

## SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

1/01

**SPORTS EAST, HARROW SCHOOL, FOOTBALL LANE, HARROW**  
**P/123/06/CFU/RP1**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

12 x 15M MASTS AND 24 x 10M COLUMNS TO PROVIDE FLOODLIGHTING TO ARTIFICIAL TURF PITCHES & TENNIS COURTS

HARROW SCHOOL GENERAL FUND for HARROW SCHOOL

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Location Plan, Site Plan 100-02211-101-J, Tennis UK52530/4, Astro UK52530/4TO87RLHC, HL 250H 15mB, Tech Spec AL 5760

**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 floodlighting hereby permitted shall only be used on any day between the hours of 30 minutes before sunset until 2200 hours.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenities of the locality.
- 3 The illumination from the lighting permitted to the tennis courts shall not exceed 766 LUX in the first 100 hours of operation of any light and 600 LUX thereafter. The illumination from the lighting permitted to the two pitches shall not exceed 478 LUX in the first 100 hours of operation and 382 LUX thereafter.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenities of the location.
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the light columns and light fittings have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 5 The light fittings shall be fixed and maintained in accordance with specification sheets AL5760 and drawings UK2530/4 and /5.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenities 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:  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.  
EP44 Metropolitan Open Land

Continued/...

D14 Conservation Areas  
D23 Lighting and Floodlighting

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 The applicant is reminded that the conditions attached to planning permission WEST/27/01/FUL continue to apply to the area to be floodlit.

---

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

- 1) Metropolitan Open Land (EP44)
- 2) Conservation Areas (D14)
- 3) Lighting and Floodlighting (D23)
- 4) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Major Dwellings
Site Area:	2.24 ha net
Conservation Area:	Nearest to site is Harrow School CA
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- A block of 12 tennis courts and two sports pitches which together form an L shape.
- These are situated within a much larger sports area between Football Lane and the borough boundary at Watford Road known as Sports East.
- The improvement and re-levelling of the larger area was permitted in 2002 and the works have been carried out including landscaping and the re-routing of the public footpath which now threads its way between the pitches.

**c) Proposal Details**

- To erect 12 x 16m high columns around the two pitches. The light fittings are to provide 382 LUX to pitch 1 and 214LUX to pitch 2. The greater brilliance on Pitch 1 is required to meet the standards of the English Hockey. When being used for training it will be lit the same as Pitch 2. A lower level of lighting is needed for football, as recommended by the Football Association, on Pitch 2.
- A total of 32 lights will be supported on the 12 columns.
- To erect 24 x 8m high columns around the twelve tennis courts. The light fittings are to provide 590 LUX to each court as recommend by the Lawn Tennis Association. Lighting will be controlled to each court so that only those in use will be lit.
- A total of 48 lights will be supported by the 24 columns.

Continued/...

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/27/01/FUL Replacement athletics track, 12 replacement tennis courts, 2 all weather pitches, new equipment store, relocation of parade ground and improvements to access to Watford Road GRANTED 28-APR-03

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Previous permission given in 2003 for various sports facilities known as Sports East. Lighting removed from that application due to concern amongst committee members.
- Previous withdrawn lighting proposals comprised 16 x 18m high columns to the pitches and 24 x 10m high columns to the tennis courts.
- Latest technology enables the lighting columns to be reduced and lower than previously submitted.
- No lighting to be used after 2200 hours.
- To lower the columns any further would require changing the angle at which lights are mounted and would increase light spillage compared to that arising from the current proposal.
- The intensity of light is greater in the first 100 hours of use after which the lights deteriorate by about 25% to give a less amount of light for the life of the fitting, around 4,000 hours.

**f) Consultations**

<b>Greater London Authority:</b>	No comment
<b>London Borough of Brent:</b>	No comment
<b>Harrow Hill Trust:</b>	Use to be limited, light pollution controlled and perceived extent of urbanisation kept as low as possible
<b>English Heritage:</b>	No comment

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 30-MAR-06	
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 52	Replies 5	Expiry 02-MAY-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)**

This is strategic open land within the urban area which contributes to the structure of London. Essential facilities will only be acceptable where they do not have an adverse impact on the openness of MOL. Policy EP 45 of the HUDP addresses additional building on MOL. Para 3.138 explains that the Council accepts that ancillary development may be necessary to sustain open land uses. That the open character and views to/from MOL should be minimally affected.

Continued/...

In 2002 it was accepted that, taking into account the School's statement of need of sporting facilities and the lack of all weather, illuminated pitches and benefits to community users that the need for the proposal had been demonstrated. Since then community use of the facilities has commenced.

## **2) Conservation Area**

By day, when viewed by looking west towards the Hill, the lighting masts will be seen against the backdrop of the Hill surmounted by a line of buildings being in conservation areas. Closer up the masts will also be seen in the setting of the tree lines and fencing around the newly improved sports facilities.

In reverse, when looking east outward from the school conservation area, the columns will be seen amongst trees, fences and playing areas in the foreground.

By night, the glow of the lighting will be seen together with that already generated by Westminster University, the hospital and golf driving range which stand on the east side of Watford Road just over the borough boundary.

## **3) Lighting**

Apart from school buildings, the nearest residential properties are approximately 450m away in Pebworth Road. The intervening rise in the ground level and trees, which have been added to by virtue of the landscaping condition attached to the previous 2002 permission will limit direct viewing. Whilst the lights may be visible such are the areas of light created that no light will shine directly onto these homes. The lit areas around the pitches do not extend any nearer than 350m to Pebworth Road properties.

An ecological assessment was undertaken in 2001. A number of measures to improve the ecological value of the playing fields were suggested and a condition imposed. The lighting did not give rise to any ecological issue.

## **4) Consultation Responses**

Apart from the points raised in the above sections of the report, other issues raised are:

Use: This is limited by the conditions attached to the previous permission, the use of the lights is also to be controlled by condition; hours, intensity of light and speed of light. The visibility of the columns during the day and night have been addressed in the appraisal section.

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

DEMOLITION AND RELOCATION OF EXISTING PLANT ROOM AND CONSTRUCTION OF THREE STOREY BLOCK OF 12 FLATS

CHARTER ARCHITECTS for CARLBURNE HOLDINGS LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 50205-200 50205-201 50205-202 50205-203 50205-204 50205-205

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

- 1 The proposal is an unacceptable overdevelopment of a backland site that by reason of poor siting and layout and excessive site coverage by buildings would be an inappropriate form of residential development in this commercial location, resulting in poor living conditions for future occupiers.
- 2 The proposed development by reason of excessive height, scale, bulk, massing and siting would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy to residents of neighbouring properties.
- 3 The proposed development by reason of excessive height, scale, bulk, massing and siting would result in unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties.
- 4 Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's requirements in respect of the development, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway(s) would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the neighbouring highway(s).
- 5 The proposed development would prejudice the implementation of Service Road proposal 5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD3 Mixed Use Development  
EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D9 Streetside Greenness And Forecourt Greenery  
T13 Parking Standards

Continued/...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Residential Character (SD1 D4 D9 H4)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (D5)
  - 3) Parking/Highways (T13, T15, T16)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type:	Major Dwellings	
Site Area:	0.072ha	
Habitable Rooms:	42	
Density:	583 hrph	166 dph
Service Road proposal 5 in HUDP 2004:		
Conservation Area:		
Car Parking:	Standard:	No
	Justified:	No
	Provided:	00
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- Site is on south west side of Bridge Street, close to junction with Love Lane.
- Comprises a three storey terraced unit in use as a hot food take away/restaurant on the ground floor with flatted accommodation on the two upper floors.
- Access is from a staircase at the rear via an archway between 27 and 29 Bridge Street.
- Site is UDP designated primary frontage within Pinner District Centre.
- Land rear of Bridge Street Pinner (east side off Love lane) has been identified in Policy T15 of the HUDP as a site where a service area should be provided for existing non residential development

### b) Proposal Details

- Redevelopment to provide 7 x 1 bed and 5 x 2 bedroom self contained flats
- Removal of existing roof top plant serving take away use and relocation to new internal plant room to be built on land occupied by existing two storey outbuilding (to be demolished) at rear of site.
- Decked garden/landscaped terrace to be provided at first floor level in front of new flats and alongside existing flats above shops on Bridge Street.
- Access is as existing, i.e. via passage alongside restaurant/take away premises and up a staircase.

### c) Relevant History

- **NB:** Pre application advice has been sought for various developments in this locality; all of them have been discouraged

Continued/...

WEST/1186/02/REN	Renewal of planning permission to permit change of use: ancillary A3 to residential for 6 flats on 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> floors	GRANTED 23-DEC-02
WEST/676/97/FUL	Change of use: Ancillary A3 to residential (Class C3) to provide 6 flats	GRANTED 20-NOV-97

**d) Applicant's Statement**

- Development would improve amenity of existing recently renovated flats as it would involve the relocation of existing plant equipment.
- An amenity area would be introduced that could be used by the existing flats and the new residents
- Visual and sound screening would be introduced between the railway lines and the existing and proposed accommodation
- Sustainable accommodation would be provided with good access to local public transport and facilities
- Design of building provides articulation and visual interest, palette of materials seeks to break up and humanise the elevations.
- Coloured render panels serve dual purpose of providing striking elevational treatment within an otherwise dull series of rear elevations and a sound barrier between the railway lines and the new flats.
- Quality of environment for existing flats will be enhanced by the development. It will provide screening and better outlook than the existing views of plant, machinery and the railway lines.
- New flats will complete the facades for the proposed landscaped area, providing a protected play space area.
- Windows in the flats are arranged for privacy, whilst overlooking the amenity space.

**e) Consultations**

- **Engineering Services:** advise that details of surface water/attenuation/storage works are provided to prevent the risk of flooding.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development		Expiry 08-APR-06
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 1	Replies 1	Expiry 08-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** Proposed flats will not be affordable for most people. Building will be too big and will have an over dominant effect on the streetscene. Access to the site is poor and the alley is often congested with traffic. Existing traffic problems will be made worse by increased traffic flows.

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Character**

It is proposed to build two x three storey blocks of flats above the ancillary area at the rear of the Macdonalds restaurant on the Bridge Street frontage. The proposed development would rise to a height of approximately 16.5m above the existing buildings. The site has a splayed configuration in relation to the rest of the buildings on Bridge Street and half of the development would be built on the extended rear wing of the site that is known as 21b Bridge Street. The other half of the proposed development would occupy the area towards the southern boundary of the site. The remainder of the footprint would be taken up by the amenity space and children's play area. No parking provision is proposed for the development.

The site has the characteristics of a backland area, i.e. it has no road frontage and has housing on three sides of it. Consequently, sensitivity should be shown in the siting and layout of development. However, the proposed development would be located adjacent to the service road and refuse bin areas of shops and restaurants that are on the main road frontage immediately to the north of the site.

Furthermore, the proposal is too close to the existing buildings within the site, particularly the existing flats at first and second floor levels. Principal windows in the southernmost block would be a distance of only 12 to 15m of the existing rear building line, which would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy for occupiers of the existing flats and future occupiers of the proposed flats. The decked communal garden would also suffer in this respect. Located in the centre of the site, it would be completely enclosed by the existing buildings to the north and east and the proposed dwellings to the south and west.

The siting and setting of the proposed development is regarded as poor and would therefore be contrary to the advice in Policy D4. It advises that development should have regard to the character and landscape of the locality and should have a satisfactory relationship with adjoining buildings and spaces.

### **2) Residential Amenity**

The proposed development would result in loss of sunlight and daylight to existing flats above shops and restaurants on Bridge Street, on the northern and eastern boundaries of the site. The existing flats above the restaurant would be placed in a tunnel between the proposed flats and the existing four storey office building on the eastern boundary of the site. This is contrary to the advice in Policy D5, which states that new residential development should ensure that the amenity of existing dwellings is safeguarded.

Moreover, Future occupiers would suffer from poor outlook and a poor quality of residential environment due to the proximity of commercial buildings and their service areas and activity from the adjacent service road and car parking areas for businesses located on Bridge Street. The quality of the environment for future occupiers would suffer in this respect and would be in conflict with the advice in Policy D5. The service road users are predominantly restaurants, cafes and shops.

Continued/...



Much of their trade takes place at night and it is considered that the activity associated with these uses would have an unneighbourly effect on the proposed development in terms of noise and disturbance, vehicle movement and cooking odours.

### **3) Parking/Highways**

The service road immediately adjoining the site has been identified in Policy T16 of the HUDP as one that should be upgraded as a service area for the retail uses on Bridge Street. In this way, manoeuvring and loading activities can be carried out off street on a sufficiently wide highway without disruption to the free flow of traffic. The proposed development would prevent such a process from taking place, as the relocated ground floor plant room of the Macdonald's restaurant and its bin storage area along with the refuse bin stores area of the proposed flats would be immediately adjacent to the pinch point of the service road, which runs between the access adjacent to the post office at the north western end of Bridge Street and Chapel Lane at the south eastern end of the locality.

No off street parking has been provided in the proposal and no justification has been submitted for its non provision, other than a brief reference in the applicants' introductory statement to the benefits of having sustainable development near to public transport services. The potential problems of the likelihood of future owners of the development parking their cars on street have not been addressed. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the advice in policy T13. It says that development should make appropriate provision for car parking and should consider whether the proposal is likely to create significant on street parking problems and the consequential traffic and highway problems associated with it. Given the physical constraints of the site, they are likely to be severe.

### **4) Consultation Responses**

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 comments received in response to notification and consultation as set out above: this application is recommended for refusal.

Continued/...

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 2/3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 14 FLATS WITH BASEMENT PARKING

HOWARD, FAIRBAIRN & PARTNERS for EATON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5272-PL01 A, 5272-PL02 B, 5272-PL03 B, 5272-PL04 B, 5272-PL05 B, 5272-PL06 B, 5272-PL07 B, 5272-PL08 B, 5272-PL09, 5272-PL10, 5272-PL11.

**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 and bulk, would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties which comprise mainly two storey, detached family dwellings and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive bulk and poor design would have a detrimental effect on the character and setting of the neighbouring Grade II\* Listed Building Sweetman's Hall and the Grade II Listed Building Sweetman's Barn.
- 3 The proposed development, through an over intensification of the use of the site, would intensify the use of the West End Lane/West Way road junction to the detriment of highway safety.
- 4 The proposed development, by reason of inappropriate positioning of the vehicle access ramp, by way of associated disturbance and general activity in close proximity to the west boundary, would have an adverse effect on the amenity of the neighbouring occupants at number 2 West Way.

## **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
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D8 Storage of Waste
  - D9 Streetside Greenness & Forecourt Greenery
  - D10 Trees and new development
  - D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

Continued/...

T13 Parking standards  
H4 Residential Density  
H18 Accessible Homes

---

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

- 1) Impact on Character of the Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D5, D8, D9, D10, D11, H4, H18, T13)
  - 2) Impact on Residential Amenity (D4, D5, D8, T13, H4)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

### **INFORMATION**

#### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Major Dwellings	
Site Area:	2,200m <sup>2</sup>	
Density:	205 hrpa	64 dph
Car Parking	Standard:	
	Justified:	20 (maximum)
	Provided:	19
Council Interest:	None:	

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

- Three detached two storey single family dwelling houses with good sized rear garden areas;
- Surrounding uses are residential, mostly detached two-storey houses;
- Exceptions to the street scene are the modest block of flats known as Mistletoe Lodge and the terraced houses at Mansard Close;
- Development site is prominent being on the corner of West Way and West End Lane;
- Large hedge lines to the rear of numbers 91 and 93 West End Lane create adequate screening between the rear garden areas and the rear elevation of number 2 West Way;
- West Lodge School close by;
- Traffic calming measures implemented over past years along West End Lane to improve highway safety.

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

- 31 bedrooms proposed, 11x2 bedroom flats, 3x3 bedroom flats;
- Build new 2/3 storey building to provide 14 self contained flats with basement parking;
- 2 disabled parking spaces to West Way elevation;
- Basement parking accessible via West Way to provide 17 spaces and cycle storage for 18 bicycles;
- Brick and render proposed for walls, tiles and felt proposed for roof;
- Boundary to be enclosed by hedge and 1.8m high fence;
- Parking area to be constructed of tarmac;
- Footprint of building 1992m<sup>2</sup> in area;
- 755m<sup>2</sup> (approx.) of rear garden area;

Continued/...

- Majority of mature trees to remain.

**d) Relevant History**

- None.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The planning application responds positively to comments received from Council at the pre-application stage;
- In particular the scale and massing of the building has been reduced, and greater consideration has been given to protecting the amenities of the adjoining owners;
- We have increased the distance between windows and the garden boundary, together with re-siting of balconies;
- The design also reflects more accurately the character of the street, both in materials and detail, borrowing from the features of nearby dwellings.

**f) Consultations**

- **English Heritage** : No response

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	23	133	20-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** Development out of context with surrounding buildings and would have an adverse effect on the street scene; Proposal would lead to an increase in the amount of traffic and have a flow on adverse effect on highway safety particularly with the neighbouring West Lodge School close by; Loss of property value for neighbouring residents; Adverse effect on heritage and village character of Pinner; Development would adversely affect the setting of a Grade II\* Listed Building; Loss of three good quality detached family houses; Building not in keeping with existing building lines on West Way or West End Lane; Creation of a terracing effect; Noise issues from extra traffic.

**Pinner Association:**

Proposed building out of character with the surrounding environment;

Poor design proposed;

Intensification of use of the site is at odds with surrounding uses;

The anticipated additional cars associated with proposed development would cause on street parking issues, particularly on West Way;

Green space identified as amenity space at the front of the development inappropriate & lacks privacy;

Overall amenity area provided with the development is too small;

Overall the development would be harmful to the surrounding area.

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The site is located in an area characterised by detached 2-storey dwellings with large garden and amenity areas. Most houses appear to be single-family dwellings.

The bulk and size of the proposed building is considered too large and over dominant in the context of the surrounding buildings and street scene.

The footprint of the proposed building would be an 'L' shape that would have a frontage on both West Way and West End Lane. The building line of the front elevations would project further than the existing established building line of West Way by 4m and the building line on West End Lane by 4m. It is acknowledged that the current property at 91 West End Lane is not in sync with the buildline on West Way (it comes out past the predominant building line by 7m), but it is in sync with other buildings on West End Lane. It is a clearly defined property on West End Lane given that it is over 27m away from 2 West Way. The existing buildline is therefore not an issue. The proposed development however would have frontages on both West End Lane and West Way. It should therefore respect the existing building lines on both streets. This it fails to do on both accounts.

This is considered to be poor design and poor practice, particularly with a large building of this size on a corner plot as it immediately gives the impression of dominating the street and not respecting the character of the area.

The overall height of the building does not reflect the height of the surrounding buildings on this side of the West Way or West End Lane. The proposed 3 storey building would be approximately 1.5m higher than the 2-storey house at 97 West End Lane and 1m higher than the roof ridge line of the 2 storey house at 2 West Way.

The development site sits across the road from the Grade II\* Listed Building Sweetman's Hall and the Grade II Listed Building Sweetman's Barn. These buildings are detached and characterised by garden areas reflecting the predominant character of the surrounding area. There are particular concerns that the proposed building would, due to its size, bulk, footprint, design and lack of breaks, have an over dominant and detrimental impact on the character and setting of these listed buildings, particularly Sweetman's Hall.

It is considered that there is no scope for a 3-storey development in this location. Although the applicant has attempted to make the development appear like a 2-storey building with habitable roof space and numerous dormers, the end result is, a building that is cramped in appearance and poorly reflects the surrounding buildings. It is acknowledged that a 2-storey with roof space and dormer windows type development already exists on West End Lane directly across the road at Mansard Close. However, these properties are mostly concealed behind mature trees. Further, Mansard Close is located in a less prominent location, hence its effect/impact on the overall street scene is relatively minor.

Continued/...

Design wise, the windows and floors of the proposed development would not follow the same predominant lines as that of neighbouring houses, particularly 2 West Way, giving the impression of cramming too many flats into a small space. The dormers on the West End Lane elevation do not attempt to line up with the windows on the lower floors and appears cramped towards the corner with West Way. There are 7 dormers proposed on West End Lane and 4 on West Way, the overall effect of this, is an inconsistent appearance to the building.

