Services be authorised to:-
 - (a) (i) Issue an Enforcement Notice Pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:-
 - (b) (ii) external and internal works to the new dwellinghouse so as to comply with planning permission EAST/1458/02/FUL for a 2-storey side to rear extension, single storey rear extension and front porch and double garage to No.20 The Avenue.
 - (c) [(b) (ii)] should be completed with within a period of three (3) months from the date on which the Notice takes effect.
 - (d) Issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above breach of planning control.
 - (e) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:-
 - (a) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
 - (b) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

Continued/...

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS & POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character and appearance of area (SD1, SH1, D4)
 - 2) Residential amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
 - 3) Traffic and parking (T13)
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

This application is reported to Committee as it includes a recommendation seeking authorisation for an Enforcement Notice.

a) Summary

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|
| Car Parking | Standard: | 2 |
| | Justified: | See report |
| | Provided: | 1 |
| No of Residential Units: | 1 | |
| Habitable Rooms: | 4 | |
| Council Interest: | None | |

b) Site Description

- North side of The Avenue, on eastern corner of junction with Weald Rise.
- Occupied by recently constructed end-terraced house which has been added onto No.20
- Semi-detached houses to north in Weald Rise and on opposite corner of junction
- Semi-detached and detached houses on opposite side of The Avenue

c) Proposal Details

- Retention of end-terraced house attached to No.20 The Avenue
- House consists of lounge, dining room and kitchen on ground-floor, plus 2 bedrooms on first-floor together with ancillary accommodation
- 1 parking space provided at far end of rear garden

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| EAST/7/01/FUL | Two Storey Side To Rear Extension | REFUSED 21-MAY-01 |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed development, by reason of inappropriate design and appearance would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the locality, and detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene, contrary to Policies E6 and E45 of the HUDP.

| | | |
|------------------|--|------------------------|
| EAST/1004/01/FUL | Two storey side, single storey rear extension & front porch, double garage & store at rear | GRANTED 13-NOV-01 |
| EAST/1458/02/FUL | Two storey side to rear extension, single storey rear extension and front porch, double garage (revised) | GRANTED 18-JUN-2003 |

Continued/...

e) Notifications

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-------------|
| 19 | 11 | 26-OCT-2005 |

Response: Terracing effect, degrades area, overcrowding, cramped development, traffic congestion, unsightly, out of keeping with adjacent houses, would affect property prices, hazardous to traffic, constructional problems, precedent, parking problems.

APPRAISAL

1) Character and appearance of area

The new house which is proposed for retention comprises single and 2-storey side and rear extensions to the original house which were granted in planning permission EAST/1458/02/FUL.

While the approved floorspace is appropriate as additions to the original house, it is unacceptable in the form of a new house as it provides an end of terrace dwelling which is cramped within its site, is out of character with the form and pattern of development in the area, and results in the overdevelopment of the site and visual harm to the area.

In addition, the sub-division of the rear garden gives rise to 2 garden areas of restricted size which are out of keeping with rear gardens in the locality.

2) Residential amenity

The significant reduction in the rear garden area for the existing house has made it more vulnerable to noise and disturbance from adjacent gardens and reduced the levels of amenity enjoyed by the existing occupiers.

3) Traffic and parking

One parking space is shown for the retained and new dwellings. This is considered to be sufficient in this location to avoid the creation of significant on-street parking or traffic congestion.

4) Consultation Responses

- Would affect property prices, precedent - not material planning considerations.
- Constructional problems – subject to other legislation
- Other issues discussed in report.

ENFORCEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Alleged Breach of Planning Control

Without planning permission, the provision of an end-terraced single/2-storey dwellinghouse attached to No.20 The Avenue.

Continued/...

Item 3/01 : P/2373/05/DCO continued/...

Reasons for Issuing the Notice

It appears to the Council that the above breach of planning control has occurred within the last 4 years.

Requirements of the Notice

Carry out internal and external works to the dwellinghouse so as to comply with planning permission EAST/1458/02/FUL for a 2-storey side to rear extension, single-storey rear extension and front porch and double garage to No.20 The Avenue.

Time for Compliance

3 months.

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 refuse.

Continued/...