In terms of green space, there would be an overall loss with the development, particularly on the West Way frontage. Four relatively large mature trees and an area of garden land roughly 264m<sup>2</sup> would be lost on West Way. This is near the entrance to the street and it is considered that it would adversely affect the character of the street scene.

## **2) Impact on Residential Amenity**

There is concern that the size of the proposed development is such that it would result in an overall adverse effect on neighbouring amenity and the amenity of future residents.

Privacy is not considered to be a key concern with the proposal given that the building is 5.5m away from the side elevation of 97 West End Lane and 3m away from the side elevation of 2 West Way. No habitable room windows from the proposed building would directly overlook rear garden amenity areas or habitable room windows of neighbouring properties. The garden area at 2 West Way is sheltered with the existing high hedge which is to be retained. Number 97 West End Lane would be screened by the existing large trees on the boundary. It is however, acknowledged that, the screening effects of these trees would be greatly reduced when trees are not in foliage.

Outlook is not considered to be an issue with the proposal when viewed from the habitable room windows at the properties immediately bordering the application site, namely 2 West Way and 97 West End Lane. It is considered however to affect the outlook from the building directly across the road at Mistletoe lodge. The existing view from this property is one which looks on to the side of a modest single family dwelling house with a large rear garden area. The development would give the impression of looking out onto a group of terraces.

Light is not considered to be a key concern with the proposed development. It is considered that there would be noticeable loss of sunlight to some neighbouring properties with the development of this size however, due to the plot size and the proximity to neighbouring buildings, it is not considered that it would be to the extent in which it would adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residents. Further the proposed development would comply with Councils 45° Code.

Noise is considered to be an issue with the proposed development and with the positioning of the access ramp for basement parking. It is proposed to locate this on the boundary with number 2 West Way. West Way is a relatively quiet suburban street and the amount of traffic movements to the development site as a result of the proposed development would increase significantly. It is considered that the location of the access ramp to the underground parking which provides for 17 car parking spaces is inappropriate as it is within 2m of the boundary with number 2 West Way and 3m from the front corner of the house.

Continued/...

There is currently a garage on the boundary between number 91 West End Lane and number 2 West Way with access but this accommodates only 1 car. It is therefore considered that the movements of 17 vehicles on a regular basis would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the occupants of 2 West Way.

Additional concerns with noise relates to the proposed internal arrangement. This is considered to be poorly thought out with the positioning of living rooms above bedrooms of proposed downstairs flats. This type of arrangement can lead to future conflict between neighbours with associated noise issues.

Amenity area is considered to be inadequate for a development with 31 bedrooms proposed. Although amenity area is proposed to the front of the property behind a new hedge, this is considered to be unsuitable with regards to providing adequate privacy, particularly on this prominent corner plot. Amenity space to the rear is smaller than the existing area that currently provides for 3 modest single-family dwelling houses. It is considered that the development would be too large to provide suitable amenity space for over 31 future occupants.

In general concerns with amenity relate back to the overall concern that a development of this size is too large, inappropriate and out of character in this location.

### **3) Consultation Responses**

Relevant consultation responses to the proposed development have been discussed and addressed above with the exception of highway congestion/safety. The majority of responses expressed concern with the impact of such a development on traffic generation and highway safety.

West End Lane has had measures implemented over previous years to assist in reducing traffic and lower car speeds such as speed humps, roundabouts etc. Concern from members of the Pinner community relate to the increase in traffic not only from future occupiers vehicles but also visitors to the premises.

Seventeen spaces are proposed at basement floor level with two disabled spaces at ground floor level of the new block of flats. It can be safely presumed that there will be an increase in vehicle movements along West End Lane and West Way as a result of a development of this size being undertaken. Councils Highways Engineer objects to the proposal on highway safety grounds as the development would result in an over intensification of the use of the site and would therefore potentially intensify the use of the West End Lane/West Way junction to the detriment of highway safety.

### **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/...

1 EASTCOTE RD, 200, 201, 202, 203 GROVE AVE, P/362/06/CFU/RP1  
PINNER

Ward: PINNER SOUTH

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE THREE STOREY CARE HOME; PARKING AND  
LANDSCAPING

CHBC ARCHITECTS for GALLEY HOMES LTD

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 04.5572-01, 5572-02,5572-03, 5572-04 and design & sustainability statement

**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 and bulk, would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 The development would, by reason of excessive site coverage by building and hard-surfaced vehicular access and garage forecourt, and associated disturbance and general activity, be an over-intensive use, and amount to an overdevelopment of the site to be detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 3 R\_CAR\_FNT1 - Parking in Front Garden - Appearance
- 4 R\_BALCONY - Balcony and Loss of Privacy
- 5 The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site contrary to HUDP policies D4 and D5.
- 6 The site lies within a Flood Zone 2 and ,in the absence of a flood risk assessment to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, the development is contrary to the Harrow Unitary Development Plan policy EP11.
- 7 The development fails to provide affordable housing in accord with HUDP policy H5 and therefore is to the detriment of delivering affordable housing appropriate to the site and the borough's acknowledged housing needs.
- 8 In the absence of any attenuation measures the development is likely to give rise to an increased risk of flooding contrary to HUDP policy EP 12.

## 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  
EP11 Development within Floodplains  
EP12 Control of Surface Water runoff  
D4 The Standard of Design and Layout

Continued/...



D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
H5	Affordable Housing
H6	Affordable Housing Target

---

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

- 1) Floodplain (EP 11) and attenuation of river's flow (EP12)
  - 2) Quality and Standard of design and layout (SD1, D4,D5)
  - 3) Affordable Housing (H5, H6)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Major Dwellings	
Site Area:	0.39 ha net	
Habitable Rooms:	107 , comprising 13 x 1 bed flats and 27 x 2 bed flats( plus common facilities such as dining room, lounge, hobby rooms and hair salon)	
Density:	270 hrpa	100 dph
Car Parking:	Standard:	53 (no restraint based approach submitted)
	Justified:	53 (if full residential standard applied  )
	Provided:	20
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Irregularly-shaped site currently occupied by 1 Eastcote Road (The Pines) and four detached houses in Grove Avenue known as Little Silver, Medomsley, The Elms and Mayfield House
- Existing Buildings are two storey in height with pitched roofs.
- To the south the site is faced by the three storey block of flats in Grove Avenue and to the west by the Council's Milman's Resource Centre. To the north stands 3 Eastcote Road which shares a boundary on two sides with the development site. Last to the east are two storey houses facing Marsh Road .The end of their rear gardens form the site's east boundary.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Existing houses to be demolished.
- Redevelopment to provide extra care home with 40 flats and common facilities

### **d) Relevant History**

- None

### **e) Applicant's Statement**

- Design and Sustainability Statement submitted.

Continued/...

- 'Extra Care' development defined as providing a home for life catering for all residents care needs. Each couple or individual will have their own front door and live their separate lives or as required use the services on offer such as meals, assistance with bathing and nursing if necessary on a 24 hour basis. Additional services also offered such as laundry, cleaning and maintenance.

**f) Consultations**

- **Engineering Services:** Objection : No flood risk assessment in line with PPG 25 and the development must include storage and attenuation measures for surface water flow and incorporate sustainable drainage solutions.
- **Environment Agency:** Objection : no flood risk assessment to satisfy EA concerns
- **Head of Social Services (Homes):** Objection; Applicant has not demonstrated why an element of affordable housing has not been included.

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	58	3	13-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** Increased risk of flooding, congestion and highway safety, strain on NHS services, scale of development out of keeping, adverse effect on residential amenity. Application supported for bringing a needed facility to Pinner.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Floodplain**

HUDP policy EP11 does not permit development within floodplains unless other material circumstances outweigh the need to protect the natural function of the floodplain, in which case the developer must incorporate adequate defence measures. The flood risk of this site has not been assessed by the applicant not has a case been made for an exception to the policy . HUDP policy EP12 is concerned with managing the run off of storm water to minimise flood risk down stream. No attenuation provision is indicated for this development.

**2) Standard of Design and layout**

The proposed building has its main frontage to Grove Avenue and extends through the site to face Eastcote Road. It is three storeys in height falling to 2.5 storeys facing Eastcote Road. Balconies are provided at all three floor levels. These and the articulation of the block gives rise to substantial overlooking of the rear garden of No 3 Eastcote Road and loss of privacy. The elevation facing the rear of houses standing in Marsh Road, some 30m plus away, is 13.4m high facing Grove Avenue and 11m high facing Eastcote Road. Those windows serving habitable rooms are farthest away from Marsh Road up to 44m distant. However there remains the issue of the scale and mass of the building which in its current form is overbearing and dominates the rear gardens of those houses in Marsh Road. It is acknowledged that the numerous trees and shrubs in these rear gardens would provide some screening but only when they are in full foliage.

Continued/...

### **3) Affordable housing**

The nature of the housing proposed is in effect self-contained flats interwoven with all those elements to be found in a care and nursing home. It will be up to those leasing the self-contained flats as to whether they use any or all of the extra services on offer. In these circumstances, and in the absence of information as required by the draft SPD 'Affordable Housing' ( February 2006), the application does not meet the requirement of HUDP policy H5.

### **4) Consultation responses**

The number of traffic movements generated by the development on Grove Avenue will increase in comparison with that generated by the four existing houses but not to the extent that a highway objection could be sustained. The issue of car parking is also raised; if the full residential standard is applied then the site makes less than 40% provision but is within an area of good accessibility to public transport; if the appropriate standard is taken to be that applied to sheltered housing then the requirement is for a total of eleven spaces. On balance it may be unreasonable and unsustainable to refuse this application on the grounds of inadequate car parking provision. The other points raised are addressed and supported in the appraisal section.

### **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.

Continued/...

---

1/05

**LAND AT COPSE FARM - END OF, BROOKSHILL DRIVE, HARROW P/3090/05/CFU/ADK**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

ALTERATIONS AND CHANGE OF USE OF BARN TO WORK SPACE (B1). EXTENSIONS TO FARM BUILDING FOR 2 HOUSES. CONSTRUCTION OF 12 DWELLINGS.

PLANNING POTENTIAL for ZED HOMES

---

1/06

**LAND AT COPSE FARM, BROOKSHILL DRIVE, HARROW P/3101/05/CCA/ADK**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF FARM BUILDINGS AND OUTHOUSES

PLANNING POTENTIAL for ZED HOMES

---

**P/3090/05/CFU**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1347/11 Rev C; 22, 25, 27, 100 Rev C, 116 Rev D, 117 Rev A, 118, 119 Rev A, 120 Rev A, 121 Rev A, 122 Rev A, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128 Rev A, 129, 130 Rev A, 131 Rev A, 132, 133, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 200, 201, 202 Rev A, 203, 1 x Planning Statement, 1 x Ecology Survey, 1 x Sustainability Statement & 1 x Design and Consultation Statement.

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

- 1 The proposed development is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances to justify it being allowed in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
- 2 The proposed houses, by virtue of size, siting, and suburban layout, would provide excessive bulk, result in an excessive loss of openness, be visually intrusive and overbearing and give rise to a suburban form of development on this rural site, to the detriment of the streetscene, the character of the Green Belt, The Area of Special Character and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area.

Continued/...

- 3 The excessive number of on site parking spaces proposed would lead to a loss of openness and the area's semi-rural atmosphere to the detriment of the character of the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area.
- 4 The proposal would give rise to the unacceptable demolition of locally listed buildings which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

#### 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
  - SEP1 Energy Use and Conservation
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - SH2 Housing Types and Mix
  - SEM3 Proposals for New Employment Generating Development
  - SEP5 Structural Features
  - SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
  - EP7 Renewable Energy
  - EP8 Energy Conservation and Efficiency
  - EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land
  - EP21 Vacant and Disused Land and Buildings
  - EP27 Species Protection
  - EP28 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
  - EP32 Green Belt – Acceptable Land Uses
  - EP33 Development in the Green Belt
  - EP32 Green Belt – Acceptable Land Uses
  - EP34 Extensions of Buildings in the Green Belt
  - EP37 Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D12 Locally Listed Buildings
  - D14 Conservation Areas
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - D16 Conservation Area Priority
  - H4 Residential Density
  - H7 Dwelling Mix
  - R7 Footpaths, Cyclepaths and Bridleways

Continued/...

**P/3101/05/CCA**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1347/11 Rev C; 22, 25, 27, 100 Rev C, 116 Rev D, 117 Rev A, 118 , 119 Rev A, 120 Rev A, 121 Rev A, 122 Rev A, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128 Rev A, 129, 130 Rev A, 131 Rev A, 132, 133, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 200, 201, 202 Rev A, 203, 1 x Planning Statement, 1 x Ecology Survey, 1 x Sustainability Statement & 1 x Design and Consultation Statement.

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

- 1 The proposal demolition, in the absence of an acceptable proposal for the replacement of the buildings, would be inappropriate and detrimental to the appearance and character of this part of the Conservation Area.

**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  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
SEM3 Proposals for New Employment Generating Development  
SEP1 Energy Use and Conservation  
SEP5 Structural Features  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
EP7 Renewable Energy  
EP8 Energy Conservation and Efficiency  
EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land  
EP21 Vacant and Disused Land and Buildings  
EP27 Species Protection  
EP28 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP32 Green Belt – Acceptable Land Uses  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extensions of Buildings in the Green Belt  
EP37 Re-use of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D12 Locally Listed Buildings  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
D16 Conservation Area Priority

Continued/...

H4	Residential Density
H7	Dwelling Mix
R7	Footpaths, Cyclepaths and Bridleways

---

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

- 1) Development in the Green Belt Land, Area of Special Character and Conservation Areas (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, EP32, EP33, EP34, EP37)
  - 2) Standard of Design and Layout (D4, D5, SD1, EP34)
  - 3) Provision of housing and density (H3, H4, H7, H18) New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy (D5)
  - 4) Parking Standards (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type	Major
Site Area:	0.97776 ha gross
Habitable Rooms:	80
Density:	81 hrph                      14 dph
Area of Special Character:	Harrow Weald Ridge
Green Belt:	
Conservation Area:	Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area
Car Parking:	Standard:                      00 (maximum)
	Justified:                      00
	Provided:                      27
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- The application site is located between Old Redding and Brookshill Drive and forms part of Copse Farm.
- The site is located within the Green Belt, the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area and the Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character.
- The site has been used, as "Suzanne's Riding School" since 1939 but at present the site is unoccupied since the riding school has recently closed down.
- The western part of the site comprises Copse Farm House and Cops Farm Barn, which are both locally listed, and the oldest buildings in the Conservation Area.
- These two buildings are also set within a courtyard grouping of agricultural buildings.
- This would include a stabling block attached to Copse Farm Barn and, to the south of Copse Farm House, single storey stabling and tack facilities. To the southeastern corner of this courtyard is a large agricultural building (indoor paddock) with a ménage along the southern boundary of the site.

Continued/...

- The eastern part of the site has also been designed in a horseshoe shape and comprises of two residential dwellings; Dairy Cottage and Farm Cottage and stable blocks to the south and west. To the south of the courtyard, these two stable buildings are linked by an archway which allows access to a large ménage beyond.
- Dairy Cottage, Farm Cottage, the stables and archway are locally listed.
- Three residential dwellings are located to the north of the application site on the opposite side of Brookshill Drive.
- Bridle Cottages are located opposite Dairy Cottage and Farm Cottage and are Grade II listed buildings.
- No's 1 and 2 Brooks Hill Cottage comprise of a two storey semi-detached dwelling located opposite Copse Farm House and Copse Farm Barn.
- Red Corners, a two storey detached dwelling is located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the application site. The south and west part of the application site is surrounded by open fields and land in agricultural use.

**c) Proposal Details**

- The site can be divided up into two distinct areas namely the eastern courtyard and the western courtyard.
- In the eastern courtyard Dairy Cottage, Farm Cottage and the hayloft arch are to be retained with the rest of the locally listed stables demolished.
- These buildings are to be replaced with 5 houses (No's 6,7,8,9 & 10) comprising 3 x three bed and 2 x four bed dwellings and the large ménage area of hardstanding to the south is to be removed and landscaped.
- In the western courtyard the locally listed Copse Farm Barn would be retained and converted in to office space (B1 Use Class).
- The stable block to the south of the barn is to be partially demolished with the two storey element converted and extended to form 3 houses (No's 3,4 &5) comprising 1 x five bed & 2 x three bed dwellings.
- Demolition of the stables to the south of Copse Farm House to provide 2 houses (No's 1 & 2) comprising 1 x four bed & 1 x five bed dwellings.
- Demolition of the two storey agricultural shed formerly used as an indoor arena to provide 4 x four bed houses (No's 11, 12, 13 & 14).
- Proposed access points to the development would remain as existing with the main access road being Brooks Hill Drive leading to Brookshill Road. Existing surfaces within the eastern and western courtyards would be retained and repaired.

**d) Relevant History**

P/1048/04/CFU	Two storey rear extension and detached garage (revised).	REFUSED 16-JUN-04 APPEAL DIMISSED 18-FEB-05
---------------	----------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------

**Reasons for Refusal:**

- 1) The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the Area of Special character contrary to Green Belt Policy.
- 2) The proposal would adversely affect the character of the building to the detriment of the Conservation Area, Area of Special Character and openness of the Green Belt.

Continued/...



**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The applicants submitted Planning, Design, Ecology and Sustainability Statements and concluded that the proposed development would be consistent with national and local planning policy guidance for the following reasons:
- Proposal is appropriate development within the Green Belt;
- Very special circumstances exist to provide additional justification for the new dwellings in the Green Belt;
- The development, by virtue of design and overall reduction in built footprint, will have less impact on the openness of the Green Belt;
- The visual impact of the site would be enhanced;
- A previously developed site will be recycled for residential use and contribute towards the Borough's housing requirements;
- A development scheme of a high design quality will be created which will enhance the amenity and character of the surrounding environment;
- The functions of the Green Belt in this area will not be compromised; and
- The proposal would result in a highly sustainable and environmentally friendly development in accordance with National planning policy.

**f) Consultations**

- **The Hatch End Association:** Proposal would be detrimental to character of Grimsdyke-Brookshill Conservation Area and Area of Special Character of Harrow Weald Ridge, development would be inappropriate and contrary to Green Belt policies both locally in the UDP and nationally in PPG2, would require 'very special circumstances' to outweigh the harm that would be done to Green Belt and believe they don't exist; site is not listed as major development site and therefore new build dwellings are not appropriate use; no evidence Green Belt use had been sought; development might be of high quality design but due to cramped lay-out it would have impact on openness, some of dwellings have below standard amenity space, hardstanding patios, parking spaces, fences, sheds, refuse bins and other domestic structures could reduce space and openness further resulting in creating detrimental urban conurbation in semi-rural setting; function of Green Belt would be compromised; would not contribute to affordable housing requirement, public transport provision limited in area and would attract car users; objecting to shuttered windows on north side of barn as it would detract from character of building and removal of locally listed stable blocks which form the character of the building; new buildings would be overdevelopment undermining character of Conservation Area; wind generators would look incongruous; loss of farm buildings would damage semi-rural feature; would be intrusive in views from within Green Belt; no satisfactory plan in terms of parking arrangement and access.
- **Thames Water:** There are public sewers crossing the site, therefore no building will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval.
- **Environment Agency:** no response

Continued/...

- **CAAC:**

“Open, agricultural character of the conservation area would be detrimentally affected by change of use to residential; site would become urbanised and the open character, which is integral to the area, would be lost; requirements of Green Belt policies to justify any unacceptable uses are pertinent for the conservation area too and reasons for building in such a sensitive location have not been justified. Proposal does not appropriately convince that all avenues for a rural use has been exhausted; the unmade track which is part of the rural character is unlikely to sustain the amount of housing proposed and as such this key semi rural area will be lost.”

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry
		16-FEB-05

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	261	411	30-JAN-06

**Summary of Responses:** inappropriate development in the Green Belt, increase in buildings would reduce openness in Green Belt, mass and bulk of buildings are not in keeping with Conservation Area and Area of Special Character, would remove views of surrounding countryside from the Harrow Circular Walk and footpath leading to Bannister Centre – will ruin visual amenity of area, just moneymaking project and proposal would not benefit community as a whole; views in and out of this site as seen by the public using bridleway, footpaths and sign posted circular walk would be adversely affected, traffic which would be generated by proposal would create large volume of noise, fumes and pollution; mini-urban estate within Green Belt at this rural location would set precedent which would impair integrity and special character of the area; public right of way from Old Reading and Brookshill Drive to the Bannister Athletics stadium may be removed; would destroy unspoilt rural location at top of attractive valley; would destroy Brookshill Drive Conservation Area, the Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character and the setting of Locally listed buildings; would destroy historical character of area known as the “City” which dated back to 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup> century when area was used for making bricks and tiles; development would eliminate this site as Green Belt land; would remove link with Harrow’s past being one of few complexes of farm buildings left in the Borough; development is suburban looking; development is unsustainable from transport aspect as every journey would require use of car; no serious attempt has been made to sell farm as an agricultural, horticultural or riding establishment, would seriously impact on local wildlife; application would cause more of Green Belt to be lost; proposed buildings would result in significant detrimental change to landscape of area and would not blend with surrounding countryside; are no valid reasons to allow inappropriate Green Belt development on this site and if allowed, would set precedent for speculative buying up Green Belt land with subsequent over-development and destruction; construction of 14 houses with parking for approximately 30 cars would alter perspective of historic area; development conflicts with relevant Green Belt and UDP policies; proposal would not respect existing pattern of development in terms of siting and spacing of properties and their setting; transform area into more urban sprawl with high levels of vehicular activity adversely impacting neighbours and public generally; development is inappropriate for the size of the plot and surrounding area; site not allocated for housing in the Local Plan;

Continued/...

development would cause harm to openness of Green Belt by reason of its excessive volume, bulk and height modest reduction in footprint will not offer significant benefits to openness of Green Belt when weighed against massive increase in bulk, volume and heights of the proposed development; application site in an area with that has lowest public transport accessibility index in Borough and increase in cars and car parking would further harm Green Belt; scale of the development would be disproportionate, overbearing and out of context with rural setting; farm buildings are essential part of appropriate building pattern of the farm site and since property has been taken over with no intention of continuing the riding school, enforced dereliction has taken place.

One letter of support was also received stating the following: the proposal is sympathetic to the area and that it would enhance the immediate vicinity, reinvigorating the small, local community; development would be of a suitable scale to surrounding environment; building highly sustainable and exceptionally energy efficient houses would create development that manages to preserve and enhance the area.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Development in the Green Belt, Area of Special Character and Conservation Area Impact**

#### Green Belt

The application site lies within designated Green Belt land, the Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character and the Brookhill Drive/Grimsdyke Conservation Area. The principle of redevelopment of the site in the Green Belt for residential purposes is therefore key to the determination of the application. PPG2 (Green Belts) contains a presumption against inappropriate development which is harmful to the Green Belt. Inappropriate development should not be approved unless there are very special circumstances so that the harm caused is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In addition to PPG2, UDP policies EP32, EP33 and EP34 require that development and changes of use will be controlled within the Green Belt to ensure that the land remains primarily open and the existing environmental character is maintained or enhanced. Furthermore, policies also require that ancillary facilities such as car parking, and intensification of uses, do not have an adverse impact on the Green Belt.

By virtue of PPG2 and policy EP32, residential development is inappropriate in the Green Belt and therefore the principle of redevelopment for this purpose is contrary to Green Belt policy. It is considered that although the proposed development has a smaller footprint than the existing buildings, the dispersal of the proposed development over a larger area of the site together with enclosed gardens, would have an adverse impact on the character and openness of the Green Belt. The change of use of Copse Farm Barn to office space / B1 is also considered to be an inappropriate development. The change of use to office space is likely to require relatively limited intervention to the historic fabric of the building but the proposed use would require parking provisions and generate more traffic which the road would be unable to sustain and would therefore alter the semi rural character of the area and have an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt.

Continued/...

PPG 2 also states that very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. The onus rests on the applicants to demonstrate the special circumstances which would justify this inappropriate use in the Green Belt. The applicants submitted a Marketing History Report which stated that discreet marketing was undertaken in January 2003 with no success and that the site was marketed again from April 2003 as a riding school with no interest. It is considered that the Market History Report does not contain sufficient evidence to justify the change of use of the site. It does not show sufficient marketing evidence for example the period of marketing, why stabling and/or other acceptable Green Belt uses are not considered to be viable or any other justification. Any assertion would have to be backed up by evidence and despite numerous requests to the applicants to submit further evidence, the Council has to date not received any further information that would justify a departure from policy.

#### Conservation Area and Area of Special Character

The application site lies within the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Conservation Area and within an Area of Special Character. The area has a semi-rural character and is characterised by open landscapes, agricultural buildings with farmyard layout, views looking south over Harrow and west towards London and with limited housing that helps to protect the sense of openness.

Copse Farm House and Copse Farm Barn with adjoining stables are locally listed and are the oldest buildings within the conservation area. Dairy Cottage, Farm Cottage and the adjoining and surrounding stables are locally listed as a group. The spaces created between the buildings and the courtyard and horseshoe shape layout of the buildings are integral to the area. The 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings at Copse Farm were built to provide additional stabling and tack facilities and as recent agricultural buildings, they are characteristic to the area.

It is therefore considered that the change of use to residential would have a detrimental effect on the open, agricultural character of the area. In association with the dispersal of the development described above, the site would become urbanised and the open character which is integral to the area, would be lost.

The proposal also entails the demolition of farm buildings and two locally listed buildings. The locally listed buildings are valuable heritage assets to the area, and the layout of these are significant to the area's character. Although the 20<sup>th</sup> century farm buildings and lean-to structures are of no particular architectural merit, they do add to the areas agricultural character. PPG15 and UDP policies D12 and D14 make reference to the presumption against the demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The demolition of the two locally listed buildings and traditional farm buildings are considered to be unacceptable as their loss would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.

In addition to this, PPG15 also requires the local authority to be satisfied that real efforts have been made without success to continue the present use or to find compatible alternative uses for the building. No strong evidence to justify the locally listed buildings demolition has been submitted and as such, together with the reasons stated above, the demolition of the locally listed buildings and farm buildings are considered to be contrary to policy.

Continued/...

### Building on Open Land

The area are characterised by clear open views over surrounding fields with pleasant vistas created between the buildings. The existing openness of the site and the historic courtyard and horseshoe layout of the buildings should be respected. The proposed development entails the erection of buildings (House No's. 2 and 3) on previously undeveloped land and the a change in the historic layout of the site. The proposed development is therefore considered to be detrimental to the area's sense of openness and significant views which are key to the area's significance. The proposal is therefore contrary to UDP policies D15, SEP6 and EP33.

## **2) Standard of Design and Layout**

The main issues are the appearance of the proposed development (design considerations) and the effects on the character and appearance of the area. New development should respect the character and landscape of the locality within which it is to be built and should have a satisfactory relationship with adjoining buildings.

### Copse Farm Houses 1 and 2

Copse Farm House is the principal building of the farmstead and any proposed new buildings in proximity to this building should therefore be subservient to the farmhouse to ensure the preservation of the character and appearance of the area. Houses 1 and 2 are however similar in size to Copse Farm House and are considered to be an inappropriate addition as the scale and proportions would appear overdominant in the location.

### Copse Farm Barn

Copse Farm Barn is a locally listed building. It is important therefore that the conversion and/or change of use and required alterations would be respectful to the historic function of the building and historic fabric. The proposed change of use to office space is considered to require limited intervention to the historic fabric of the building and as the proposal only entails restricted external alterations to the internal courtyard, it is considered to be acceptable from a design/locally listed point of view. However, the change of use would lead to an intensification in use of the building and increase in traffic with parking requirements which would be harmful to the semi-rural character of the conservation area and harmful to the openness of the Green Belt.

### Houses 3, 4 & 5

Houses 4 and 5 utilise the historic fabric and convert the stables into residential units. There are no objections to the design of these buildings as it is sympathetic to the character of the area and respects the courtyard layout of the farmyard. The removal of the additions to the rear of this building is also welcomed. However, the proposed carparking and landscaping are considered to have a detrimental effect on the courtyard space which should be kept clear to retain the historic formation and space between buildings.

House 3 is considered to be unacceptable as it would extend into open space which would impinge on views and would detract from the original courtyard layout.

Continued/...

### Houses 6 & 7

These two houses are considered to be well designed and complementary to the character and appearance of the adjoining Dairy Cottage. The erection of House No's. 6 & 7 would however necessitate the demolition of a locally listed building which, together with its historical layout, is considered to be a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The loss of the locally listed building should therefore be strongly resisted.

### Houses 8, 9 & 10

As stated in various sections of the report, the area is characterised by open landscapes, agricultural buildings with farmyard layouts and views created between buildings, wide views over Harrow as the land falls away and long views over the stable roofs at this part of the site. The proposed houses would be higher than the existing locally listed building that is to be demolished to make way for the proposed development. This would have a detrimental effect on the current views enjoyed over the stable roofs and would diminish the open rural character of the area. The loss of the locally listed building that makes a positive contribution to the character of the area is also considered to be unacceptable.

### Houses 11-14

The demolition of the indoor paddock is considered to be acceptable as it does not make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area. The proposal entails the construction of 4 sustainable houses in the place of the indoor paddock. Detailed drawings for this part of the proposal have not been submitted but the replacement buildings appear to be of innovative design and its low setting would help to retain the openness and views over the buildings.

## **3) Provision of Housing and Density**

The proposal includes the provision of 5 x 3, 7 x 4 and 2 x 5 bed houses. Council policies require the provision of a mix of dwelling sizes to reflect Boroughwide housing needs. The provision of family sized accommodation in this location is considered to be in accordance with Policies SH1, SH2 H7 which also seek to meet the housing needs of all household sizes. However, as stated earlier in the report, residential development is considered to be inappropriate use in the Green Belt and as such the proposal is unacceptable in principle. In addition to this, the proposed development would be low density with a density of 81 habitable rooms per ha. This would be below the recommended minimum figure of 150 habitable rooms per ha which would reflect the additional policy considerations in the UDP for Green Belts, MOL and Conservation Areas.

## **4) New Residential Development – Amenity Space and Privacy**

New residential development should be designed to ensure adequate privacy for new and existing housing. There is a higher expectation of privacy at the rear of dwellings and this should be considered in new developments to minimise the potential for direct overlooking and loss of privacy to private garden areas.

The proposed development has been designed in such a way as to prevent overlooking of habitable room windows and to provide private amenity space for all the proposed dwellings. The proposal is therefore considered to be satisfactory in terms of amenity and privacy of prospective occupiers of the proposed dwellings.

Continued/...

### **5) Parking Standards and Access**

Proposed access point to the development would remain as existing with the main access road being Brookshill Drive. Existing surfaces within the eastern and western courtyards and adjacent bridlepath would be retained and repaired. House No's. 11-14 are to be accessed via the existing shingle covered road which runs through the site. It is proposed to be informally surfaced.

The proposed development makes provision for approximately two car parking spaces per dwelling (apart from No's 6, 7 and Farm Cottage which would have access to single garages) and 7 car parking spaces for the new office space, as such the potential of 27 cars would significantly impact on the area. This is considered to be unacceptable in this location.

### **6) Consultation Responses**

Relevant consultation responses which objects to the proposed development have been discussed and addressed above.

### **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.

Continued/...

---

**MARLBOROUGH HOUSE, 159 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE** **1/07**  
**P/3039/05/COU/DT2**

Ward: WEALDSTONE

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT OF CAR PARK FOR RESIDENTIAL USE (SITING)

BRITANIA ACADEMY PLANNING LTD for MR N H KARIA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered plans received 13/03/06

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

- 1 The proposed block of flats would, by reason of excessive site coverage by building and hard surfaced vehicular access and garage forecourt and associated disturbance and general activity, would be an over-intensive use, and amount to an over development of the site to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 The proposal is an unacceptable overdevelopment of a backland site that by reason of poor siting and layout would be an inappropriate form of residential development in this commercial location, resulting in poor living conditions for future occupiers.
- 3 The proposal would result in the loss of a car parking area and a goods vehicle servicing area that would have an unacceptable impact on the free flow of traffic and highway safety in the local road network, contrary to policy T13 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SD3 Mixed use Development  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
T13 Parking Standards  
H4 Density

---

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

- 1) Principle of Residential Development (SD3, D5)
- 2) Parking/Access (T13)
- 3) Residential Density (H4)
- 4) Consultation Responses

Continued/...



## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type	Major Dwellings
Site Area:	0.0525 ha net
Density:	228 dph
Car Parking:	Standard:
	Justified: 12
	Provided: None
Council Interest:	None

### b) Site Description

- Broadly rectangular site in use as a car park and vehicle service area.
- Located on west side of Wealdstone High Street at rear of Marlborough House, a flat roofed four-storey office building with an external staircase.
- Site adjoins a designated Industrial and Business Use area on its northern boundary.
- To the west and south of the site are terraced houses.
- To the east of the site are Sacred Heart School and a block of flats.

### c) Proposal Details

- Permission is sought in outline for consideration of siting for a residential redevelopment of the car park area.

### d) Relevant History

EAST/1008/01/FUL	2 <sup>nd</sup> and third floor extension to staircase at rear with canopy and single storey extension to front entrance area.	GRANTED 14-NOV-01
------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

### e) Applicant's Statement

- It is envisaged that probably twelve residential units could be accommodated on the site in a four-storey block involving the retention of car parking at ground level. The residential element would be built on a concrete slab supported by reinforced concrete columns.
- Details of design, external appearance, landscaping and access would be submitted subsequently.
- Access to the existing office building would not be disturbed.

### f) Consultations

**Highways Engineers:** The applicant's claim that the proposed flats would be acquired by people who work in Marlborough House and that there would be no loss of parking seems unlikely, in view of the way the housing market functions. Although current UDP parking standards are maxima and that theoretically an absence of general parking could be acceptable, account has to be taken of the location and the consequences of the effect on neighbouring streets that are not subject to parking controls.

Continued/...

Furthermore, the removal of the car park takes away an area that function as a goods vehicle servicing area for deliveries from small or medium sized vehicles. Without which, deliveries would have to be taken from surrounding streets that are not equipped for this purpose.

The proposal should therefore be refused because it does not take into account UDP policies and Government policies and how they relate to Marlborough House itself.

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	58	3	08-MAY-06

**Summary of Responses:**

- Existing parking problems in the area are acute. They would worsen if the development were allowed, as neighbouring roads such as Bruce Road are resident parking permit controlled. Further traffic congestion would ensue.
- The claim that the existing car park needs to be covered is unfounded, as is the claim that the flats would be occupied by people who work in the existing office block, meaning that there would be no increase in on street parking and traffic congestion.
- Houses in Bruce Road do not have deep foundations and if the development was to be built, structural damage could occur to properties nearby as a result of pile driving and construction activity.
- A four-storey development would overlook rear gardens of houses in Bruce Road. This is not the case with the existing office block as it is not immediately adjacent.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Principle Of Residential Development**

The proposal is in outline, with all but the siting of residential development to be dealt with as reserved matters. However, the applicants have not provided any information other than a site plan in support of the proposal. No details have been provided relating to the height, scale or orientation of the buildings, only a brief reference has been made in the statement saying that it is likely that 12 units, four on each floor, could be provided on the site. In the absence of any illustrative material an on site judgement has been made, taking into account the site and its surroundings.

On this basis, it is considered that the site would be an unsuitable location for residential development. The land is flanked to the east by Marlborough House, an office building, which is four storeys in height and to the north by Orion House, an office building of similar scale. An even larger warehouse building alongside that in turn adjoins this. These non-residential buildings are five and fifteen metres respectively from the northern boundary of the application site. It is likely that in such circumstances, notwithstanding the lack of illustrative material, a residential development would be unacceptable.

Continued/...

The warehouse building, that is 15m from the site, is one of the former Windsor and Newton factory buildings that extend to the south west of Bruce Road. Immediately behind the site is a loading bay of this industrial use. It is considered that the activities associated with this use would result in a poor residential environment for future occupiers, due to noise and disturbance from the factory and warehouse activities.

Moreover, it is also likely that the proposal would have an unsatisfactory relationship with the existing two storey terrace of houses on Bruce Road, immediately to the west of the site. A four-storey building would be likely to cause overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight to these houses. It would also be likely to cause overlooking and loss of privacy in addition.

The proposal would therefore be in conflict with the advice in Policy D5. It stresses that residential development should ensure that the amenity and privacy of occupiers of existing and proposed dwellings is safeguarded.

## **2) Car Parking and Access Issues**

The proposal would result in a loss of off street parking and a goods vehicle servicing area. The Highways Engineer has recommended that because the site is in a locality that is not subject to parking controls, the loss of the car park for delivery vehicles would exacerbate on street parking problems and increased congestion in the local traffic network. This is unacceptable and contrary to the advice in Policy T13. It advises that in the interests of promoting sustainable development it is expected that proposals should consider whether it is likely to create significant on street parking problems and the potential highway and traffic problems that are likely to arise.

## **3) Residential Density**

No plans have been provided, other than those outlining the site area in red. The applicants envisage they would be able to provide 12 flats on the site, resulting in a density of approximately 228 dph (dwellings per hectare). This is indicative of a high-density development.

## **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 comments received in response to notification and consultation as set out above:  
this application is recommended for refusal.

Continued/...

## SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**PRIESTMEAD MIDDLE SCHOOL, HARTFORD AVENUE,  
HARROW**

2/01

P/3027/05/CFU/SC2

Ward: KENTON WEST

2 FIRST FLOOR EXTENSIONS

IAN SCROGGS for MR BRIAN A ROBERTSON

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drawing No's E5382/100 + 101 and location plan E5382/102

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match
- 3 COMP\_DEVT - Completed Development - Buildings

### 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
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - C6 First and Middle Schools
  - C7 New Education Facilities
- 

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of Area (SD1, D4)
  - 2) Amenity of Neighbours (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety (C6, C7, T13)
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Minor Other  
Council Interest: Council Owned

Continued/...

**b) Site Description**

- Site occupied by First and Middle School consisting of 2-4 storey building
- Application relates to Priestmead Middle School and the applicant site is situated on the north side of Hartford Avenue, opposite its junction with Oakfield Avenue and west of Kenton Lane
- School Playing grounds located north of the site while Priestmead Recreation Ground adjoins the site to the west.
- Immediate area is predominantly residential. Applicant school and grounds is surrounded on all sides by residential dwellings

**c) Proposal Details**

- Two first floor extensions to infill parts of the school buildings rear elevation both overlooking the school yard
- Extensions sought to provide a staff study room and a Middle School Reception
- Proposal would create an additional 47.89 sq. m of floor space – 25.13sq. m for the Middle School reception and 22.76 sq. m for the staff study room.
- Extensions will include 5 new windows with materials to match existing

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1162/00/LA3	First floor single and two storey extensions to replace temporary classrooms; widening of fire access	GRANTED 08-FEB-01
EAST/350/02/LA3	Replacement single storey temporary building to provide classroom with toilet and ancillary facilities	GRANTED 05-AUG-05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None received

**f) Consultations**

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	2	0	27-APR-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

The area surrounding the applicant school is predominantly residential. The school's playing field separates residential dwellings from the school to the north of the site while Priestmead Recreation Ground separates the site from residential properties to the west. Existing school buildings shield the proposed extensions from residential dwellings to both the south and east. As the extensions are proposed for the rear of the school their construction will be outside the public realm and as such, will not impact sufficiently on the character of the surrounding area to warrant a refusal of permission. The school is well established in the area and has a history of planning approval for extensions and for the provision of temporary units.

Continued/...

Previous developments were necessary in order to accommodate increases in student numbers. Both extensions sought in this application however are not considered to accommodate for an increase in future student numbers but rather to improve facilities for existing staff members.

The northern most extension, facing westwards, involves a single storey extension at first floor level over an existing ground floor, flat roofed part of the building. This extension would represent an infill at first floor level, thus retaining the building line. The extension would match the existing building in terms of materials, would be flat roofed and would incorporate a new window. This extension is envisaged to create an additional 22.76 sq. m of floor space to be used as a staff study area.

The southern most extension, facing northwards and again overlooking the school yard, would create an additional 25.13 sq. m of floor space and would be used as a reception area for Priestmead Middle School. The extension would be single storey at first floor level over an existing ground floor section with a slated lean to roof to the main building. This extension would also infill part of the school's rear section and as such would not affect the building line. A lean to roof is proposed for the extension similar to the existing lean to roof it will replace. Materials are proposed to match those used in the existing school building while 4 new windows will be added to the rear elevation.