31 ELMS ROAD, HARROW

3/02

P/2834/05/DFU/TEM

Ward: HARROW WEALD

DETACHED SINGLE/2 STOREY HOUSE WITH ROOMS IN ROOF, DETACHED GARAGE, ACCESS FROM STAMFORD CLOSE

CARL O'BOYLE for TAYROSS HOMES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: SC1, SC2, SC3, SC4, SC5A3, SC6A3

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

- 1 The proposal would give rise to an unacceptable form of development by reason of inappropriate design and appearance, harm to the appearance of the area and the setting and character of No.31 Elms Road, a locally listed building, and detriment to neighbouring residential amenity, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

INFORMATIVES

1 INFORMATIVE:

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

SD1 Quality of Design

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

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D10 Trees and New Development

D12 Locally Listed Buildings

T13 Parking Standards

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on Locally Listed Building and Character and Appearance of Area (SD1, SD2, SH1, D4, D12)
- 2) Impact on Trees and Vegetation (SD1, D4, D10)
- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 4) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| UDP Key Policies: | SD1, SD2, SH1, D4, D5, D10, D12, T13 |
| Listed Building: | Locally Listed |
| Car Parking | Standard: 2 |
| | Justified: See report |
| | Provided: 3 |
| Site Area: | 1 ha |
| No of Residential Units: | 1 |
| Density: | 10 dph 90hrph |
| Council Interest: | None |

b) Site Description

- Part of original curtilage of 31 Elms Road, locally listed detached dwelling house facing junction of Elms Road and Stamford Close
- Comprises mainly rectangular area of land with part-splayed south-eastern boundary adjacent to remaining garden of No.31, together with narrow strip behind rear garden boundaries of 27, 29 and 29a Elms Road
- Site fronts onto Stamford Close, L-shaped cul-de-sac containing 2 blocks of flats
- Extensive tree and hedge cover along north-western and north-eastern boundaries
- TPO covers oak tree at end of narrow strip, and group of trees along north-western boundary

c) Proposal Details

- Detached house fronting onto north-eastern boundary of site with Stamford Close
- 3-storeys proposed adjacent to No.31, 2-storeys elsewhere
- front and rear gable features, rear dormer windows
- brick and tiled elevations, tiled roof
- detached single garage in northern corner of site, accessed from Stamford Close with adjacent forecourt/turning area in front of proposed house

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|
| EAST/878/95/OUT | Outline: Demolition of house and erection of 3 terraced and 2 detached houses with integral garages | WITHDRAWN 23-FEB-96 |
| EAST/282/96/OUT | Outline: 2 detached houses with integral garages | REFUSED 01-AUG-96 |
| EAST/60/97/OUT | Outline: 2 detached houses with integral garages with access from Stamford Close (revised) | REFUSED 25-MAR-97 APPEAL |

Continued/...

DISMISSED
04-NOV-97

EAST/914/97/OUT Outline: Detached house with integral garages with access from Stamford Close REFUSED
10-FEB-98

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposal, by reason of its excessive plot size, would leave a garden for the adjoining locally listed building which would not be commensurate with the size of the building and out of character with it, to the detriment of the setting of the locally listed building and the overall character of the locality.

INFORMATIVE: An application for a smaller plot with a smaller house sited no closer to the north-west boundary may be more favourably considered.”

EAST/228/98/FUL Detached house with double garage with access from Stamford Close REFUSED
22-APR-98

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposal, by reason of its excessive plot size, would leave a garden for the adjoining locally listed building which would not be commensurate with the size of the building and out of character with it, to the detriment of the setting of the locally listed building and the overall character of the locality.

INFORMATIVE: An application for a smaller plot with a smaller house sited no closer to the north-west boundary may be more favourably considered.”

APPEAL
DISMISSED
11-AUG-98

EAST/157/02/FUL Detached house with double garage with access from Stamford Close and garage for no.31 REFUSED
16-APR-02

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposal would give rise to overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessive site coverage of buildings and inadequate space about the building, with inappropriate design and appearance and excessive hard surfacing, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area and the setting of No.31 Elms Road, contrary to the relevant policies of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan”.

APPEAL
DISMISSED
21-NOV-02

P/33/04/CFU Detached single and 2-storey house with detached garage; access from Stamford Close (Alternative 1). REFUSED
11-AUG-04

Continued/...

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposal would give rise to an unacceptable form of development by reason of the loss of open land and space about no.31 Elms Road, inappropriate design and appearance, excessive bulk and hard surfacing, threat to trees and vegetation, and harm to residential outlook, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area, the setting of a locally listed building and neighbouring residential amenity.”

P/34/04/DFU Detached single and 2-storey house with REFUSED detached garage; access from Stamford Close 11-AUG-04 (Alternative 2)

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposal would give rise to an unacceptable form of development by reason of the loss of open land and space about no.31 Elms Road, inappropriate design and appearance, excessive bulk and hard surfacing, threat to trees and vegetation, and harm to residential outlook, to the detriment of the appearance and character of the area, the setting of a locally listed building and neighbouring residential amenity.”

APPEAL
ALLOWED
04-JUL-05

e) Applicant’s Statement

- similar to approved scheme
- gross floor area 15% more than previous scheme, achieved by dropping building partly into ground
- footprint and height of previous approval not exceeded
- similar materials as previous scheme, including Arts and Crafts features
- trees to be removed same as approved scheme

f) Notifications

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 41 | 3 | 13-DEC-05 |

Response: Building too big for the site, no connection in style with 31 Elms Road, loss of privacy, on street parking, harm to character of area, loss of vegetation, restrictive covenant affects site, traffic noise and disturbance, will destroy flora and fauna and wildlife, subsidence, loss of light, overdevelopment.

APPRAISAL

1) Impact on Locally Listed Building and Character and Appearance of Area

There have been 4 appeal decisions in relation to residential proposals for this site. The first 3 Inspectors all expressed concern at the loss of space to No.31 and the detrimental impact this would have on the setting and character of the locally listed building.

Continued/...

The most recent Inspector noted that the appeal proposal would infill an open space which once formed part of the garden to No.31, but considered that its setting has already been severely compromised by its previous subdivision for new development so that the setting and character of the house and its garden are now of a more suburban nature. The Inspector concluded that No.31 would retain a reasonable sized garden for its suburban setting, and as the proposal would be smaller in scale than No.31 the dominance of that house in the street scene would be maintained. In addition, the Inspector considered that the proposed house would reflect some elements of the 'Arts and Crafts' style of the locally listed building.

This proposal occupies the same footprint as the house allowed on appeal and, given the comments of the Inspector, a rerun of the previous objection to the loss of space about the locally listed building would not be sustainable.

It is important however that the design of the proposed house complements No.31 and provides a harmonious relationship in the street scene. Whereas the house allowed on appeal was fairly restrained and balanced, and maintained an Arts and Crafts appearance, this proposed house provides a confused and incongruous mix of styles, materials and features. Its proportions have deteriorated and the building appears to sprawl more than it did before. Although the building has been sunken into the ground in order to incorporate 3 floors into the design, this results in a building that appears larger and more dominant than before, which appears to loom up from beneath the ground. The increase in glazing on all elevations gives the impression of a bulkier and more intensely used building, and disrupts the more discreet character that is normally associated with Arts & Crafts houses.

In detailed terms, the front elevation facing Stamford Close is important in relation to the adjoining locally listed building, as it can be seen in the street scene of Stamford Close in context with 31 Elms Road. This elevation should reflect and pick up details from the Arts & Crafts designed 31 Elms Road in order to preserve and enhance the setting of the older building.

However, the revised elevation is far more imposing than the previous scheme, with a larger expanse of blank roof slope that almost compresses the ground floor. The only features within the roof slope are an excessively large and poorly sited roof light, and a staggered eaves height on the northeast corner which is awkward. With the building sunken into the ground, the ground floor windows peer out beneath the mass of the main roof, with the ones on the south-east corner looking more like windows to a basement or bunker. The front gable has been transferred from the north-east to the south-east corner of this elevation, and its ridge height has been dropped as it protrudes and sprawls further forwards than before. The increased gap between the ridge of this gable and the ridge of the main building (from 1m to 1.7m) adds to the sense of a bulkier main roof. The front gable accommodates a stunted and boxy first floor bay window that appears out of place. The introduction of a rather formal porch canopy increases the confused design of this elevation and further detracts from an Arts & Crafts appearance. The proposed use of glass blocks either side of the front door is an incongruous feature in what should be a traditionally designed building.

Continued/...

The south-east elevation facing No.31 is also particularly sensitive, as it overlooks 31 Elms Road. However, the problems of the front elevation continue into this elevation. The front gable has not been set back from the side, which results in an awkward and bulky continuation of the flank wall, rather than a definite break. The gable to the main roof appears to float because of this lack of a clear break. The side bay window at its full height would appear to be an odd and tacked on feature, but it looks even more boxy and squat on the submitted plans because it is partly sunk beneath the ground. The two windows at first floor level are randomly sited and relate poorly to the rest of the elevation. The mock-Tudor timber planting at roof level introduces a new design feature that further confuses the design of this building. There is also a clear view of the tower-like gable which forms part of the rear elevation, exacerbating the overall bulk of this elevation.

Although the rear elevation is less visible to the locally listed building, it still needs to be well designed, especially as there are side views of certain features. The revised rear elevation is highly confused in terms of design and layout, and the balance that existed with the previous scheme has gone. The tall tower gable on the south-west corner is boxy, narrow and appears to be suspended in mid-air. The ground floor window beneath this gable looks squashed because of the way in which the building goes beneath ground floor level. The two dormers in the main roof have a similar design to the previously approved dormers, but they are both much wider and dominant than before, with different dimensions adding to the confusion. The building's solitary chimney looks too small for a house of this size and design and needs to be more proportionate and striking. The introduction of a lean-to conservatory, squashed between the lounge and kitchen is an incongruous design feature to what should be an Arts & Crafts building, and the same could be said of the French windows to the lounge. These two features exacerbate the amount of glazing on this elevation.