Both proposed extensions are relatively small scale and would not represent disproportionate additions to the existing school. As both extensions would infill parts of the existing building at first floor level, neither will affect the existing building line nor look out of place in their surroundings. In any case Priestmead School is not considered to be of any architectural merit. This coupled with the design and siting of both extensions means that the proposal would not have any negative impact on the character of the local area.

## **2) Amenity of Neighbours**

While the school is situated in a predominantly residential area, the Council considers that the works proposed will have a minimal effect on the amenity levels of local residents. The small scale of both extensions coupled with their locations, overlooking the existing schoolyard towards the rear of the school and surrounded by both a large school playing field to the north, and Priestmead Recreation Ground to the west, mean the proposed development cannot be viewed from the surrounding residential area. Furthermore, as the extension will be single storey and within the existing buildings envelope, no overlooking, overbearing or loss of privacy issues would be encountered.

The nature of the works proposed indicates an intention not to accommodate an increase in student numbers but instead to improve existing staff facilities. The works, therefore will not lead to a major increase in students or any subsequent increase in noise and traffic levels and as such will not impact negatively on the amenity levels of local residents.

Continued/...

### **3) Parking/Highway Safety**

Policy C7 of the 2004 UDP seeks to ensure that appropriate education facilities are provided while it also encourages the expansion of existing facilities. In such cases, certain issues must be taken into consideration. These issues include the local population and need for educational facilities, site accessibility, proximity to public transport and the availability of safe setting down and picking up points within the school.

The works proposed in the current application adhere to all the issues outlined. The application does not appear to facilitate an increase in pupil numbers at Priestmead Middle School as the extensions are to provide for a Reception Area and a Staff Study Area. The proposal to improve existing staff facilities would not result in an increase in either car or pedestrian traffic above current levels. The works will also not result in a loss of existing school parking facilities and the schools existing setting down and picking up points would be unaffected.

### **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 grant.

Continued/...

ALTERATIONS AND FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION; ENLARGE ROOF AND RAISE HEIGHT, SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

ROBIN G BENYON for LARKSWORTH INVESTMENTS LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: AN30A, 31A, 32A, 33A, 34A, 35A, 36A, 39, 40

**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 window(s) in the flank wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no.AN36 shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing protective fencing for trees at the rear of the site has first been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The erection of fencing for the protection of any retained tree shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and particulars before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development, and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition, and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered, nor shall any excavation be made, without the written consent of the local planning authority.  
REASON: The existing trees represent an important amenity feature which the local planning authority considers should be protected.

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:

SEP5 Structural Features

SD1 Quality of Design

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

EP31 Areas of Special Character

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D10 Trees and New Development

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Relationship to P/2529/04/DFU
- 2) Character of area (SD1, D4, D5)
- 3) Amenity of neighbouring occupiers (SD1, D4, D5)
- 4) Mount Park Estate conservation area (SD2, D14)
- 5) Harrow-on-the-Hill area of special character (SEP5, EP31)
- 6) Protected trees (SD1, D10)
- 7) Other matters
- 8) Consultation responses

Continued/...

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to the Committee on 15th March but a determination was deferred pending a Member's site visit. This took place at 9.45am on Saturday 1st April. The application was reported again to the Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006 but was deferred again to secure amendments to the rooflights on the front elevation.

### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:                    Householder - Other  
Council Interest:                            None

### **b) Site Description**

- two storey detached dwelling on south-east side of Georgian Way turning head, Harrow-on-the-Hill
- this part of hill slopes steeply from east to west and south to north; existing dwelling set up slope from road with extensions to east side and front (incorporating garage) and driveway set down the slope at the front
- wall, railings and gate to front boundary
- neighbouring detached dwelling to north-east, no. 5, a 1970s gable ended dwelling also sited up from road (set further back than application dwelling) and on higher site level (retaining wall to common boundary at rear 3-4m high); facing flank wall has clear-glazed window at first floor level
- neighbouring detached dwelling to west, no. 7, also set up from road but angled in relation to application dwelling – to turn to face the cul-de-sac head – and on lower site level (1.65m approx); facing flank wall has clear glazed window at ground floor level (2.34m wide and 1.45m high, sited 0.8m above adjacent ground level and 0.95m from the adjacent rear corner) but room also served by glazed patio doors on rear (2.45m wide and 1.95m high)
- nos. 8, 9, 10, 11 & 12 sited down slope and below street level; other than no. 11 which has been recently redeveloped all neo-Georgian design with low pitch hipped roofs
- rear boundary of site abuts Brookesfield and delineates boundary of adjacent part of The Mount Park Estate conservation area (site outside)
- all within Harrow-on-the-Hill Area of Special Character; tree preservation order no. 788 protects two individual sycamore trees and a further group of three sycamore trees in the rear garden

### **c) Proposal Details**

- single storey extension to south-west flank of existing dwelling to form double garage: 6.5m wide x 6.5m deep set back from front main corner by 6.5m; two windows in flank wall; hipped roof over to height 4.5m falling to 2.5m at the eaves
- first floor rear extension would enclose existing roof terrace between two existing rear projections; rear elevation of extension to comprise two windows and juliette balcony; ground floor bow windows to be extended up to existing first floor rear projections
- eaves level to be raised by 0.15m; roof to be enlarged by pitch increase to 35° (retaining sprocket eaves detail) and ridge height raised by 0.45m; rooflights to front

Continued/...

Item 2/02 : P/2896/05/DFU continued/...

- subordinate roof elements over existing rear projections to be replaced by single roof span across the entire width of the dwelling and to the same pitch/ridge height
- a rear dormer that had been proposed is now omitted from the scheme

**d) Relevant History**

**No. 6 Georgian Way**

WEST/98/94/FUL	Single Storey Side and Front Extension;	GRANTED 26-APR-94
WEST/15/95/FUL	Single Storey Side and Front Extension (Revised)	GRANTED 22-FEB-95
WEST/1274/02/FUL	Balcony Inset in Front Roof Plane to Serve Loft Conversion	REFUSED 25-FEB-03

**Reason for Refusal:**

The proposed balcony would be a discordant feature in this cul-de-sac, where none of the house have such a structure; it would be detrimental to visual amenity and to the character of the street scene.

A subsequent appeal against his decision was dismissed.

P/677/03/DFU	Rooflights to Front and Rear	GRANTED 07-MAY-03
P/2529/04/DFU	Alterations to Enlarge Roof and Raise Height; Garage Extension at Side	REFUSED 21-DEC-04

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1) The proposed roof enlargement, by reason of its prominent siting, additional height and pitch, would appear unduly bulky and discordant when viewed from this part of Georgian Way and surrounding property, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

2) The proposed side extension, by reason of its siting and roof design, would detract from the spatial setting and appearance of this and the neighbouring dwellings, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that a revised application including the following amendments would be likely to be more favourably considered: Omit the proposed roof extensions. Push the single storey extension back from the front wall by at least 3m and reduce the extent of eaves overhang.

**No. 5 Georgian Way**

P/1249/04/DFU	Replacement Detached House of Two & Three Storeys	GRANTED 09-SEPT-04
---------------	------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The proposal involves the reconstruction of the roof with a dormer at the rear and rooflights to the front and sides. The eaves would be raised by two brick courses to achieve 2.5m internal headroom on the first floor and the pitched altered to provide headroom to the second floor.

Continued/...

The proposals are the outcome of discussions and correspondence with the planning officer. As agreed the sprocketed eaves pitch would be increased from 22.5° to 25° and the main roof from 32.5° to 35°. This results in increased ridge height by 450mm also agreed.

The raising of the eaves is in keeping with other neo-Georgian houses in Georgian Way. The roof outline and overall form of the property are sympathetically retained in principle. The dormer would be sited at the rear and not visible from the road.

The garage would be sited well back from the front of the house and would thus be barely visible from Georgian Way. The roof is in pyramidal form and the elevation to the rear garden balances to give a symmetrical composition.

**f) Consultations**

**Harrow Hill Trust:** Main problem is the alterations to the roof; height of eaves raised, roof pitch increased, dormers to back and front. The whole effect would substantially increase the perceived bulk of the house.

**Mount Park Residents' Association:** No reply

**ADVERT:** Character & Appearance of a Conservation Area; Expiry : 09-FEB-06

**CAAC:** Objections to the design: The proposed extension is not in the conservation area but is in close proximity and as such any extension in this location will affect the character of the conservation area. There are concerns that this may set a precedent in other houses, which could potentially blight the area. There are objections over the poor quality of design. The design changes the proportions and the style of the house. It is bulky with overly projecting dormers which are not appropriate to this location.

**g)**

**Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
9	2 petitions (same head petitioner and names repeated): 1 x 10 names and 1 x 5 names	30-JAN-2005

**Summary of Responses:** concerned that proposal follows discussion and agreement with the planning department; similar proposal refused in December 2004 and previously an appeal dismissed; proposal runs counter to appeal Inspector's findings and supplementary planning guidance; proposal fails to compliment the streetscene and should be rejected; does not respect the context or setting of this residential area contrary to Policy D4; previous objection about proximity of garage to boundary and its inaccessibility stands.

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Relationship to P/2529/04/DFU**

The first floor in-fill extension incorporating Juliette balcony and bow window additions featured in the previously considered scheme but no objection to these elements was raised. Similarly the replacement of the rear subordinate roof elements by a single span roof was also previously proposed and not, in itself, considered to be unacceptable.

However the roof enlargement was, under the previous scheme, to have increased the main roof pitch to 40° and the ridge height by 0.9m. This increased pitch and height was considered to appear unduly bulky and discordant, given the prominence of the property when viewed from Georgian Way and surrounding property, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality. The subject proposal seeks to overcome this objection by reduced pitch (now 35° to main element) and a lesser increase in ridge height – of 0.45m - of which 0.15m is accounted for by an increase in eaves height to achieve improved internal headroom.

The front and side rooflights featured in the previous scheme and no objections to these were raised. As originally submitted, this application had also proposed a rear dormer; however following discussion with officers, this element has been withdrawn from the application proposal.

The side extension previously proposed was to have continued the front main wall of the dwelling to within 1m of the side boundary with no. 7 and its flank wall was to have continued rearward to a depth of 5.5m, following the angle of the irregular side boundary. It was to have had a pitched roof with eaves overhang of up to 1m beyond the extension walls on all external elevations. This extension was deemed to unacceptably detract from the spatial setting and appearance the property, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality. The subject proposal seeks to overcome this objection by siting the side extension further back in the plot and by substituting a more appropriate roof/eaves design.

### **2) Character of the area**

In dismissing the appeal against the Council's decision to refuse permission for an inset roof balcony at the front (WEST/1274/02/FUL) the Planning Inspector concluded that:

“The appeal property is a wide fronted two storey detached house in a neo-Georgian style with a low pitched pan tiled roof. It is one of five similar houses grouped in a rough semi-circle around the turning head of the cul-de-sac, which make up the character of the streetscene in this locality. The houses are arranged on a steep hillside with the appellant's house in the most elevated position overlooking both the road and the other houses in the group, which are lower down. The house is therefore prominent and is highly visible in the context of the neighbouring houses and to anyone approaching this end of Georgian Way”.

Continued/...

At paragraph 6 he went on to conclude:

“...The appellant has pointed out that the adjoining house 5 Georgian Way is of a different style, however I do not agree that this one house establishes that there is a variety of house types. The houses beyond (nos. 4, 3 and 2) are of the same style and symmetrical design as the appellant’s house and others forming the group at the end of Georgian Way”.

Acknowledging the strong, consistent neo-Georgian character of development in the cul-de-sac it is noted that there are nuances in the detailed roof design of individual dwellings. Notably: nos. 7 & 9 have a traditional overhanging eaves and gutter treatment similar to the application dwelling, though they appear to have an additional brick course between the top of the first floor windows and the soffit board, and matching sprocketed roof design; nos. 8 & 10 have matching parapet walls rising above their first floor front windows and concealing the gutter treatment, with a conventional hipped roof design. No. 11 has been redeveloped to provide a replacement house, following permission granted in 2001 (WEST/298/01/FUL) and again on appeal in 2002 (WEST/31/02/FUL), with a much larger expanse of roof than any other dwelling in the cul-de-sac.

Whilst it remains important to ensure a continuity in the general neo-Georgian characteristics of the dwellings around the turning head of the cul-de-sac it is, in light of the above circumstances, considered that there is some scope for minor variation in individual instances. In the subject instance it is not considered that raising the eaves by 0.15m would, subject to matching bricks and detailing, materially harm the appearance of the property in the streetscene nor its contribution to the group. Furthermore, taking into account both the informal arrangement of the houses around the cul-de-sac and their variation in levels, it is considered that the increase in ridge height and pitch would now be sufficiently curtailed as to avoid the formation of an unduly bulky, discordant roof enlargement when viewed in the streetscene and from surrounding property. The replication of the original sprocketed roof design is considered particularly commendable.

The introduction of rooflights to the front elevation is as previously approved in 2003 and these are considered to remain acceptable.

Although the single storey side extension would now be wider than that for which permission was last sought, its siting back from the front elevation of the dwelling together with the angle of the property in relation to the cul-de-sac’s turning head would significantly reduce its presence in the streetscene. There would be a pinch point of 1.3m between the front corner of the extension and the side boundary but, significantly, substantial space in front of the garage/to the side of the original dwelling would be retained. Together with the more appropriately designed overhanging eaves/gutter detail and subject to matching materials, it is now considered that this part of the proposal would satisfactorily preserve the spatial setting and appearance of this and the neighbouring dwellings.

Continued/...

### **3) Amenity of neighbouring occupiers**

The roof extensions and the side extension would all sit well within a 45° line drawn, on plan, from the adjacent rear corner of no. 7. Although the side extension would lead to a pinch point of 1.3m at its front corner distance from the irregular side boundary would increase towards the rear (to 5m at the rear corner) by reason of its parallel flank wall. It is acknowledged that the proposal does involve substantially increased roof bulk at the rear and that the re-sited garage would now sit behind the rear elevation of no. 7, the affect of which would be exacerbated by the unfavourable change in levels between the properties. Nonetheless, given siting off the boundary/within a 45° line and the orientation of the site east of no. 7, it is not considered that the development would appear unduly overbearing or that there would be any harmful loss of light to/outlook from that property's rear facing windows. The facing ground floor flank window at no. 7 is not considered to be protected, for the purposes of the Council's guidelines, and in these circumstances the effect of the proposal on light to, and outlook from, this opening would not be such as to merit refusal.

Measured from the mid-point of the proposed flank windows in the single storey side extension there would be a distance of 2.8m and 5m respectively between them and the side boundary. Subject to obscure glazing, that can be controlled by condition, it is not considered that windows at these distances would lead to a degree of actual/perceived overlooking of no. 7's garden as to be detrimental to privacy amenity.

The additional roof bulk would increase the presence of the building when viewed from no. 5, but the arrangement of the dwellings around the cul-de-sac is such that the main focus of that property's garden is orientated away from the application site. With the favourable change in site levels towards the rear and the distance of 55m+ between the rear of the application dwelling and Brookesfield, neither is it considered that the roof would appear unduly bulky when viewed from that property or its garden.

The associated alterations at the rear – to enclose the existing rear terrace and to extend the rear bays – would bring first floor windows to a distance of 19m and 14m respectively from the common rear boundary with Brookesfield. Such a distance, combined with the change in levels and boundary screening, is considered sufficient to safeguard the privacy amenity of the occupiers at the rear.

### **4) Mount Park Estate Conservation Area**

The dormer has been removed from the scheme during the course of this application to reflect the close relationship of the site with the neighbouring Mount Park Estate conservation area at the rear. With this amendment it is not considered that the proposal, as a whole, would so severely affect views into or out of the conservation area as to be of demonstrable harm to its setting. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the neighbouring conservation area.

### **5) Harrow-on-the-Hill Area of Special Character**

Neither is it considered that the proposal would be of such significance as to cause demonstrable harm to the Harrow-on-the-Hill area of special character.

Continued/...

**6) Protected trees**

Subject to the conditions suggested it is not considered that the proposal would prejudice the health or survival of any trees on the site.

**7) Other matters**

Third party comments have queried the usability of the side extension as a garage. Vehicles would have to pass through a pinch point of just over 3m between the front corner of the original dwelling and the irregular side boundary with no. 7; the garage is then set 6.5m back from the pinch point – providing some manoeuvring space - and has a double width garage door to the front. It is considered, in these circumstances, that a vehicle could adequately enter and leave the garage. Even if it were not so, however, it is not considered that there is any planning interest in pursuing this question further. The property has an existing double garage and further off-street parking on the driveway; accordingly the logistics of the extension as a garage are considered to be a matter for the applicant only.

**8) Consultation Responses**

- Dormers to back and front : no front dormer proposed; rear dormer deleted
- concerned that proposal follows discussion and agreement with the planning department: pre-application discussion a legitimate activity without prejudice to the final decision of the local planning authority
- contrary to Policy D4: as the proposal is found to cause no harm to amenity and character there is no conflict with Policy D4 of the UDP
- precedent to other houses which could potentially blight the area: each application to be considered on its own merits
- overly projecting dormers: deleted to reflect this comment
- All other matters dealt with in the main report above.

**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/...



BAY WINDOW TO REPLACE GARAGE DOOR

ANDREW NEIL ASSOCIATES for SILVERBAY INVESTMENTS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Drawing No's PL-001-005, Site Plan + Un-numbered Photographs

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match
- 3 COMP\_DEVT - 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:**  
**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  
D4 The Standard of Design and Layout

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type: Householder

Continued/...

Green Belt:

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- Large 2 storey detached house set on ample sized plot, located on southern side of Stanmore Hill
- Detached properties to either side and to the rear. Stanmore Common situated directly opposite
- Property is within both the Green Belt and the Harrow Ridge Area of Special Character
- Surrounding area is predominantly residential characterised by large detached dwellings on sizeable plots of land

**c) Proposal Details**

- Replace existing garage door at the front of the property with a bay window
- Bay window would match the existing bay windows within the dwellings façade
- Window extends 0.92m from the house and creates an additional 2.31 sq m of floor space

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/27580	Single storey front extension to garage	GRANTED 20-MAY-85
EAST/415/01/FUL	Single storey front, single and two storey rear extensions, chimney stack at side & two rear dormer windows	GRANTED 09-JUL-01
EAST/838/02/FUL	2 Bay windows at front, two storey porch, single and two storey rear extension, 2 rear dormers, rooflights at front	GRANTED 13-SEP-02
P/711/04/CFU	Provision of double car port	GRANTED 09-SEP-04

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None received

**f) Consultations**

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	2	0	30-DEC-05

**APPRAISAL**

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

Harrow Council's Green Belt policies recognise that extensions in the Green Belt can be acceptable, provided they minimise environmental impact on its character and are appropriate in terms of height, bulk, site coverage and proximity to site boundaries.

Continued/...

Such extensions must not result in disproportionate additions, over and above the size of the original dwelling.

In this instance, while the property has been previously extended, the current proposal would only provide an additional 2.31 sq m of floor space and footprint. This is minimal compared to the dwellings' existing footprint of 226.2 sq m and floor-space of 399.1 sq m. The bay window is not obtrusive and would add to the symmetrical make up and aesthetic quality of the buildings façade. The fact that the property is set-back from the road and screened by mature planting means that the proposal would have minimal impact on the character of the area and the openness of the site.

The applicant property has a grand symmetrical entrance bounded either side by two large bay windows. Replacing the garage with an additional smaller bay window will strengthen the otherwise asymmetrical detailing of the house, whilst providing continuity within the design. There are therefore no objections to replacing the garage with the proposed window, as this will enhance the façade whilst providing the additional accommodation required. Should materials carefully match those of the existing house as proposed then this would be considered an improvement to the property and considered acceptable by the Council.

Given the above, the proposed works would not represent a disproportionate addition to the dwelling and the character of this part of the Green Belt and Area of Special Character would be preserved.

## **2) Amenity of Neighbours**

The applicant dwelling is well screened from neighbouring properties by mature planting. Given the very modest nature of the proposal, it is considered that the amenity of neighbours would not be affected.