The north-west elevation facing the far end of Stamford Close would not be visible from the locally listed building, but views of 31 Elms Road will be seen in the background, meaning that the design is still very important. Many of the same criticisms referred to above can be applied to this elevation. It appears overly dominant and bulky, with the protruding gables and other features of the front and rear elevation clearly visible. This elevation is oddly staggered, with the sidewall to the study set back by 1m. The main roof gable (which has similar timber planting as the other side elevation) would appear top-heavy and over-hanging, adding to the visual confusion of this elevation. The tall and narrow vertical ground floor windows bear little design reference to this style of building, while the windows in the gable appear unnecessary and out of character.

To summarise, the proposed building, by reason of its design, bulk and layout, is considerably worse than the previous scheme which was allowed at appeal. It feels bigger and less discreet than before, with a number of poor features. It almost seems that the house has been designed from the inside out, as all of the elevations contain conflicting, bulky and awkward elements. The revised scheme would detract from the setting of the locally listed building and the character and appearance of the area, and would be contrary to policies SD1, SD2, D4 and D12.

Continued/...

2) Impact on Trees and Vegetation

The last Inspector considered that the trees and vegetation on the site, which individually are modest specimens, are of group value and contribute significantly to the streetscene. While accepting that the appeal proposals would be likely to result in the deterioration and possible loss of some of the trees and part of the hedging, the Inspector considered that new planting would adequately compensate for such loss, and imposed an appropriate condition. As the footprint of this proposed house is the same as the appeal scheme the above considerations still apply and it is not considered that a refusal on landscape grounds is justified in this case.

3) Residential Amenity

The last Inspector concluded that the appeal proposal would not detract from the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

This scheme however provides considerably more bulk adjacent to the boundary with No.31 than in the approved scheme. It is considered, given that the application site is higher than No.31, that the size and siting of the proposed house would be harmful to the outlook from No.31 and its environs, and would compromise an obtrusive and overbearing form of development. The greater mass and more sprawled form of the proposed house would be intrusive when viewed from Nos.14-17 Stamford Close, which was a concern identified by the 2002 Inspector. The rear elevation of the house would be some 16m from the boundary with 29a Elms Road. Although it contains significantly more glazing than the house allowed on appeal it is considered that a reasonable separation distance would be provided to obviate direct overlooking.

4) Consultation Responses

- On-street parking – the last 2 Inspectors have expressed no concerns on highway or parking grounds, and adequate parking would be provided within the site.
- Traffic noise and disturbance – it is not considered that the amount of traffic generally generated by one dwelling would be harmful to amenity or the character of the area.
- Will destroy wildlife – no evidence of wildlife has been provided
- Restrictive covenant affects site, subsidence – not 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 refuse.

Continued/...

140 WEMBOROUGH RD, STANMORE

3/03
P/2903/05/DFU/PDB
Ward: BELMONT

RETENTION OF 2-STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS, ROOFLIGHT AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

MR A M MERI for MR PRAVIN PATEL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1131(2)/1A & 2A

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

- 1 The single storey east side and rear extension, by reason of its height and siting, unduly curtails light to the facing kitchen window at no. 138 Wemborough Road and appears unduly bulky and overbearing, to the detriment of the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.
- 2 The single storey west side extension, by reason of its height and siting, appears unduly bulky and overbearing when viewed from adjacent property in Honister Gardens, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
SD1 Quality of Design
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
D5 New Residential Development – Amenity Space and Privacy

ENFORCEMENT RECOMMENDATION

The Director of Legal Services be authorised to:-

- a) Issue an enforcement notice pursuant to S.172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

EITHER: (i) compliance with planning permission EAST/890/02/FUL;
Or (ii) reduce the height of single storey side, rear and front extensions by 0.5m

- b) comply with (i) and (ii) above within six months from the date on which the Notice takes effect
- c) Issue Notices under S.330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control
- d) Institute legal proceedings in even of failure to:-

Continued/...

- (i) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices under S.330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990; and/or
- (ii) comply with the enforcement notice

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Relationship to Planning Permission EAST/890/02/FUL
 - 2) Amenity and Character of Proposed Rooflight
 - 3) Other Matters
 - 4) Consultation Responses
 - 5) Enforcement Considerations
-

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- two storey detached house on north side of Wemborough Road, Stanmore
- formerly three bedroom (five habitable room) dwelling with single storey attached garages to both sides; recently extended single and two storeys to rear and both sides
- neighbouring detached house to east, no. 138, unextended at adjacent side and rear; facing flank wall contains bathroom, landing and kitchen window; also bedroom window wraps around first floor front corner
- flank kitchen window obscure glazed and 1.54m (w) x 0.87m (h) and 1.63m above ground level; kitchen also served by part glazed (clear) door on rear elevation with glazed area 0.59m (w) x 1.25m (h)
- west flank boundary splayed in relation to original house flank walls and forms rear garden boundary of houses fronting Honister Gardens
- rear site boundary forms flank garden boundary of no. 9 Honister Gardens
- levels fall gently east to west

c) Proposal Details

- retention of single and two storey extensions not in accordance with the approved plans
- addition of rooflight at rear

Continued/...

d) Relevant History

EAST/890/02/FUL Two Storey and Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extensions (Revised); GRANTED 22-JAN-03

EAST/474/02/FUL Two Storey and Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extensions REFUSED 04-JUL-02

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of unsatisfactory design, excessive size and neighbourly siting, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the appearance and character of the area.

e) Applicant's Statement

- The double storey side extension has permission to be built 5m deep but has been built to 4.525m deep at the request of the occupier at no. 138. The pitched roof on the single storey rear extension adjacent to no. 138 was not practical because of its height so this has been built to with a flat roof and parapet wall. We believe the additional impact on the adjoining building is very minimal because of the orientation and nature of the room of the next-door building.

The building in Honister Gardens is away from this building by 20m and the physical and visual impact of the parapet wall is negligible.

We hope that the application is considered reasonably acceptable in the given circumstances.

Additional Applicant's Statement

- We have amended the application to omit the rear dormer as we gathered that it would not be recommended for approval. We propose instead a simple rooflight window to comply with the building regulations in terms of light and fire safety.

f) Notifications

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 14 | 4 | 20-DEC-05 |

Response: loss of privacy; retention of development as-built and addition of dormer will add to grossly overdeveloped site; size and scale intrusive and disproportionate to the site's size; overshadowing of neighbouring gardens/private spaces; loss of light and sight lines; design and scale achieves greatest mass without consideration to the environment - detrimental impact; side extensions too high; balconies out of keeping; loss of light to no. 138; obstructs view from back of house; have had to cut down own tree; extensions on all sides changes character and is safety risk; departure from plans has resulted in higher wall on boundary; meant to be detached houses; applicant's disregard for neighbours relies on fact that pursuit in civil law courts would be costly and time consuming; party wall demolished and plants removed without permission/compensation; scaffolding erected on neighbouring property without permission; credibility of planning process questioned as original permission granted despite three objections; confused by development description having been told by officers that the work was being carried out in accordance with the plans.

Continued/...

APPRAISAL

1) Relationship to Planning Permission EAST/890/02/FUL

Two Storey Rear Extension

This element is larger, in terms of width, depth and roof height, than that shown on the plans approved under EAST/890/02/FUL. However the departures are slight and are not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers of the character of the locality. Specifically:

- The development continues to fall within a 45° line drawn, on plan, from the adjacent rear corner of no. 138 and together with siting off the boundary does not – on its own - appear unduly bulky or overbearing from the rear of that neighbouring property. Notwithstanding the site's orientation to the west of no. 138 it is considered that compliance with the 45° code in conjunction with the siting of the two storey rear element off the common boundary is sufficient to curtail the degree of lost light and overshadowing to within acceptable parameters. An upward 45° plane from the base of the facing kitchen window at no. 138 is also cleared by the two-storey rear element.
- In relation to Honister Gardens and notwithstanding the fall in site levels towards those neighbouring properties it is not considered that the larger two storey rear extension appears so much more bulky than that approved as to warrant refusal. Sufficient space between the flank wall and the rear boundaries of Honister Gardens properties is maintained to avoid an unduly overbearing visual impact or excessive loss of light.
- The distance between the extension and the rear boundary is reduced to 14m and is only 11cm less than that approved. It is considered that this is sufficient to maintain the pattern and character of development in the locality, to provide a visual spatial setting for the two-storey development when viewed from surrounding gardens, and to avoid excessive overlooking of the rear garden of no. 9 Honister Gardens.

Single Storey Rear Extension (adjacent no. 138)

This element is larger, in terms of width, depth and roof height, than that shown on the plans approved under EAST/890/02/FUL. Here, it is considered that the additional height would cause harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Specifically:

- The extension depth continues to comply with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments in relation to no. 138. Although marginally deeper than 3m this is more than adequately compensated for by the separation that is maintained from the boundary. However, the as built height of the extension is considered to be excessive for a single storey element and adds unduly to the overall bulk of development at the rear. In combination with the single storey side extension this element appears overbearing and obtrusive when viewed from surrounding property, to the detriment of the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Refusal, with enforcement action to follow, is therefore recommended.

Continued/...

Item 3/03 : P/2903/05/DFU continued/...

- The 'as built' development maintains adequate space around the building sufficient to safeguard the pattern and character of development in this locality.