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

---

**44 HIGH ST, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/04**

**P/776/06/DFU/OH**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CHANGE OF USE OF GROUND AND LOWER GROUND FLOORS FROM OFFICES (CLASS B1) TO CAFE AND RETAIL (CLASS A3 & A1)

KATINA BRUM

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: A3 plan (showing ground floor front, rear and lower ground)

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 RESTR\_A3 - Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
- 3 NOIS\_INSL4 - Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 The premises shall be used for the purpose specified on the application and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class A3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification).  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and in the interest of highway safety
- 5 The garden area and terrace detailed on the approved drawing shall not be made available for the use of customers, except in the event of fire or other emergency which requires the premises to be rapidly vacated.  
REASON: In the interests of the amenities of neighbouring residents.
- 6 The bread ovens within the rear ground and lower ground floors shall be retained in a visible condition to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To ensure the retention of this feature of interest within the 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:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance, and Historic Parks and Gardens  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

Continued/...

D14 Conservation Areas

T13 Parking Standards

EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas

EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

2 INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that any future introduction of external mechanical ventilation/extraction equipment will require a separate application for planning permission.

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Loss of Employment Floorspace (EM15)
- 2) Character of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D14)
- 3) Neighbouring Amenity (EM25)
- 4) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
- 5) Consultation Responses

---

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Continued/...

Statutory Return Type: Change of Use  
Conservation Area: Harrow on the Hill  
Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- Three storey mid-terraced property located on the eastern side of High Street within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area
- The ground and lower ground floors of the property are currently vacant, with an existing use class order B1
- The first floor is in residential use
- There is a rear garden area and terrace and a service access path at the rear with access through a doorway located on Short Hill (which runs underneath 5 Short Hill)

**c) Proposal Details**

- Change of use of existing ground and lower ground floors from a B1 office use to café/retail (class A3 and A1)

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/F/31625/W Change of Use: basement & ground floor from GRANTED  
light industrial and retail to office with front 05-AUG-82  
ground floor room as customer display and sales  
area

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Home craft goods for sale – i.e. chutneys and jams, greeting cards, arts and crafts, bespoke kitchenalia
- Bakery items, sandwiches and cold drinks for sale to be eaten off premises
- A maximum of 32 covers to be provided in store for consumption of drinks, sandwiches, soups
- Cakes, soups and bread to be brought from supplier, no cooking to take place on site
- Ventilation thorough existing windows in the kitchen
- Property has been standing vacant and on the market for over 12 months it has been extensively marketed as a B1 unit for all of this time
- The agent has confirmed that there is established rear access to 44 High Street, with numbers 42, 44 and 46 sharing this access. There is no access to properties on Short Hill – there is access however to facilitate and maintain one property on Short Hill

**f) Consultations**

- **Highways:** B1 use could cause 3-6 cars looking for all day parking in the area; therefore no objection on parking grounds
- **CAAC:** No objection to change of use, but need to see details of any external works (e.g. terracing, new shop front etc).

**Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
18-MAY-06

Continued/...

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	8	8	23-MAY-06

**Summary of Responses:** 7 x objections: parking, traffic congestion, problems with deliveries, already A3 uses on Hill, ventilation from kitchen-cooking smells, fire risk, detrimental to amenity and character of the area, noise, once A3 granted a full restaurant with cooking etc could take place.

1 x no objection: in support of application

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Loss of Employment Floorspace

Policy EM15 of the HUDP seeks to resist the loss of B1 floorspace, on employment grounds, subject to the assessment of individual proposals against specific criteria. In relation to each of these: -

- a) The Council's survey of available business premises, dated January 2005, show there to be 365,225m<sup>2</sup> available office in the Borough as a whole, ranging from prime office rents of £96.84 to £285.14 per square metre and rents of £64.56 to £150.64 per square metre for older premises. Such a level of provision for the Borough is considered to be generous, though may not be evenly distributed. The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 118m<sup>2</sup> floorspace of non-modern type but would not, on its own, detract from the range of office sizes and type available within the Metropolitan Centre. In the longer term it is considered that the loss of older, less suitable accommodation at Harrow on the Hill – could increase values within Harrow Town Centre and therefore stimulate the development of more suitable accommodation. In these circumstances it is not considered that the proposal would result in any conflict, in this case, with criterion A.
- b) There is no evidence to suggest that the use of the premises for A1/A3 occupation would be harmful to the local economy for the purposes of criterion B. Indeed, the addition of the proposed A1/A3 unit would add to the interest, the appearance and the vitality of the area.
- c) The applicant has stated that the B1 use has been extensively marketed for at least 12 months with no positive response.
- d) The site has been vacant for a period of at least 12 months.
- e) Criterion E does not apply.
- f) For the purposes of criterion F access to the site is considered to be reasonable. There are two bus routes available and Harrow on the Hill tube station is within reasonable walking distance.
- g) As B1 offices it is unlikely that access for delivery vehicles is necessary on any significant scale, though it can be noted that there is a service path at the rear of the site, with access via Short Hill. Accordingly there is no conflict with criterion G.

Continued/...

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

It is considered that the change of use of the existing vacant B1 offices would enhance the character of the conservation area. The premises have been vacant for a long period of time. It is considered that bringing this unit back into use would serve to enhance the appearance of this property creating an active shop frontage. The proposed change of use would add to the interest in this part of the Hill and to the vitality of the area.

## **3) Neighbouring Amenity**

Given the potential for a food and drink premises to cause detrimental amenity impacts for nearby residential premises, selective restrictive conditions are proposed.

This application is for a mixed use scheme and as detailed within the applicant's statement the use would entail a retail element and only light preparation of sandwiches, hot drinks and possible reheating of soups would occur on the premises, no cooking would occur. All produce would be sourced from an external supplier. It is considered necessary to restrict the use of the premises to that proposed within the application to ensure that no other use within use class A3 (for example a restaurant) can be established without further consideration by the Local Planning Authority. It is considered that this restrictive condition is necessary because the intensity of use and amount of activity associated with other A3 uses may differ to the proposed café use, such a change of use within this use class would therefore need to be assessed in light of the circumstances then prevailing.

In light of the proximity of residential occupiers, a condition restricting the hours of operations is proposed. As well as this, a condition restricting the use of the rear garden area is proposed to ensure that no unreasonable activity associated with customer use can occur within the rear garden area.

The proposed noise insulation condition attached would further negate potential noise disturbance within the building.

In relation to refuse storage, there is an area set aside within the rear garden to accommodate refuse from the premises. It is considered that this location is satisfactory in relation to neighbouring amenities as it is sited at the rear of the garden and away from any neighbouring windows.

## **4) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking**

The property has a right of way to an access pathway at the rear which itself is accessed via an opening on Short Hill. This access route could be used for refuse collection and deliveries associated with the proposed business.

As discussed earlier, access to public transport within this location is reasonable. There is no parking associated with this property and it is noted that parking on the Hill is at a premium. However, it should be noted that if this property was brought back into use as a B1 office it could well accommodate up to ten staff members each looking for parking in the area, as well as visitors to the premises.

Continued/...



In contrast, the nature of the proposal as a mixed use A1/A3 property would be more likely to attract passing pedestrians, local residents, as well as office workers within the vicinity of the site. Some element of parking would be likely to occur as a result of this proposal, however it is considered that this would be unlikely to be any more than what the current B1 use would demand, therefore it is considered that a parking reason for refusal can not be justified on this basis.

#### **5) Consultation Responses**

Material planning concerns addressed in appraisal above.

#### **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 grant.

Continued/...

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR EXTENSION TO FORM TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

C&S ASSOCIATES/W H SAUNDERS for S CARPENTER ESQ

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: CS/SC/26 & CS/SC/30; 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 scale drawing detailing the hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt of the site, to include screened refuse storage for the existing dwelling and approved flats, has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the details so agreed and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the locality and to ensure that satisfactory arrangements for the storage and collection of waste are made.
- 5 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a metric scale drawing detailing the subdivision of the rear garden and satisfactory access thereto from the first floor flat has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The flats shall not be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the details so agreed and thereafter retained.  
REASON: To ensure that all dwellings on the site have access to an area of outdoor amenity space, in the interests of the living conditions of occupiers of the development.
- 6 The existing garages identified in blue on the approved site plan shall be allocated one each to the two flats for the occupiers' motor vehicle storage and shall thereafter be retained for that purpose unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.  
REASON: To ensure satisfactory off-street parking for the development hereby approved.

**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

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:

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 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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Conversion Policy (H9)
- 2) Personal Circumstances
- 3) Consultation Responses

---

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to the Committee at the request of a nominated member at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> April but was deferred to allow a Member's site visit.

Continued/...

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type: Minor Development  
Site Area: 465m<sup>2</sup>  
Habitable Rooms: See report  
Car Parking: Standard: 3 max  
Justified: 2  
Provided: 2  
Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- two storey semi-detached dwelling on south side of Ellement Close, Pinner; with single and two storey rear extensions and detached rear outbuilding
- detached block of two garages adjacent to east side of dwelling purchased by the applicant and within the site
- last house on this side of Ellement Close; adjacent to turning head; flats opposite
- rear gardens in Hill Road adjacent to east boundary of site; distance between original rear of Hill Road dwellings and common boundary between 25m and 30m
- on-street parking not controlled

**c) Proposal Details**

- conversion of recently approved two storey side to rear extension to two self-contained flats
- ground floor flat to be accessed at side with two bedrooms and living room (3 habitable rooms)
- first floor flat to be accessed at front with two bedrooms and living room (3 habitable rooms)
- the applicant's agent has advised that two existing garages opposite the site have been purchased; these are shown in blue on the application site plan

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/574/01/FUL	Detached Three Storey Building to provide 1 x Two-Bed and 1 x One-Bed Semi Detached Dwellings with Integral Garage	REFUSED 14-DEC-01 APPEAL DISMISSED 10-SEP-02
-----------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------

**Reasons for Refusal:**

- 1) The proposal, by reason of excessive bulk and prominent siting, would be unduly obtrusive in the streetscene, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property, and the character of the locality.
- 2) Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's requirements in respect of the development, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway(s) would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the neighbouring highway(s).

Continued/...

P/1532/03/DFU	Two Storey Side Extension	GRANTED 05-SEP-03
P/1473/05/DFU	Two Storey Side to Rear Extension	GRANTED 10-AUG-05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- I am trying to provide for my son's future; i.e. relative independent living accommodation as well as a base for financial stability as he approaches adulthood and the setbacks he will incur in employment and earning capacity. I have followed all previous advice to achieve this aim, by purchasing the adjoining land to submit full building potential for planning approval which has been accepted. I have also incurred the maximum financial cost to the local authority for the additional land and parking facility.
- The last estimate to build the approved extension to 'plaster finish' would be financial suicide. As a family we wish to live and work in the closest proximity although as husband and wife we wish to live independent lives within the household. The drawings are self explanatory about how the property would be divided. Please take these considerations into account.

**f) Consultations**

- **LBH Occupational Therapist:** support application: the applicant's son has significant physical, sensory and learning disabilities and in adulthood will require specialist accommodation to allow him to live semi-independently; the plans submitted will meet the applicant's son's needs

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	17	3	13-MAR-06

**Summary of Responses:** large wall adjacent to rear garden boundary impact on view of garden and privacy – consequent devaluation; flats out of character with dwellings on this side of Ellement Close; overdevelopment of available space for financial gain; inadequate turning space, proposal now constitutes new development not permissible under the Town & Country Planning Act, application is property development by stealth or land that belonged to the Council.

**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 the ground floor and one on the first floor of the approved two-storey side to rear extension. Each flat would comprise two bedrooms and a living room. The ground floor flat would be served by an approved flank door with access ramp whilst the first floor flat would be served by a door in the ground floor front elevation. In terms of their size and circulation arrangements the proposed flats are

Continued/...

considered to be satisfactory. The vertical arrangement of rooms avoids potential conflict between the living and bedroom areas of the two flats. A scheme of sound insulation between the flats could be agreed by condition. The original semi would remain as a single-family dwellinghouse.

- Details of the subdivision of the garden have not been provided. However, if subdivided to form two conventional rectangular plots to the rear of the original dwelling house and side extension respectively then it is calculated that an area of just over 100m<sup>2</sup> would be available to the proposed flats. Given the size of the flats and as no objection to amenity space provision was made to the 2001 application for houses it is not considered that the proposal is unacceptable in this regard. It would be possible for occupiers of the first floor flat to access the garden around the side of the extension, subject to modifications to the ramp that could be required by condition. The ground floor flat has direct access to the garden at the rear.
- The site plan indicates that the block of two garages opposite the site are within the applicant's control and these could be made available to the two flats. The 2001 scheme for two houses had only one garaged space; in dismissing the subsequent appeal the Planning Inspector concluded that the site is not well served by public transport and that the scheme would place an extra burden on kerbside parking in a road that is already heavily parked. Since then, however, the Council's replacement UDP has been adopted with the crucial change that parking standards are now expressed in maximum, not minimum terms to encourage sustainable living. Application of the standard to the proposed flats would give a combined maximum requirement of 2.8 spaces; it is considered that the provision of two garaged spaces within that maximum – equating to one per flat – amounts to an acceptable level of provision. A condition to ensure that they are provided and retained for the purpose is suggested.
- The applicant's side boundary includes an area in front of the extension but this appears to form part of the vehicle turning head to the Close and should be kept free from obstruction. However there is a forecourt to the front of the existing dwelling and some land to the side of the turning head (abutting the rear boundary of property in Hill Road), all shown within the application site, that could be used to provide bin storage and appropriate landscaping. Subject to details of these matters, that can be controlled by condition, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable.

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 2 two-bed flats in conjunction with the retained original 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. As there are original purpose-built maisonettes on the opposite side of this part of Ellement Close neither is it considered that there can be any objection to the impact of the proposal upon the character of the locality.

Continued/...

## **2) Personal Circumstances**

The personal circumstances of the applicant, cited as the reason for the proposed development, are noted. However the proposal has been found to be acceptable on its own planning merits and consequently there is no need to consider this issue further.

## **3) Consultation Responses**

- Extensions as previously approved and found to have an acceptable relationship with neighbouring property
- it is not considered that the proposal is an overdevelopment
- motive of applicant not a material planning consideration
- turning space not affected
- application to be considered on its own merits under the Town & Country Planning Act
- details of application proposal and site history as set out

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

PART DEMOLITION OF CLUBHOUSE AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION WITH ROOMS IN ROOF

JACK CRUICKSHANK ARCHITECTS for GRIMS DYKE GOLF CLUB

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: GDGC/3/LOC, 3/XI, 3/X2, 3/OD1A, 3/OD2B, 3/PERS

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 DIS\_ACC\_BG - Disabled Access - Buildings
- 3 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match
- 4 LAND\_APPR - Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 LAND\_IMPL - 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

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

SR1 Open-Air Leisure and Sporting Activities

EP32 Green Belt Acceptable Land Uses

EP34 Extensions to Buildings in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

T13 Parking Standards

R4 Outdoor Sports facilities

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:**

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.

Continued/...



- 4      **INFORMATIVE:**  
**IMPORTANT:** Compliance With Planning Conditions Requiring Submission and Approval of Details Before Development Commences
- You will be in breach of planning permission if you start development without complying with a condition requiring you to do something before you start. For example, that a scheme or details of the development must first be approved by the Local Planning Authority.
  - Carrying out works in breach of such a condition will not satisfy the requirement to commence the development within the time permitted.
  - Starting development in breach of a planning condition will invalidate your planning permission.
  - If you require confirmation as to whether the works you have carried out are acceptable, then you should apply to the Local Planning Authority for a certificate of lawfulness.

---

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

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, SD1, EP32, EP34)
- 2) Outdoor Sports facilities and activities (R4, SR1)
- 3) Standard of design and layout (D4)
- 4) Parking standards (T13)

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Minor - Other
Site Area:	1068 sq.m.
Green Belt:	
Area of Special Character:	
Car Parking:	Standard:                      On its merits as per PPG 13
	Justified:                        1 space per player plus 10%= 84 spaces
	Provided:                        100
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- Large 180 acre site just within Borough boundary with Three Rivers District
- Access is from Oxhey Lane to the club house and car park which are situated to the rear of detached houses facing Oxhey Lane

**c) Proposal Details**

- Part of existing clubhouse to be demolished and part altered.
- Redevelopment ,on the site of demolished part, to provide office, pro shop, men's and juniors' locker rooms , trolley store, drying room and workshop on the ground floor
- The first floor, within the roof space, provides a committee room, snooker room and store.

Continued/...

Item 2/06 : P/136/06/CFU continued/...

- The alterations are all at ground floor level and provide disabled access to all parts, new toilets, showers and entrance lobby.

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/42487	Alterations and single storey side and rear and two storey side extensions to clubhouse incorporating two flats. Inspector dismissed appeal due to 'the unnecessary bulk ( <i>of the building caused</i> ) by the inclusion of inappropriate residential development.' He was particularly concerned at the size of the pitched roof with dormers to serve the flats but accepted that a pitched roof was an appropriate design.	REFUSED 29-MAY-91  DISMISSED ON APPEAL NOV-91
EAST/44602/92/FUL	Alterations and single storey extensions to front, side and rear of clubhouse	GRANTED JUN-92
EAST/95/FUL	Single storey infill and rear extensions to Clubhouse	GRANTED OCT-95
EAST/771/95/FUL	Single storey building at rear of clubhouse	GRANTED DEC-95
P/2305/CFU	Provision of practice bay/shelter within practice zone	GRANTED NOV-03

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- New extension has been designed to be in keeping with existing / retained club house
- Materials to match clay roof tiles and white rendered finish to walls
- Extension will unify the building as a whole greatly improving the overall appearance.

	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>% increase</b>
<b>Footprint</b>	948 m <sup>2</sup>	1068 m <sup>2</sup>	12.7%
<b>Area</b>	1198 m <sup>2</sup>	1493 m <sup>2</sup>	24.6%
<b>Volume</b>	3594 m <sup>3</sup>	4301 m <sup>3</sup>	19.7%

**f) Consultations**

- Access Officer:** no response
- Stanmore Society and Hatch End Assn:** no response

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 20-APR-06
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** None received

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The golf course is situated in the Green Belt and an Area of Special Character. Policy EP 32 indicates that 'The construction of new buildings for the following uses is acceptable in principle:- ...B) Open-air recreational facilities which maintain the character and open nature of the green belt, have no significant adverse environmental effects and do not damage sites of nature conservation importance ... . Policy EP 34 sets the policy in relation to extensions to buildings in the Green Belt. It requires that 'Proposals to extend buildings, including residential units in the green belt should:- A) minimise adverse environmental impact on the green belt character and be appropriate in terms of bulk, height and site coverage in relation to the total site area; C) Contribute to the reduction of any environmental problems on the site.

Given the existing buildings to be demolished, their poor visual relationship to the main building, the far better relationship achieved by the proposed extension and its location on the site of the former buildings, it is submitted that the development complies with these policies.

### **2) Outdoor Sports and activities**

Policy R4 of the HUDP states that 'The council will seek further provision of outdoor sports facilities that are in limited supply by: A) encouraging public and private recreational schemes... . Paragraph 8.26 goes on to explain that 'There continues to be a demand for golf facilities... The Council.... will support the development of commercial facilities for outdoor sports where there is no detrimental effect on the environment or local residents.' This application does not increase the capacity of the course itself but does improve conditions for players before and after the game.

### **3) Standard of Design and Layout**

This has already been commented upon by the applicant in his statement. As the perspective drawing shows the new extension will complement the existing building and visually will be an enhancement compared to the existing collection of low quality buildings of poor design.

### **4) Parking**

Given the playing capacity of the course is not increased by the proposal and the amount of parking on site, the proposal does not need to be accompanied by an increase in parking provision.

### **5) Consultation Responses:**

Nil.

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

DEMOLITION OF BUILDING AND ERECTION OF ANCILLARY CHURCH BUILDING

COUNTER & KING ARCHITECTS for DEREK BISHOP

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: BEL/05/246 -S/01, S/100,SK/01, SK/101, 102, 103,104,105

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - 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 All activities shall take place within the building(s).  
REASON: To ensure that adequate precautions are taken to avoid noise nuisance and 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:  
SC1 Provision of Community Services  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
C2 Provision of Social and community Facilities  
C10 Community Buildings and Places of Worship  
T6 Transport impact of Development Proposals
- 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.

Continued/...

- 3      **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.
- 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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)  
Website: <http://www.safety.odpm.gov.uk/bregs/walls.htm>

---

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

- 1) Community services
- 2) Design and Layout
- 3) Community buildings and Places of Worship
- 4) Transport Impact
- 5) Consultation Responses

---

### **INFORMATION**

#### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Minor - Other	
Site Area:	0.058 ha	
Car Parking:	Standard:	On its merits as per PPG 13
Council Interest:	None	

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

- Wedge-shaped site on the south side of Pinner Road opposite the entrance to Harrow Recreation Ground
- East and south of the site are commercial properties. The south boundary is marked with a 1.8m drop in level with a service road at the lower level.
- To the west are two pairs of semi-detached houses.

Continued/...

**c) Proposal Details**

- Existing outbuilding and hall of 341 sq m, on the rear half of the site, to be demolished
- Redevelopment to provide a new hall on the site of the old buildings of 325 sq m.

**d) Relevant History**

- None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- There will be no change from the use of the present buildings namely to hold church services and other meetings mainly for children i.e. Sunday school classes, and various clubs some in the evenings especially during school holidays

**f) Consultations**

- **Environmental Health:** no reply
- **Highways:** No objection
- **Thames Water:** no reply
- **Harrow Civic Residents Association:** no reply

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	12	Nil	13-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** Nil

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Community services**

This proposal represents the replacement of existing facilities in accord with the UDP policies

**2) Design and Layout**

The proposals are for a modest single storey building. A three storey commercial building stands to the east side and the rear part of two storey houses and their gardens on the west side of the site. Three roof lights face the houses' rear gardens to maintain amenity.

**3) Community Buildings and Places of Worship**

This is a well-established free church which also permits the wide use of its hall to serve the local community in accord with policy.

**4) Transport impact**

No parking has been provided on this site but given its proximity to Harrow Bus interchange and the tube station, it has a high public transport accessibility rating indicating that car use should be restrained in favour of public transport. The proposals provide for access for the disabled.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Dealt with in appraisal section

Continued/...

**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 grant.

Continued/...

PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO ROOF (RENEWAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION WEST/238/02/FUL)

ORCHARD ASSOCIATES for MR & MRS L GOODCHILD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 356/1, 356/2, 356/3A

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - 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)  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no 356/3/A 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 COMPDEV\_CA - Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - 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:  
SEP5 Structural Features  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Greenbelt and Metropolitan Open Land  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance, and Historic Parks and Gardens  
EP31 Areas of Special Character

Continued/...



- EP33 Development in the Greenbelt
- EP34 Extensions to Buildings in the Greenbelt
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 Amenity Space and Privacy
- D14 Conservation Areas
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

4 INFORMATIVE:

**IMPORTANT: Compliance With Planning Conditions Requiring Submission and Approval of Details Before Development Commences**

- You will be in breach of planning permission if you start development without complying with a condition requiring you to do something before you start. For example, that a scheme or details of the development must first be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- Carrying out works in breach of such a condition will not satisfy the requirement to commence the development within the time permitted.

- Starting development in breach of a planning condition will invalidate your planning permission.

- If you require confirmation as to whether the works you have carried out are acceptable, then you should apply to the Local Planning Authority for a certificate of lawfulness.

---

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

- 1) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (SD1, D4, D14, D15)
- 2) Impact on Greenbelt (SEP5, SEP6, EP33, EP34)
- 3) Impact on Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, EP31)

Continued/...

- 4) Neighbouring Amenity and Residential Character (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Householder  
Green Belt:  
Conservation Area: Pinner Hill Estate  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- Two storey detached property on east side of Pinner Hill, Pinner
- Sited within Green Belt, Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character and the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area
- Dwelling sited minimum 4.5m from north side boundary and 4.7m from south side boundary; flat roofed single storey utility to north side believed to be original feature
- Detached tandem garage adjacent to north side boundary appears on 1935 Ordnance Survey map
- Neighbouring property to north, "Sandlewood", sited 3m approx from boundary and on higher level
- "Crossways" to south sited in excess of 5m from the boundary and on lower level

### c) Proposal Details

- Renewal of unimplemented planning permission details include the following:
- Part single, part two storey rear extension including pitched roof over existing utility room
- Two storey element to project rearward 2.9m from rear main wall of house across central third of rear elevation; subordinate hipped roof over
- Single storey extension to project rearward 2.7m and sited between proposed two storey extension and existing utility; height 3.8m to ridge falling to 2.6m at eaves
- Fenestration and other architectural details replicated
- South flank elevation includes ground floor window to dining room – sited 8m from facing side boundary

### d) Relevant History

WEST/653/01/FUL	Part single, part two storey rear extension	WITHDRAWN 03-OCT-01
WEST/238/02/FUL	Part single, part two storey rear extension and alterations to roof	GRANTED 05-AUG-02

Continued/...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None

**f) Consultations**

**Advertisement**                      Character of Conservation Area                      Expiry  
01-JUN-06

**CAAC:** Awaited

**Notifications**                      Sent                      Replies                      Expiry  
2                      AWAITED                      23-MAY-06

**APPRAISAL**

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

There has been no material change in circumstances since the previous application was granted.

As in the previous application, the design and form of the proposed extension would reflect that of the original building. It would not be visible in the streetscene and neither, when viewed from the rear, would it dominate the original building. In these circumstances and subject to the control of external materials, for which a condition is suggested, it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area.

**2) Impact on Greenbelt**

Thrushwood is a sizeable dwelling on a substantial plot but which has a compact form that maximises space around the building and between neighbouring buildings. The proposed extension is of modest proportions and its design/siting would continue to contain the extent of the dwelling within a compact building envelope; there would be no reduction in space between the house and neighbouring dwellings. In these circumstances it is considered that the proposal would retain the openness and character of this part of the Green Belt and would have no adverse impact on the skyline.

The increase in size over and above the original dwelling house is as set out below.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>% over original</b>	<b>proposed</b>	<b>% over original</b>
<b>Footprint (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	110m <sup>2</sup>	110m <sup>2</sup>	0	130m <sup>2</sup>	18
<b>Floor Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	152m <sup>2</sup>	152m <sup>2</sup>	0	179m <sup>2</sup>	18

Continued/...

It is considered that the resulting floorspace and footprint would be not be disproportionate and the proposed extension therefore constitutes appropriate development in the Green Belt.

**3) Impact on Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character**

The proposal would have no detrimental impact on the structural features that contribute to this part of the Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character.

**4) Neighbouring Amenity and Residential Character**

The extension would be located centrally within the site at some distance from the boundaries with adjoining properties. Notwithstanding the marginal difference in levels between the application property and Crossways to the south, the orientation, siting and design of the proposal are favourable and would not detrimentally affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Similarly the proposal would preserve the character of this residential locality.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Awaited.

**CONCLUSION**

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

Continued/...

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY/FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION INCORPORATING NEW EXTERNAL ACCESS TO FLAT; FRONT AND REAR DORMERS (REVISED)

MR DILIP GUDKA

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: DG/PA05/100, DG/PA05/101A, DG/PA05/102/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 The consulting room hereby approved shall be used only in conjunction with the use of the ground floor as a pharmacy, and for no other purpose, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To prevent the function of an independent consulting use that could only be accessed from the rear, in the interests of the access and servicing convenience of surrounding commercial uses and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
- 4 NO\_BALCONY - Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony

## 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  
SD3 Mixed Use Development  
ST2 Traffic Management  
EP25 Noise  
D4 Design and layout  
D5 Amenity space and privacy  
D7 Design in retail areas and town centres  
T13 Car Parking
- 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.

Continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Amenity and use of single storey extension
- 2) Amenity of first floor extension
- 3) Amenity and character of front and rear dormers.
- 4) Car Parking
- 5) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

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

Statutory Return Type: Minor - Other

Site Area: 144m<sup>2</sup>

Habitable Rooms: 2 additional

Car Parking: Standard: 1 (maximum)

Justified: 1

Provided: 1

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- Two storey property with single storey rear extension and detached outbuilding on north side of Eastcote Lane, South Harrow; ground floor occupied by chemist, first floor residential with ground floor rear access
- Premises part of non-designated retail parade in four terraces: 302-312; 314-324 - [Kings Road] – 326-336; and 338-348; service road behind and Kings Road bungalows beyond

Continued/...

Item 2/09 : P/3184/05/DFU continued/...

- Adjoining terrace no. 334 in retail use (grocer/newsagent) with single storey rear extension adjacent to common boundary and stairs/first floor enclosed canopy to upper flat
- Neighbouring end of terrace no. 338 forms double unit with 340 and used as vehicle repair garage; single storey rear extensions spans the site at the rear
- Single storey extension fills the 2m gap between the end of terrace properties
- The terraces east of the Kings Road junction have original front dormers vertical in emphasis/proportions; front and rear dormers (horizontal emphasis/proportions) at nos. 328, 330, 340, 346 (rear only) and 348

**c) Proposal Details**

- Existing store to the rear demolished: Located adjacent to the boundary with no.338, is 2m wide and 12.5 depth.
- Single storey rear extension: The extension will have a depth of 10.5m , width of 7m and a height of 3.8m (flat roof)
- First floor rear extension: The extension will have a depth of 1.45m, width of 3m and a flat roof
- Front and Rear dormers: Additional bedroom accommodation is to be added by the addition of dormers.

**Revisions to Previous Application:**

Following the previous decision (P/2198/05/DFU) the following amendments have been made:

- The formation of an independent consulting room has been replaced with a consulting room that is operated via the pharmacy.
- The external staircase is open sided and the flank wall height has been reduced.

**d) Relevant History**

P/2198/05/DFU                      Single and two storey first floor rear extension    REFUSED  
inc. new external access to flat, front and rear    24-OCT-2005  
dormers

**Reasons for Refusal:**

- 1) The proposed single storey extension, by reason of its design and layout, would permit the introduction of an independent consulting use that would increase access, parking and general activity at the rear, to the detriment of the access/servicing convenience of surrounding commercial uses and the amenity of occupiers of the first floor flats.
- 2) The proposed external access to the first floor flat, by reason of its height, design and siting adjacent to the boundary, would appear unduly bulky and overbearing when viewed from no. 338A Eastcote Lane, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of that property.

Continued/...

**Informative:**

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

- (i) Omit the formation of an independent consulting room on the ground floor. If it is intended to be operated in conjunction with the pharmacy explain the nature of the inter-relationship between the two uses and revise the floor layout to integrate the consulting room with the customer circulation area at the front of the premises.
- (ii) Omit the external access and provide a ground floor footway within the single storey extension leading to the flat's existing ground floor lobby and stairway.

<b>No. 338/340 Eastcote Lane</b>	Single Storey Rear Extension	GRANTED
P/2105/04/DFU:	to Workshop	17-SEP-04
<b>No. 348 Eastcote Lane</b>	Front and Rear Dormers	GRANTED
WEST/1024/02/FUL		29-OCT-02

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- NHS Primary Care Trust's (PCT) requirement for pharmacy accreditation is to provide a consultation area within the pharmacy and larger area of consultation to provide diagnostic testing services.
- Applicants statement accompanied by Harrow NHS PCT Pharmacy Premises Accreditation notes and self certification form.

**f) Consultations**

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	4	0	24-FEB-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Amenity and Use of Single Storey Rear Extension**

It is proposed to demolish the existing detached outbuilding and replace with an extension to the existing rear projection. The extension would increase the depth of the projection by 1.2m, adjacent to the boundary with no. 334, and would span the width of the site wrapping around the side of the existing extension and returning to the rear main wall of the original building. The extension would have an overall depth of 10.5m from the original building and would follow the side boundary with no. 338, which is part chamfered to increase the site width at the rear. The main part of the single storey extension would have a flat roof to a height of 3.8m.

Although high on the boundary with no. 334 this is not considered to be unacceptable having regard to the limited depth beyond that property's own rear extension and its commercial use at ground floor level. In view of the extensive existing rearward projection at no. 338, which would be increased by the implementation of planning permission P/2105/04/DFU, neither is it considered that the proposal would have any unacceptable impact in relation to the ground floor of that neighbouring property.

Continued/...



The extension would contain windows and a door in the rear elevation; a small raised platform of 1.2m depth and 0.5m above ground level is also proposed. However a distance of some 10m would be maintained to the boundary with the Kings Road bungalows, which is delineated by a 2m close-boarded fence. Taking this and existing commercial development to the rear of property in the terrace into account, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers by reason of overlooking, visual impact or noise/disturbance.

The extension would provide additional storage space, staff facilities and a consulting room. And it has been demonstrated that its use would be integral to, not independent from the established pharmacy use on the ground floor of the premises, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. The consulting room has been amended to integrate with the existing pharmacy. Further the applicant's statement clearly shows the relationship between the pharmacy and the consulting room. To ensure that in the future this does not become a separate use it is recommended a condition to that effect be placed on the consent.

## **2) Amenity of First Floor Extension**

A first floor rear extension is also proposed, to provide revised access and an enlarged bathroom to the residential flat. The extension would have a depth of 1.45m and a width of 3m, inset from the outer flank wall of this end-terrace by 0.1m. It would have a flat roof terminating just below the level of the eaves on the original building.

This element would sit well within 45° lines drawn, on plan, from the rear first floor corners of the adjacent buildings. Combined with the extension's modest depth and height, it is not considered that there would be any material loss of light/outlook in relation to neighbouring flats. Neither is it considered that the bathroom window and revised entrance would, at a distance of 19m to the boundary with Kings Road bungalows and taking into account the existing degree of overlooking, be detrimental to privacy amenity.

Beyond the first floor extension, the flank wall (adjacent to no. 338) of the single storey extension is no longer built up to enclose the new external stairs providing access to the first floor flat. Other external stairs have been added to the rear of this parade, notably at no. 334 and no. 342. That at 342 is similarly open sided. Previous concerns about the bulky, overbearing impact of the previously proposed canopy feature and flank wall have been alleviated. Although the residential access has not been enclosed as suggested by informative on decision notice P/2198/05/DFU, this revised proposal has addressed previous reasons for refusal no.2 and would be of no detriment to the amenity of the occupiers of no.338A Eastcote Lane.

## **3) Front and Rear Dormers**

Finally, it is proposed to add additional bedroom accommodation to the first floor flat by the addition of front and rear dormers. Consistent with the Council's guidelines for end-terrace property, the rear dormer would be sited 0.5m from the party boundary, 1m from the outer roof edge and 1.5m from the eaves, measured externally along the roofslope. The roof would be set-down from the ridge and it is considered that the dormer's bulk would appear suitably well contained within the roofslope as to be of no detriment to the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

Continued/...

Whilst the Council's guidelines normally resist the introduction of front dormers, the presence of existing dormers in this and the other terraces forming this non-designated retail frontage along Eastcote Lane is a compelling relevant site consideration. Accordingly it is not considered that there can be any objection in principle. Turning to the detail, the front dormer would be considerably smaller than that at the rear, being sited 1.7m from the party boundary, 1.8m from the outer roof edge and 1.7m from the eaves, measured externally along the roof slope. It would also be set-down from the ridge and again, therefore, would appear adequately contained within the remaining front roof slope. The horizontal emphasis/proportions of the dormer would be consistent with those at nos. 328, 330 & 340, but larger than the more square-shaped dormer approved and recently constructed at no. 348. Nonetheless, in streetscene terms it is considered that the proposal would be visually appropriate, and that there would be no detriment to the visual amenity or character of this terrace.

The front dormer would face the Herga community centre at a distance of over 30m, whilst the rear dormer would face the boundary with the Kings Road bungalows at a distance of 21m. Taking into account existing overlooking characteristics, it is not considered that these distances would be so short as to lead to unreasonable actual or perceived loss of privacy amenity.

#### **4) Car Parking**

The subject proposal provides one car parking space to the rear of the premises, this is in accordance with council's policy. It is noted that the subject site is located within a sustainable location, where the site occupiers would not be disadvantaged by non-car ownership (local shops and public transport services within walking distance).

#### **5) Consultation Responses**

Apart from the points raised in the above sections of the report, no other issues have been raised.

#### **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 grant.

Continued/...

ERECTION OF DETACHED GARAGE

PHD CHARTERED TOWN PLANNERS for MR & MRS ROMAIN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1/1250 Location Plan, PHD 03 street elevation (scale 1:100), PHD 03 elevations (scale 1:50) and PHD 02

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - 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 RES\_PK\_DWG - Parking for Occupants - Single Family Dwelling

## **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:  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP32 Green Belt-Acceptable Land Uses  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- 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.

Continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP31, EP32, EP34, D4)
- 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (EP31, EP33, EP34, D4)
- 3) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:            Householder - Other

Green Belt:

Area of Special Interest:

Car Parking:	Standard:	1.6 (maximum)
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	2

Council Interest:                None

**b) Site Description**

- Detached house on the south side of Brookshill Drive, standing in a line of four dwellings
- To the rear is an extensive area of open land
- The north side of Brookshill Drive is within the conservation area of the same name
- Also within Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character

Continued/...

**c) Proposal Details**

- Detached double garage to be located to the west of the dwelling.
- Garage to be 5.5m wide by 6.5m deep with a tiled pitched roof
- Garage will be 2.3m from the boundary with adjoining house, Red Corners.

**Revisions to Previous Application:**

Following the previous refusal (P/2770/04/CFU) the following amendments have been made:

- Reduction of floor area from 50 to 35.75 m<sup>2</sup>
- Reduction of height of roof ridge to 4.2m
- Increase in distance from flank of garage to boundary from 1.2 to 2.3m
- Distance from flank of garage to house remains at 1.5m
- The table below sets out changes to footprint, floorspace and volume compared to the original and existing building as already extended. The figures in ( ) in the proposed column indicate the % change which would have occurred if the most recent application had not been refused.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Total % increase</b>
Footprint	83 m <sup>2</sup>	110	36 (50)	75 (175)
Floorspace	150 m <sup>2</sup>	220	36 (50)	70 (170)
Volume	490 m <sup>3</sup>	751	99 (186)	73 (173)

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1271/01/FUL	Single and two storey extensions, alterations to roof, front porch and wall and gates at front	GRANTED 07-MAR-02
EAST/292/02/FUL	Two storey side/rear extensions, alterations to roof with rear dormer, front porch, wall and gates at front (revised)	GRANTED 28-JUN-02
EAST/1054/02/FUL	Rear Conservatory	REFUSED 11-NOV-02
P/257/03/CFU	Works to facilitate use of garage as habitable room	GRANTED 17-MAR-03
P/255/03/CFU	Detached double garage at rear	REFUSED 17-MAR-03

**Reasons for 2003 Refusal:**

1) The proposed development, taken in conjunction with previous extensions to the property would result in disproportionate additions to the original dwelling house and would give rise to a loss of openness and constitute inappropriate development detrimental to the Green Belt and Area of Special Character.

2) The proposed development, by virtue of its size, bulk and siting, would be unduly obstructive, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property Red Corners.

Continued/...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Floor area reduced by 30%, height reduced by 20% and gap to boundary increased
- Original detached garage not included in previous calculations
- In terms of the increases proposed these are reduced not only because of the smaller size of the proposed garage but also because of the larger size of the original dwellinghouse.

**f) Consultations**

**Stanmore Society:**

No response

**Notifications**

Sent

Replies

Expiry

5

0

10-APR-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Green Belt And Area Of Special Character**

UDP policies EP 31-34 together with revised PPG 2 (Green Belt) recognise that extensions to houses in the green belt can be acceptable provided they minimise environmental impact on its character and are appropriate in terms of height, bulk, site coverage and distance to a site's boundary. As revealed by the table above setting out proposal details this application is for a more modest garage further away from the boundary. The floor level has also been lowered to minimise the height of the garage when viewed from the road. The new garage would not intrude on the skyline being single storey and would complement the single storey element of the adjoining house. On the basis of the submitted drawings compared to that previously submitted a sufficient reduction in the garage has taken place to overcome the reasons for refusal.

**2) Visual And Residential Amenity**

The garage is now to be 2.3 m (7' 6") away from the boundary with the neighbour. Coupled with the traditional design of the garage, with materials to be approved, and its position set back 3.2m from the front bay of the main house visual amenity will be maintained. For the same reasons, a blank wall facing the common boundary, residential amenity will also be maintained.