Two Storey Side Extension (adjacent no. 138)

As the depth of this element is smaller than that of the approved scheme and in all other respects remains this same there can be no objection.

Single Storey Side Extension (adjacent no. 138)

This element is larger, in terms of height and relative depth (i.e. because of the shallow two storey extension) than that shown on the plans approved under EAST/890/02/FUL. Here it is found that the departures from the approved plans would cause demonstrable harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Specifically:

- Although obscure glazed and supplemented by a part-glazed rear kitchen door, the larger kitchen window in the west facing flank elevation at no. 138 was considered to be principle source of light and therefore 'protected' in accordance with the Council's householder guidance. Unlike the approved scheme, the 'as built' development interrupts a 45° plane drawn from the lower edge of the glazed area of that 'protected' window and rises approximately 0.5m above the point of intersection. In so doing it is considered that the single storey flank wall unreasonably curtails light to this window, relative to the pre-existing situation, and is as a result detrimental to the residential amenity enjoyed by the neighbouring occupiers. Refusal, with enforcement action to follow, is therefore recommended.

Two Storey Side Extension (adjacent Honister Gardens)

This element is larger, in terms of width, depth and roof height, than that shown on the plans approved under EAST/890/02/FUL. However the departures are slight and are not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers of the character of the locality. Specifically:

- The development maintains a distance in the region of 26m to the rear main walls of dwellings in Honister Gardens and the first floor flank wall continues to be sited adequately off the common boundary. In these circumstances and taking into account the fall in levels towards Honister Gardens it is not considered that the development appears unduly bulky or overbearing from the surrounding gardens, nor that the degree of lost light/overshadowing beyond that approved would be so significant as to merit refusal.

Continued/...

- It is also considered that there is sufficient space around this element to maintain the pattern and character of development in the locality and to provide a visual spatial setting for the two-storey development when viewed from surrounding gardens. The provision of a high level window in the rear elevation, as approved, would continue to avoid any unreasonable actual or perceived overlooking of the rear gardens in Honister Gardens.

Single Storey Side to Rear Extension (adjacent Honister Gardens)

This element is larger, in terms of width and height than that shown on the plans approved under EAST/890/02/FUL. Here it is found that the departures from the approved plans would cause visual harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Specifically:

- Taking into account the fall in adjacent garden levels towards Honister Gardens and the siting of this element immediately adjacent to the common boundary it is considered the flank wall reaches an unnecessarily excessive height. Across the total depth of the extension this height gives the flank wall an overbearing, dominant presence both in the outlook of the rear windows of adjacent dwellings in Honister Gardens and in the setting of their gardens, detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. Refusal is therefore recommended also for this reason.

Single Storey Side to Front Extension (adjacent Honister Gardens)

This is a continuation of the above and therefore unacceptable in its relationship with adjoining Honister Garden property. It is noted that the front extension width is narrower than that approved and overall this element is considered to have an improved appearance in the streetscene. However to ensure a satisfactory appearance when viewed obliquely in relation to the flank wall its height will need to be reduced accordingly.

Main and Two Storey Side Extension Roofs

The roofs are of some increased overall bulk relative to the approved scheme, by reason of increased height and width. Given the separation of the dwelling from those in Honister Gardens and the rise in levels on Wemborough Road towards Weston Drive, creating staggered ridge heights, it is not considered that the 'as built' roof has a detrimental appearance in the streetscene nor that its size/form is out of character in this locality.

2) Impact on Amenity and Character of Proposed Rooflight

This application had also sought permission for a rear dormer, but this has been designed out following discussion with officers. A rooflight, 1.7m up from the eaves in the rear roofslope, is now proposed instead. The rooflight will serve a loft-bedroom.

Continued/...

It is not considered that the rooflight will add to the bulk of the development nor detract, to any significant extent, from the appearance of the extended dwelling when viewed from surrounding property. Neither is it considered that the degree of actual or perceived overlooking from the rooflight would be such as to be of demonstrable harm to the privacy amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

3) Other Matters

In association with the on-going development of the property a timber summerhouse has been erected on a concrete base adjacent to the rear boundary of the property which No.9 Honister Gardens. Although no formal determination as to lawfulness has been sought, such developments are normally permitted under Class E of Part 1 (Schedule 2) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

4) Consultation Responses

- balconies out of keeping: no balconies proposed
- obstructs view from back of house: no right to a view *per se*; issues of outlook as considered above
- have had to cut down own tree: tree not protected and therefore a civil matter between the parties
- extensions on all sides is safety risk: it is not considered that the approved extensions to both sides pose an undue safety risk
- applicant's disregard for neighbours relies on fact that pursuit in civil law courts would be costly and time consuming: noted but not a material planning consideration
- party wall demolished and plants removed without permission/compensation: noted but not a material planning consideration
- scaffolding erected on neighbouring property without permission: noted but not a material planning consideration
- credibility of planning process questioned as original permission granted despite three objections: objections taken into account but public opposition to a development is not on its own a reason for withholding planning permission
- confused by development description having been told by officers that the work was being carried out in accordance with the plans: original advice to residents that development complies with planning permission incorrect

All other matters addressed in the report above.