**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/...

---

**EBBERSTON, 39 SOUTH HILL AVE, HARROW**

**2/11**

**P/74/06/DFU/SB5**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for MR & MRS J SNOWDON

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1475/1; 1475/2a; 1475/3a

**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 roof planes 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  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- 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,

Continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

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:

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) Quality of Design and Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D14, D15)
- 2) Amenity Space and Privacy (D5)
- 3) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee at the request of a nominated member. Details of this application were reported to the Committee at its meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> April but was deferred to allow a Members' site visit.

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Householder
Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Conservation Area:	SOUTH HILL AVENUE
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- Detached dwelling located on the southern side of South Hill Avenue
- Dwelling has an existing single storey rear extension measuring 3.5m in depth
- Adequate size plot with rear garden measuring 17.5m in depth
- South Hill Avenue Conservation Area characterised detached dwellings with irregular building lines.

Continued/...



**c) Proposal Details**

- First floor extension to be constructed on the existing single storey rear extension, which has a footprint of 3.5m x 7.15m
- Flat roof to the existing extension would be removed and replaced with hipped roof
- Small dormer sited to rear (new) roof slope, with hipped roof details to match
- Distance of 1.3m maintained to site boundary with Chestnut
- Distance of 3.5m maintained to site boundary with Rosemead

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/24824	Single storey rear extension	GRANTED 31-JAN-84
WEST/484/98/FUL	First floor rear extension	GRANTED 13-OCT-98

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None

**f) Consultations**

**CAAC:** No objections  
**Harrow Hill Trust:** No response

**Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Expiry 23-FEB-06

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	2	1	09-FEB-06

**Summary of Responses:** 2 objection letters and a number of email communication received, all objections to development due to height, size and scale; potential loss of light; overshadowing and breach of 45° code; overlooking and out of character.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Quality of Design and Conservation Area**

The proposed first floor rear extension would be a unique development to this detached bungalow, many dwellings along South Hill Avenue are unique in character and in built form, notwithstanding this, the proposed extension would be in accordance to the current supplementary planning guidance. The amended hipped roof would sit above the existing single storey rear extension, with the roof ridge height level with that of the existing roof ridge to the dwelling house. The proposed rear roof slope would have a small dormer with a matching hipped roof detail and a rear facing 1.5m x 1.5m window.

Continued/...

This rear dormer would be sufficiently contained within the proposed rear slope and would form a subordinate feature to the overall proposed development. The proposed first floor extension would be obscured from view of the streetscene, in terms of the overall quality of design the proposed extension has been sympathetically designed in keeping with the original character of the dwelling and would not, therefore be considered a detriment in terms of the scale, mass and character. It is considered that proposed development, subject to the use of appropriate matching materials, would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding conservation area.

## **2) Amenity Space and Privacy**

The proposed first floor extension would be set away from the neighbouring site boundaries and by replacing the originally proposed end gabled roof, with a hipped roof and smaller dormer has considerably reduced the bulk and would satisfactorily comply with the relevant SPG guidance in particular the 45 degree code. In terms of orientation of this dwelling and the neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would not result in undue overshadowing or loss of light. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not appear visually overbearing and obtrusive to the neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed small rear dormer would allow some overlooking of neighbouring gardens. However, the application property is only single storey at the rear and both adjoining properties are two storey in height, with first floor rear windows or dormer windows. The proposed rear extension would introduce only one first floor dormer window, centrally located. Although the flank roofplanes would not incorporate any rooflights or windows, any future insertion can be satisfactorily dealt with an appropriate condition. Based on these factors it is considered that the proposed development would not amount to any unreasonable overlooking.

## **3) Consultation Responses**

As detailed above.

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

---

**WESTLANDS, 93 SOUTH HILL AVE, HARROW**

**2/12**

**P/17/06/CFU/OH**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CHANGE OF USE: RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME (CLASS C2) TO A SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE (CLASS C3)

CYGNET HEALTH CARE - M FULLER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Drawing No4, A4 plan (titled fire zones), existing elevations x 2 and site plan

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 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.
- 3 The roof area of the single storey rear projection shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance, and Historic Parks and Gardens  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
SC1 Provision of Community Facilities  
C2 Provision of Social and Community Facilities  
C8 Health Care and Social Services

Continued/...

- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 Amenity Space and Privacy
- SEP5 Structural Features
- SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Greenbelt and Metropolitan Open Land
- EP31 Areas of Special Character
- D12 Locally Listed Buildings
- D14 Conservation Areas
- D16 Conservation Area Priority
- 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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

4 INFORMATIVE:

**IMPORTANT: Compliance With Planning Conditions Requiring Submission and Approval of Details Before Development Commences**

- You will be in breach of planning permission if you start development without complying with a condition requiring you to do something before you start. For example, that a scheme or details of the development must first be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

- Carrying out works in breach of such a condition will not satisfy the requirement to commence the development within the time permitted.

- Starting development in breach of a planning condition will invalidate your planning permission.

- If you require confirmation as to whether the works you have carried out are acceptable, then you should apply to the Local Planning Authority for a certificate of lawfulness.

---

Continued/...

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

- 1) Change of Use (SH1, SH2, SC1, C2, C8)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Character of Conservation Area/Locally Listed Building/Area of Special Character (SD2, D12, D14, SEP5, SEP6, EP31)
  - 4) Accessible Homes (H18, D16)
  - 5) Parking (T13)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Change of Use	
Conservation Area:	South Hill Avenue	
Car Parking:	Standard:	1.8 (maximum)
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	3
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- Three storey large detached Victorian property located on the eastern side of South Hill Avenue
- The property features decorative bargeboards, balustrade balconies and canted bays and it is locally listed
- There is a large single storey rear projection and an external staircase leading from the first floor into the rear garden
- The garden is to an overall depth of approximately 20 metres
- Driveway located adjacent to the southern flank wall of the property and detached pre-fabricated garage located adjacent to the southern boundary, approximately 3 metres from the main rear wall, this space could accommodate up to four vehicles parked in tandem
- The site and its immediate surroundings are located in the South Hill Avenue Conservation Area and within the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character
- The lawful use of the property is a C2 residential care home, property is currently vacant

**c) Proposal Details**

- Change of use of property from a residential care home (class C2) to a dwellinghouse (Class C3)

Continued/...

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/18923	Use of premises as old peoples rest home	GRANTED 26-JUL-61
LBH/1677	Continued use of old peoples home	GRANTED 14-SEP-66
LBH/1677/1	Permanent use of premises as old peoples rest home	GRANTED 16-JUL-68
WEST/17/96/CAC	Conservation area consent: demolition of two storey bay on rear elevation and single storey rear extension	GRANTED 11-MAR-96
WEST/613/95/FUL	Change of use: class C2 to C3 (rest home to 4 flats), two storey rear extension, rebuild single storey rear extension	GRANTED 11-MAR-96
WEST/17/96/CON	Continued use as a residential institution (class C2) without compliance with condition 1 of planning permission LBH/1677/1 dated 17 <sup>th</sup> July 1968	GRANTED 18-MAR-97

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None

**f) Consultations**

- **CAAC:** This would be the preferred use.

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	18	1	17-MAR-06

**Summary of Responses:** Prefer the building to be a single dwelling house

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Change of Use**

Based on current policy within the Harrow Unitary Development Plan, there are no objections to the change of use. The site is located within a residential area and public transport accessibility is relatively poor. In line with policy C3, reverting the property back to its original intended use would result in the positive contribution of a unit to the housing stock within Harrow. It would provide a larger than average unit for occupation by a larger household in line with policy SH2.

**2) Residential Amenity**

The existing use as a care home could accommodate up to fourteen residents with six full-time staff. It is considered that the change of use of this property back to a single-family dwelling would reduce the activity and associated intensity of use of this property, therefore having less of an impact on the amenity of exiting residents compared to the existing lawful use.

Continued/...

In view of the generous width and depth of the rear garden there is considered to be ample amenity space for use by the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling.

The forecourt of the site is currently landscaped and there is ample opportunity to provide refuse storage within the curtilage of this property (either at the front or within the rear garden) without detriment to the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the area, details of this are requested by condition.

### **3) Character of Conservation Area/Locally Listed Building/Area of Special Character**

Given the residential character of this Conservation Area, the principle for restoring the property back to its original intended use as a single-family dwelling house is considered acceptable.

The proposal would also serve to maintain a locally listed building in active use and in line with best conservation practice would restore the building back to the use for which it was originally designed, whilst enabling necessary modernisation. It is not proposed to extend or otherwise alter the external appearance of the building.

In terms of the impact on the street scene, this part of the Conservation Area is subject to an Article 4 direction restricting the provision of a hard surface within the curtilage of the dwelling house; therefore the street side greenness, which has been lost in other parts of the Conservation Area, can be controlled and retained.

In these circumstances it is considered that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of this locally listed building and this part of the Conservation Area and would therefore be acceptable.

The proposal would have no detrimental impact on the structural features that contribute to this part of the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character.

### **4) Accessible Homes**

This property is a locally listed building, located in a Conservation Area and the proposed intention to change this property back into a single-family residence is considered desirable in conservation terms.

UDP policy D16 seeks to give priority to conservation considerations over other plan policies and standards in appropriate cases. In this instance it is considered, on balance, that further disruption to the internal and external fabric of this locally listed building within a conservation area is not justified by the provision of one single family dwelling to lifetime home standards. It is therefore considered that the proposal is an appropriate case for exception in line with policy D16.

### **5) Parking**

The existing use as a residential care home could generate parking demands over and above what would be required for a dwelling. Schedule 5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan states that for C2 uses each development proposal should be assessed on its merits provided a restraint-based approach is demonstrated. In comparison, the proposed use as a dwelling house would generate a maximum parking standard of 1.8 spaces.

Continued/...

Item 2/12 : P/17/06/CFU continued/...

Currently, the site has provision for up to 3 off-street tandem parking spaces located adjacent to the southern flank. Although these would be retained, in excess of the maximum recommended levels, it considered that a refusal based on over-provision in respect of a single family dwelling in this location would not be justified.

**6) Consultation Responses**

Material planning concerns addressed in appraisal above.

**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 grant.

Continued/...



SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSION, REAR DORMER, REVISED ROOF OVER EXISTING GARAGE

MR N PATEL

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 01, 02 Rev A, 03 Rev A, 04, 05 Rev A, Site Plan

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match

## 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 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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

Continued/...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, SPG - Extensions)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4, D5, SPG – Extensions)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

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

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Householder  
Site Area: 600m<sup>2</sup>  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- The application site is located on the southeastern corner of Gordon Avenue and Maytree Lane and is occupied by a two storey detached dwelling with integral garage.
- The surrounding area consists predominantly of two storey-detached dwellings.
- The adjoining dwelling to the immediate east, No. 73, has a single storey rear extension.
- The adjoining dwelling to the immediate rear, Whernside, also has a single storey rear extension.

### c) Proposal Details

- Front and side ground floor extension that will wrap around the northwestern corner of the dwelling.
- New roof over existing garage to create a single roof over the extension and garage.
- Two rear dormers to facilitate loft conversion.

### d) Relevant History

LBH/16591	Erection of single storey extension to side and rear of dwelling house.	GRANTED 14-OCT-80
P/363/06/DFU	Erection of brick wall with metal railing along Gordon Avenue frontage.	GRANTED 26-APR-06
P/1101/06/DFU	Single storey outbuilding at rear of garden.	PENDING DECISION

### e)

#### Notifications

Sent  
5

Replies  
1

Expiry  
06-MAR-06

Continued/...

**Summary of Responses:**

- No objections to ground floor extension or revised garage roof.
- Rear dormer not in character with house - out of keeping with design in surrounding neighbourhood - eyesore from Maytree Lane - will overlook window on north side of Whernside if vegetation is removed from the site - will set precedent.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character and Appearance of Area**

The existing dwelling has a stepped front building line, with the integral garage protruding further than the main wall of the dwelling. The proposed front extension will bring the main wall of the dwelling in line with the front wall of the garage and then wrap around the side of the dwelling. The front/side extension is considered consistent with the character of the dwelling and appears subservient to the original building. The proposal is expected to have a minimal effect on the streetscene given its height, setback from the footpath and the fact that it keeps to the existing front building line established by the garage.

The proposed dormers are both 3m in width, stepped in 1m from both verges, and stepped up 1m from the eaves lines and as such are in compliance with the requirements of the SPG. The dormers appear as subordinate features in the roof as they retain a clearly visible section of roof around the perimeter of the dormers, including the upper corners. The dormers are also set 2.8m apart and this separation distance assists in reducing the dominance and bulk of the dormers and ensuring the overall character and scale of the dwelling is maintained.

**2) Neighbouring Amenity**

The front/side extension brings the dwelling closer to the corner boundary and therefore is located a considerable distance from all adjoining dwellings. Given this, no impact is expected on the existing amenity of the neighbouring plots. Furthermore, the new roof over the garage is lower than the existing roof and as such will result in a reduction of bulk along the boundary to No. 73.

The proposed rear dormers will not impact upon the existing neighbouring amenities or create a significant loss of privacy to the neighbouring houses or gardens. The dormers are located approximately 20m from the rear boundary line, and almost 25m from Whernside (the dwelling), this distance mitigates against any overlooking from the dormers. Furthermore, the site has significant vegetation along the boundaries to both adjoining dwellings.

**3) Consultation Responses**

Discussed in text.

**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 grant.

Continued/...

CONSTRUCTION OF ENTRANCE GATES AND PIERS

THOMAS LANDSCAPES for MRS COLLINS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: EG-001, PG-001 and Site Plan

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt, to include boundary treatment, have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the forecourt has been laid out and planted in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure the development makes a satisfactory contribution to the street scene and in the interests of the occupiers of the development.
- 3 LAND\_APPR - Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 LAND\_IMPL - 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:  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
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.

---

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

- 1) Standard of Design and Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
- 2) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Householder  
Green Belt:  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- Site in the Green Belt in the far north eastern end of Priory Drive cul-de-sac
- Wedge shaped site
- There is substantial mature vegetation surrounding the site
- Other gates are evident at the AD Astra Site opposite
- Surrounding area is predominantly residential characterised by large detached dwellings on sizeable plots of land

### c) Proposal Details

- Gates and piers to be constructed
- The entrance/exit will be moved to a new location towards the start of the site
- Development will be set back from the road within the curtilage of the applicants property

### d) Relevant History

- None

### e) Applicant's Statement

- None

### f) Consultations

- None

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	4	0	10-JAN-06

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Standard of Design and Residential Amenity

The proposal is for iron gates and railings to be constructed with rendered piers. The maximum height of the proposal will be 2.1m. The gates will be set back from the highway approximately 4.2m. The proposal would call for the existing hardstanding to be altered.

There would be 1 vehicular entrance to the property with the gates situated across this access. The gates would be shielded from the highway by the existing mature vegetation that surrounds the property.

Continued/...

Item 2/14 : P/2691/05/CFU continued/...

The gates would not be directly visible from the highway unless they were approached head on and are therefore not considered to pose any undue harm to the special character and appearance of this part of the Green Belt.

Although it is not specified the plans indicate that the existing entrances will be landscaped to provide a uniform frontage. Two conditions are suggested to provide details of the landscaping scheme and time frames for implementation.

As the gates will be set away from the road they would not be directly viewed from the property opposite. They would be partially obscured by the mature vegetation and as such are not considered to have any detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

It is also noted that there are gates installed at the entrance of the AD Astra site opposite approved as part of application EAST/58/01/FUL.

**2) Consultation Responses**

- None

**CONCLUSION**

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations this application is recommended for grant.

Continued/...

**1 & 2 BANKFIELD COTTAGES, ASS HOUSE LANE, P/3026/05/CFU/SC2  
HARROW**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

RENEWAL OF PERMISSION OF EAST/1229/00/FUL: DEMOLITION AND  
REPLACEMENT OF 2 TWO STOREY SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES WITH PARKING

GRIMS DYKE GOLF CLUB LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 779/P/1D

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 LAND\_APPR - Landscaping to be Approved
- 3 LAND\_IMPL - Landscaping to be Implemented
- 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  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 5 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the building(s) is/are occupied  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality
- 6 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-  
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste  
(b) and vehicular access thereto  
has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 7 RESTR\_STOR - Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 8 RES\_PARKSP - Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces

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:

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

SD1 Quality of Design

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP32 Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

EP37 Re-Use of Existing Buildings in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

T13 Parking Standards

H3 New Housing Provision - Land Identified for Housing and Vacant Sites

H8 Empty Houses and Property in the Borough

### 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.

It is recommended that the applicant apply for this award.

For additional information, please contact the Borough Crime Prevention Design Advisor through the Crime Reduction Unit, Harrow Police Station, 74 Northolt Road, Harrow, Middlesex, HA2 ODN, tel. 020 8733 3465.

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, SD1, EP31, EP32, EP33, EP37)
- 2) Residential Amenity Space (SD1, D4, D5)
- 3) Parking (T13)

---

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Minor Dwellings

Site Area: 0.2ha

Habitable Rooms: 10

Continued/...



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

**b) Site Description**

- Pair of 2 storey semi-detached houses with single storey additions on all their sides and a footprint of 140m<sup>2</sup>
- Existing buildings have a volume of 605m<sup>3</sup>
- Houses were constructed prior to the provision of the adjacent golf course
- Currently vacant due to poor condition (formerly rigged as flats)
- Combined cartilages include garden areas at front (south – some 100m<sup>2</sup>), a rear depth of some 4.5m (north – approx 95m<sup>2</sup>) and at the western side (some 200m<sup>2</sup>)
- To the east/south-east is an area of parking (at least 6 spaces) traversed by public footpaths
- Previous use was residential accommodation for Grimsdyke Golf Club's 'Greenkeepers'
- Large barn/store for the Golf Club's equipment lies to the south-east, some 10m away from applicant site
- To the south, west and east are the open grounds of Grimsdyke Golf Club; to the north are other open and wooded areas of the Harrow Weald Common
- Site and its surroundings are part of the Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character

**c) Proposal Details**

- Renewal of permission granted on 9<sup>th</sup> March 2001 (ref EAST/1229/00/FUL) for demolishing existing building and replacing it with a pair of semi-detached, two storey houses (footprints of 58m<sup>2</sup> each)
- Original permission was a revised scheme to a previously refused scheme (ref EAST/8/00/FUL)
- Siting almost identical to existing houses
- Height of proposed buildings is 7.3m at main roof's ridge; chimney stack and pots rise another 2.2m
- Garden spaces as existing, with approx 20m<sup>2</sup> addition to western side garden and marginally deeper rear garden; a communal garden area is proposed with a sideways depth of some 16.4m
- Car parking area reduced to 4 spaces with consequent increase in soft landscaping

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/8/00/FUL	Demolition and replacement of two storey semi-detached houses with parking	REFUSED 08-SEP-00
---------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

**Reasons for Refusal:**

- 1) 'the proposed development, by reason of its excessive size and bulk, would be visually obtrusive, out of keeping and amount to inappropriate development in this green belt location to the detriment of the character of the locality'

Continued/...

EAST/1229/00/FUL                      Demolition and replacement of two storey semi-detached houses with parking (revised)                      GRANTED  
09-MAR-01

**e) Applicant's Statement**

(from original permission)

These proposals differ (i.e. new dwellings are smaller) from those previously refused by the Planning Committee

- Dwellings proposed not inappropriate, in that they replace existing dwellings which are not materially smaller

**f)**

**Notifications**

Sent  
2

Replies  
0

Expiry  
26-JAN-06

**APPRAISAL**

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

This renewal is for a scheme, which proposes the replacement of the present buildings with similar (in terms of size, siting and use) development. There has been no change in circumstances since the previous permission in 2001. The 2004 UDP did not introduce any material change in Green Belt policy.