5) Enforcement Considerations

1. The alleged breach of planning control

The erection of single and two storey side and rear extensions not in accordance with planning permission EAST/890/02/FUL.

2. Reason for Issuing the Notice

It appears to the Council that the above breach of planning control has occurred within the last four years.

Continued/...

The single storey east side and rear extension, by reason of its height and siting, unduly curtails light to the facing kitchen window at no. 138 Wemborough Road and appears unduly bulky and overbearing, to the detriment of the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The single storey west side extension, by reason of its height and siting, appears unduly bulky and overbearing when viewed from adjacent property in Honister Gardens, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

The Council does not consider that planning permission should be granted and conditions would not overcome these impacts.

3. Requirements of the notice

- EITHER: (i) Modify the extension to comply with Planning Permission
EAST/890/02/FUL
OR (ii) Reduce the height of the single-storey side, rear and front extension by
0.5m.

4. Period for Compliance

Six months.

CONCLUSION

For all of 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.

Continued/...

SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

4/01

EDGWARE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, BURNT OAK BROADWAY, LONDON P/2956/05/CNA/RJS

Ward: Adj Auth - Area 1(E)

CONSULTATION: NEW ACCESS, PARKING FOR MOBILE MRI SCAN UNIT

PHILP ALLARD for BARNET NHS PRIMARY CARE TRUST

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: W00546 BV/05: Site Plan, W00546 BV/05: Existing Layout & W00546 BV/05:

RAISES NO OBJECTION to the development set out in the application, subject to regard being had to the following matters:

INFORMATIVES

1 **INFORMATIVE:**

These comments are provided by this Council as a Local Planning Authority affected by the development and are made in response to consultation under the provisions of Article 10 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Highway Safety
 - 2) Residential Amenity & Impact on London Borough of Harrow
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) **Summary**

Council Interest: None

b) **Site Description**

- An area of hardsurfacing/roadway constituting the former entrance to the Edgware Community Hospital site. This roadway is no longer utilised as a point of access for vehicles;
- Located on the north eastern side of Burnt Oak Broadway;
- Fixed concrete bollard are located along the pavement edge;
- Burnt Oak Broadway forms the boundary between Harrow and Barnet Council;

Continued/...

Item 4/01 : P/2956/05/CNA continued/...

- Located to the north west of the site is fencing, advertising signage and a commercial warehouse beyond. This property is within the Borough of Barnet;
- Located to the south east of the site is an area of landscaping and single storey building as part of the Hospital site. These are within the Borough of Barnet;
- Located on the opposite side of Burnt Oak Broadway to the southwest are attached two storey buildings (accommodating commercial at ground floor and residential above), as well as a commercial timber yard. These properties are within the Borough of Harrow;

c) Proposal Details

- Installation of a drop kerb with drop down bollards along an 11 metre section of the former Hospital entrance;
- This would be to allow access to the area of hardstanding for the parking of a mobile scanner unit;

d) Relevant History

- None

e) Notification

| Sent | Replies | Expiry |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 35 | None | 09-JAN-06 |

Response: None.

APPRAISAL

1) Highway Safety

The provision of a drop kerb with drop down bollards would allow occasional access to an area of hardstanding for use by a mobile scanner unit. As vehicle movements would be extremely infrequent there are no concerns with respect of highway safety.

2) Residential Amenity Impact on London Borough of Harrow

Given that Burnt Oak Broadway is a classified road with existing high levels of traffic, the proposal to provide infrequent access would not cause any harm to residential amenity in terms of additional noise and disturbance. Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not cause a direct impact upon on the London Borough of Harrow nor to any person or property within the Borough.

3) Consultation Responses

None

Continued/...

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, no objection is raised to the proposal.

Continued/...

SECTION 5 - PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS

5/01

LAND AT SUDBURY HILL, HARROW, NEAR JUNC. P/3018/05/CFU/SC2
SOUTH HILL AVE

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

8M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND 3 EQUIPMENT CABINETS

LCC UK for T MOBILE UK LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 50827/01 REV A, 50827/02 REV A, 50827/03 REV A, 50827/04 REV A

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of street furniture to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and the area in general; it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of and would adversely affect important views in Sudbury Hill Conservation Area and would adversely affect important views.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:
D24 Telecommunications Development
D14 Conservation Areas
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
EP31 Areas of Special Character

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS & POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Telecommunications Development (D24)
 - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Area of Special Character (D14, D15, D24, EP31)
 - 3) Residential Amenity (D24)
 - 4) Consultation Response
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Conservation Area: HARROW:SUDBURY HILL
Council Interest: None

Continued/...

b) Site Description

- Grass verge inside pavement at Sudbury Hill opposite junction with South Hill Avenue, adjacent to boundary wall of Chasewood Park
- Boundary walls steps down to reflect fall of ground level to southeast down Sudbury Hill, ranging from approximately 2-2.5m in height
- Mature trees inside boundary wall of Chasewood Park, pedestrian entrance to which is sited just to the southeast
- Nearby street furniture includes BT cabinet and public bench
- Levels fall away down South Hill Avenue to the west and Sudbury Hill to the southeast
- Site located in Sudbury Hill Conservation Area and Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character

c) Proposal Details

- 8m (overall) streetworks 'Victorian flue' effect pole and 3 associated equipment cabinets
- Materials: Grey tower, Dark Green steel cabinets
- An ICNIRP certificate of compliance has been included with the application
- Near identical application was refused on 8th September 2005 for the same reason as above. This decision has been appealed and a verdict from the Inspectorate is pending

d) Relevant History

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|
| P/1957/05/CFU | 8m high telecommunications mast and equipment cabins | REFUSED 08-SEPT-05 |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|

The reason for refusal was as follows:-

The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of street furniture to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and the area in general; it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of and would adversely affect important views in Sudbury Hill Conservation Area and would adversely affect important views.

e) Applicant's Statement (Summary)

- The site benefits from a back drop of large mature trees and nearby street furniture including lamp posts and BT equipment cabinets, which provides an appropriate context for the pole; the site is located such that significant separation is achieved from residential properties in the vicinity; views into the site from surrounding areas are well screened; T-Mobile has a clear requirement for an installation within this particular area and no other suitable structures, buildings or sites exist; the proposal is ICNIRP compliant.

f) Consultations

Advertisement : Character of Conservation Area

Continued/...

Notifications

Sent
448

Replies
Awaited

Expiry
03-FEB-2006

APPRAISAL

1) Telecommunications Development

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

The first consideration is whether any satisfactory and less harmful alternative is available within the area of coverage deficiency as identified by the operator. It was concluded by the applicant that this site was most appropriate in terms of providing coverage to the residential areas surrounding Harrow on the Hill and as no other suitable alternative sites were available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. No suitable existing buildings or structures were available.

The site is located in a conservation area and an area of special character, therefore special consideration should be given to the impact on the list of structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. Thus the issue shall be dealt with separately below.

The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves a slim line pole intended to mimic a streetlamp, with a shrouded antenna at the top, and associated equipment cabinets adjacent. However, the pole and cabinets would be located on the east side of the bend of Sudbury Hill, where no high level items of street furniture currently exist. The pole would thus be of excessive size, particularly given the prominent siting on the bend and as levels fall away down South Hill Avenue to the west and Sudbury Hill to the southeast. Due to the existence of existing street furniture such as the public bench and BT cabinet adjacent on the grass verge, the proposal would result in a proliferation of street furniture. The design of the structure would be out of character with the general appearance of the area, and thus would be detrimental to visual amenity.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the LPA should not consider the health aspects further.

In summary, it is considered that due to excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, the current proposal would still give rise to a proliferation of street furniture to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and the area in general.

Continued/...

2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Area of Special Character

The Conservation Team's comments on the previous refused application (P/1957/05/CFU) are incorporated into the Development Control Committee Report dated 7 September 2005. There were significant objections to this scheme, based on a number of issues including the visual impact of the development on a prominent corner site, the excessive height and bulk of the development and the clutter and proliferation of street furniture at this location.

These comments still apply with regard to this application, where the only revision is the mock Victoriana design of the telecommunications mast. This revision does not overcome the objections to the proposal, and in many ways it exacerbates the proposal by drawing more attention to something that is clearly fake. The excessive height and size still exists, as does the visual clutter and proliferation of street furniture. Furthermore, the location of the development is unchanged, so it would still be highly prominent and detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The concerns and objections of the Conservation Team still apply and the development is still contrary to policies EP31, D14, D15 and D24 and guidance contained within the Sudbury Hill Conservation Area Policy Statement.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposal would not impact on the amenity of residents in the area, given the distance from neighbouring properties. The pole and cabinets would be sited a distance of 20m from the nearest property at Sudbury Lodge, however there is a 2m close boarded fence on the boundary of that property with Chasewood Park and mature trees in the intervening space, thus the structure would not be visible. The pole would be approximately 30m from the front of Gooden Cottage opposite, this is also considered to be sufficient distance so as to preserve residential amenity.

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

4) Consultation Responses

Awaited.

CONCLUSION

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