Council policy recognises that proposals for replacement dwellings, are acceptable in the Green Belt provided there is no material increase in site coverage, bulk and height of buildings. In this case the proposed site coverage would be less than the present buildings.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>% Over original</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>% over original</b>
<b>Footprint (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	120	140	16.67%	116	-3.33%
<b>Floor Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	N/K	205	N/K	226	10.24% over existing

The present buildings have been extended by a number of discordant single storey extensions and have various roof designs at single and two storey levels. Consequently, the unifying nature of the proposed buildings' design (albeit involving an 11% increase in building volume) merits support. It emulates the present buildings by retaining the concept of two two-storey cottages, whilst their uniformity of design would be neater and thereby appear less discordant than the present cottages. By replacing buildings in poor condition, this scheme would improve the appearance of the local environment. Moreover, it introduces the opportunity to implement improvements to landscaping within the cartilages in particular through the reduction in hard surfacing adjacent to the public footpath by the removal of parking areas.

Continued/...

By comparison with the proposed houses that were previously refused planning permission, the buildings sought for renewal are smaller. These proposed buildings have a combined width of 14m, whereas the previous scheme's width was 16m; they are also set approximately 1m further west. The proposed volume is now some 670m<sup>3</sup> compared to the previous scheme's 762m<sup>3</sup>.

## **2) Residential Amenity**

The scheme slightly increases the present area of the western-side garden, otherwise the site's amenity spaces remain as at present. In this area, which is dominated by open land around the site, the proposed garden areas are satisfactory. Moreover, this scheme's smaller building width and the relocation further east also increases the proposed communal side garden by some 8m<sup>2</sup> when compared with the refused scheme.

## **3) Parking**

The proposed parking is satisfactory in terms of numbers and spaces and it represents an improvement in as much as it is intended to formalise and reduce the present parking areas. The 1m eastward shift of the proposed building allows the two parking spaces adjacent to the building's western flank wall to be set 1m away from that wall.

## **CONCLUSION**

There has been no material change in circumstances since the previous permission so, 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 grant.

Continued/...

**ROXETH MANOR 1ST & MIDDLE SCHOOL, 280 EASTCOTE LANE, SOUTH HARROW**

Ward: ROXBOURNE

PART SINGLE PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO WEST WING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FACILITIES

RICKARD PARTNERSHIP for HARROW COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 3209/1 3209/2 3209/3 3209/4 3209/5 3209/6 3209/7 3209/8 3209/13

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - 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 DIS\_ACC\_BG - Disabled Access - Buildings

## **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  
C7 New Education Facilities  
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.

Continued/...

- 3        **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.

---

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

- 1) Standard of Design and Layout (SD1 D4)
  - 2) Provision for Schools (C7 T13)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type	Minor Other
Site Area:	1706m <sup>2</sup> (gross) existing    1881m <sup>2</sup> (gross) proposed
Green Belt:	
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- School buildings located on north side of Eastcote Lane at the rear of terraced housing with frontage on that road, bounded to the east by houses on Tithe Farm Avenue and to the south by houses on Minehead Avenue. To the west buildings of Rooks Heath High School bound site.
- Main building has an 'E' shaped configuration, is two storeys built in red brick with a pitched roof.
- Access is along a driveway off Eastcote Lane.
- Sports field to the rear of the site is designated Green Belt land in the HUDP.

**c) Proposal Details**

- Demolition of existing two storey youth awards room and staircase.
- Construction of new 2 storey reception, Head teacher's office and administration block and new staircase with internal lift for people with disabilities

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/131/97/LA3	Extension and alterations to toilet block and dining room including new windows and recladding and disabled access facilities with ramps and steps	GRANTED 23-MAY-97
-----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Not submitted

Continued/...

**f) Consultations**

**Head of Engineering** : no response

**Access Officer**: no response

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	13	0	21-MAR-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Standard of Design and Layout**

The proposal would result in a net addition of 175 sqm to the footprint of the building. The proposed building would have a width of 7.5m, 5m more than the existing building and a depth of 13.5m, 4.2m deeper than the existing building. The height of the proposed and existing buildings would be the same, 8.7m. The existing front building line would not be extended.

The proportions, scale and massing of the proposed extension are considered to be acceptable and can be easily contained within the existing footprint of the building. In this respect the proposal is consonant with the advice in Policy D4, on the need for development to have regard to the scale and character of the surrounding environment.

The design and external appearance of the proposed extension merits more consideration because it is of a contemporary style that departs from the traditional neo Georgian architectural vernacular of the existing building. In this case, white powder coated aluminium windows set in an exterior of soft red facing bricks, the main exterior surfaces of the building, would be replaced by elevational treatment of terracotta rainscreen cladding and grey anti-sun glazing set in aluminium glazing bars.

However, the proposed terracotta cladding, which would be the main building fabric, would not be radically different to the existing appearance of the soft red facing bricks. Moreover, given that the proposal is a relatively small extension to the building that would be concealed from the main road frontage by the buildings of Rooks Heath High School, it is concluded that the proposal would not be regarded as visually obtrusive.

As such, it is concluded that the proposal complies with the advice in Policy D4. It says that new buildings should set standards for future development, not necessarily mimicking what already exists. Within the context of the existing site, the proposal is able to achieve such a relationship.

**2) Provision For Schools**

The expansion of the existing administrative facilities of the school is much needed and will enhance the overall level of support management for the entire complex of schools; the High School, the First and Middle School and the Nursery School. A common main entrance would therefore be provided for the three separate tiers of the premises. At the moment there are separate facilities for the three school levels across the site. The existing access to the site would be unchanged.

Continued/...

It is concluded that the proposal is in line with the advice in Policy C7, which stresses the need for appropriate education facilities to be provided by the Council.

**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 comments received in response to notification and consultation as set out above:  
this application is recommended for grant.

Continued/...

RETENTION OF DETACHED SUMMER HOUSE

MR & MRS A CUMBER

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: MAD/01/05, Site Location Plan.

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

- 1 The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling.  
REASON - To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 2 The building hereby approved shall not be materially altered in appearance without prior consent from the Local Planning Authority, this shall include, painting, changing materials or altering windows.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents 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  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D14 Conservation Areas  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP32 Green Belt-Acceptable Land Uses  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt

Continued/...



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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Conservation Area Impact (SD2, D14)
- 2) Green Belt/Area of Special Character (SEP6, EP31, EP32, EP33)
- 3) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 4) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:      Householder

Site Area:                      0.19 ha

Area of Special

Character:

Green Belt:

Conservation Area:          Pinner Hill

Council Interest:            None

**b) Site Description**

- Detached residential property on north east corner of Hillside Road and Potter Street;
- Located in Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area, Green Belt and Area of Special Character;
- Large oak tree on corner of property boundary with Potter Street and property at number 125 Potter Street;
- Single storey 'summer house' built around existing oak tree;
- Site located on Harrow Borough boundary with London Borough of Hillingdon.

Continued/...

**c) Proposal Details**

- Retention of 'summer house'

**d) Relevant History**

P/1833/03/CFU	Provision of close circuit TV Camera on 4m High Pole.	REFUSED 28-NOV-03 APPEAL DISMISSED 24-JUN-2004
---------------	-------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------

**Reason for Refusal:**

1) The proposed CCTV camera and related pole, by reason of unsatisfactory siting, design and appearance, would detract from the appearance of the property, "Monks Rest" and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Pinner Hill Conservation Area.

P/848/04/CFU	Replacement double garage with new driveway and provision of wall with double gates on Hillside Road frontage.	GRANTED 17-JUN-2004
--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

P/2604/03/CFU	Two storey side extension with roof dormers	GRANTED 14-OCT-2004
---------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None.

**f) Consultations**

- **CAAC:** Objection – very large and intrusive. Can be seen from public road and it fails to preserve or enhance Conservation Area.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry: 03-MAR-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	7	3	25-02-05

**Summary of Responses:** support proposal as summerhouse is only replacing original summerhouse in same location.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Conservation Area Impact**

The summerhouse has been constructed around the existing mature oak tree. It is positioned to the southern corner of the property adjacent to the property at 125 Potter Street and the Potter Street frontage.

Continued/...

Feedback from the conservation officer states that the summerhouse is undesirable as any infilling of side or rear garden areas and spaces between properties will typically be resisted by the Council. Furthermore the existing close-boarded fence around the property boundary is considered to draw a blank edge to the general greenery of the area. The summerhouse is considered to exacerbate this blank edge and detract from the semi-rural character of the area.

In addition to this the Conservation Area Advisory Committee have objected to the development on the grounds that it is very large and intrusive and that it can be seen from a public road whilst failing to preserve or enhance the conservation area.

Although the summerhouse is located in a fairly prominent location, it is considered from a planning perspective, that its impact on the street scene is relatively minor. Its height and bulk are considered minimal in comparison to neighbouring buildings and the summerhouse is mostly obscured from view from the street particularly when the surrounding deciduous trees have their leaves. Furthermore, it is not considered that the summerhouse results in a clear infilling of the garden area or the space between the houses. The plot size at Madalane House and at 125 Potter Street are particularly large and even with the inclusion of the summer house there is still ample green space amenity area and a clearly defined gap between the neighbouring houses.

The semi-rural character of the conservation area is not disputed. However it pays to note that the application property is on the boundary with the neighbouring London Borough of Hillingdon, directly across the road on Potter Street. The make up of the opposite side of the street is quite different from the Harrow side and is clearly a more defined urban environment, with several semi-detached properties and significantly smaller plots and garden areas. With the summerhouse on the borough boundary facing Potter Street, it is not considered that this noticeably or significantly detracts from the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The roof of the summerhouse is made of charcoal coloured shingles, the walls are timber oak coloured shiplap boarding, and the doors and windows are timber framed. It is considered that the use of these materials in the construction is sympathetic to the surrounding area.

Feedback from the tree officer states that although the summerhouse has been constructed around the existing oak tree it will not damage or adversely affect the tree. Even though this is an unusual characteristic to the summerhouse, the tree and building can essentially coexist.

## **2) Green Belt/Area of Special Character**

The building has already been constructed. Due to its minimal footprint (which is discussed further in the next paragraph), and overall appearance the building is not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the integrity, character, appearance, amenity and nature conservation of the site or surrounding area. The footprint of the building is 46.6m<sup>2</sup> in addition to the footprint of Madalane House, which is 211m<sup>2</sup>. The overall increase in built area of the plot is 22%. Considering the plot size is 1,900m<sup>2</sup> the total built area of 257.6m<sup>2</sup> is relatively minor in comparison.

Continued/...

### **3) Neighbouring Amenity**

It is not considered that neighbouring amenity is adversely affected from the summerhouse. The summerhouse is 4.1m high, 7.4m wide and 6.3m long and fairly modest in comparison to the large detached 2-storey buildings that characterise the surrounding area. The position of the building is 18m away from the nearest neighbouring building at 125 Potter Street. Being a single storey building with no windows overlooking neighbouring amenity areas there are no concerns with loss of neighbouring light, privacy or outlook.

### **4) Consultation Responses**

The responses from neighbouring occupants are all in support of the summerhouse. They all state that there was a similar building on this property historically and that the new building is not at odds with the historical make up of the property.

There is no planning evidence available to suggest that there has or has not been a summer house or shed in this location. Irrespective of this it is considered that the retention of the summerhouse would not have an undue adverse effect on the surrounding area and would therefore not contravene adopted HUDP 2004 policies.

### **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 grant.

Continued/...

RETENTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR, SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION (REVISED)

D N TALPADE for P A KULKARNI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: KT/AK/04002C, KT/AK/04003F, KT/AK/05/05/1

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - 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.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **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
- 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;

Continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Character of the area (SD1, D4, & D5)
- 2) Amenity of neighbouring occupiers (SD1, D4, & D5)
- 3) Consultation Responses

---

### **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as the applicant is a Councillor.

#### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type: Householder

Council Interest: None

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

- The site is located on the southern side of Wimborne Drive.
- The site contains a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located towards the front of a long rectangular site.
- The dwelling at 31 Wimborne Drive is set away 2m from the side boundary shared with 29 Wimborne Drive.
- The adjoining properties, being 27 and 31 Wimborne Drive, do not have rear/side extensions.
- The surrounding neighbourhood is residential in character, typified by predominantly two-storey semi-detached dwellings.

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

- To retain and complete construction of a two storey side to rear and single storey front and rear extension

Continued/...

**Revisions to Previous Application:**

Following the previous decision (P/66/05/DFU) the following amendments have been made:

- Construction of a flank wall straight down the western boundary with a depth of 12.28m, rather than a staggered flank wall with a depth of 12.08m as previously approved.
- The length of the first floor side to rear extension is to be 10.68m, rather than 10.08m as previously approved.
- Providing a 470mm separation between the eastern boundary for the single storey rear extension rather than 680mm as previously approved.
- The total width of the rear elevation has increased to 7.615m as opposed to 7.40m due to the removal of the flank wall stagger on the western boundary and the single storey rear extension being closer to the eastern boundary.

**d) Relevant History**

- None.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None

**f)**

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	4	1	25-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** The revised application will require work on the boundary; concern regarding the horizontal 45° splay, affect the light and future value of property; would find it difficult to build a side extension should this go ahead.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of the area**

The street is characterised by semi-detached dwellings. In this area the proposal is considered to have a satisfactory relationship with the adjoining dwellings and the streetscene. The extensions have been designed in accordance with Councils supplementary planning guidance for householder extensions, and complement existing building form.

**2) Amenity of neighbouring occupiers**

The two-storey side extension will not appear overbearing or visually obtrusive when viewed in the context of the existing dwelling. The first floor front wall has been set in 1m behind the main front wall and the proposed roofline dropped below the existing main ridge, giving a subordinate appearance to the dwelling. The extension will not overlook or unduly shade adjoining properties nor adversely interfere with neighbour's outlooks. No side windows are proposed. There are no protected windows on the adjacent flank wall of 31 Wimborne Drive that would be adversely affected by the proposal. As No.31 is set off the side boundary by 2m and set slightly rearwards of No.29, the rear two-storey projection of 2.9m will accord with the 45° angle drawn on plan from the first floor rear corner of the next door dwelling.

Continued/...

The two-storey element is setback away from 27 Wimborne Drive by approximately 4.8m, a sufficient distance to ensure no adverse effects are generated on that property, meeting the 45° angle.

The single storey rear extension has a depth of 3.0m from the applicants rear wall, when measured from both neighbouring properties the extension does not exceed 3m and is therefore considered to be acceptable. The roof is to be a 3.15m high flat roof; the extension will not unduly detract from the amenity of the dwelling or site. The extension will not overlook or unduly shade adjoining properties nor adversely interfere with neighbour's outlooks. The 0.47m set in from the boundary with 27 Wimborne Drive provides a level of separation over and above that perceived as generally acceptable in the SPG and enhances a subordinate appearance to the dwelling. The rear garden remains a large open space, ensuring the extension does not appear cramped.

The proposed single storey front extension will not detract from the streetscape of Wimborne Drive, which includes similar front elevation elements (for example 37 and 44 Wimborne Drive). The proposed front elevation is coherent with the existing façade and will tie in with the existing front door. No link is proposed between the porch and front bay window.

### **3) Consultation Responses**

- Any work that is required on the boundary of the property would likely fall under the Party Wall Act 1996, which is outside the remit of Council.
- Issues regarding the 45° splay, and loss of light have been dealt with in the report above.
- The potential loss of value and difficulty with future neighbouring side extensions are not within the powers of the Local Planning Authority to consider.

### **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 grant.

Continued/...



FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS

ALAN COX ASSOCIATES for MR J FEENEY

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 320605 & 320605/3

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match

**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
- SEP5 Structural Features
- SEP6 Areas of special Character, Green Belt & Metropolitan Open Land
- EP25 Noise
- EP32 Acceptable Land Uses
- P33 Development in the Green Belt
- EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

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

Continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

---

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

- 1) Development in the Green Belt (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34)
- 2) Standard of Design and Layout (D4, D5, SD1, EP34)
- 3) Residential Amenity (D4, D5, SD1, EP25)
- 4) Consultation Responses

---

### **INFORMATION**

#### **a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type: Householder

Site Area: 1.1014 ha

Habitable Rooms: 8

Green Belt:

Council Interest: None

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

- Detached, two storey residential dwelling located on the northern side of Spring Lake;
- The original building is largely unaltered apart from a small single storey extension to the rear of the garage.
- Spring Lake is a cul-de-sac characterised by large single and two storey detached houses set within ample sized plots of land.
- The surrounding properties reflect a variety of building designs.
- The subject site is located within the Green Belt.

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

- Demolition of existing single storey rear extension to garage and front porch;
- Erection of single storey extension to rear of kitchen, erection of new front porch and first floor side and rear extensions.
- The first floor side extensions would entail the continuation of the existing roof slope.

#### **d) Relevant History**

HAR/8868/N	Internal alterations and enlargement of garage.	GRANTED 10-MAR-59
------------	-------------------------------------------------	----------------------

Continued/...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None.

**f) Consultations**

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	5	0	23-MAY-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Development in the Green Belt**

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

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing</b>	<b>% Over original</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>% over original</b>
<b>Footprint (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	179	187.36	+4.8%	197.45	+10.3%
<b>Floor Area (m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	263.7	272.06	+3.18%	320.48	+21.5%

It is noted that the dwelling has previously accommodated a small addition. The single storey extension to the rear of the garage (included in the existing footprint and floor area calculations) together with the original porch are to be demolished.

The proposed single storey rear extension and replacement porch would create an additional 20.95 sq. m of floor space at ground floor level. The first floor side and rear extensions would not result in an increase in the property's footprint but would add approximately 38.33 sq. m of floor space to the original property.

The proposed additions to the existing property and the demolition of the single storey rear extension to the garage and original porch would result in an increase of 18.4 sq. m in the footprint and 56.78 sq m in the floor area of the original building. The proposed additions are considered to be acceptable both in terms of floor area and volume and the siting of the development would not detract from the existing openness of the site and would therefore comply with green belt policy.

**2) Standard of Design and Layout**

The main issues are the appearance of the resulting development (design considerations) and the effects that it has on the character and appearance of the area.

The surrounding area is not typical of Green Belt land. The subject site and the properties in the immediate vicinity are characterised by large detached dwelling houses set on large plots with ample vegetation. The surrounding properties reflect a variety of designs. It is considered that the proposed additions to the property are both sympathetic and complimentary to the existing building. The single storey rear extension is modest in scale and is considered to be an appropriate addition to the property in terms of design and

Continued/...

appearance. Whilst the proposed first floor extension and replacement porch would be clearly visible from the street, it has been designed so as to match and compliment the existing building. Both the side extensions to the front and rear of the property would entail the continuation of the existing roof slope and would compliment the general style of the existing building to ensure the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be preserved.

### **3) Residential Amenity**

It is not considered that the proposed additions to the property would cause any detrimental impacts to any of the adjoining properties. The proposed side extension to the front of the property would be located at a distance of approximately 5.0 metres away from the flank wall of No 1 Spring Lake. The proposed side extension and single storey extension to the rear of the property would be sited a distance of approximately 6.0 metre away from the front and side elevation of No 3 Spring Lake. As such the siting, size and overall scale of the proposed development do not raise any issue of overshadowing, loss of light or overlooking to adjoining properties.

### **4) Consultation Responses**

- None

### **CONCLUSION**

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

Continued/...

INSTALLATION OF WINDOW AT FIRST FLOOR SIDE ELEVATION

TRUSHAR DATTANI

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site plan; 2129-TC-04C

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match
- 3 The window(s) in the east 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.

## 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:  
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.

Continued/...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Standard of Design and Layout (D4)
  - 2) New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy (D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Householder  
Green Belt:  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- Detached two-storey house situated in Fauna Close.
- The spacing between properties on Fauna Close measures approximately 1.5m where the houses sit parallel, as is the situation at the application site.
- Fauna Close is a recent Green Belt development in the former government offices on Brockley Way.
- The development is characterised by detached houses built in similar styles, some with windows on their flank walls where the houses sit parallel.
- Application property has no windows on its east flank wall.
- Adjacent property No.34 Fauna Close has no windows on its west flank wall.

### c) Proposal Details

- Installation of window at first floor on the properties east elevation.
- The window will be double paned, measuring 1300mm in width and 1050mm in height, and be 1.5m from the front wall of the house.
- Planning permission is required as the property has no permitted development rights by virtue of a condition restricting such rights on the original planning permission for the housing estate

### d) Relevant History

EAST/1060/99/OUT Outline: Redevelopment – 4.86HA for 96 GRANTED detached houses: 2.34HA for public open space: 29-JUN-00 access from Brockley Hill

### e) Applicant's Statement

None.

### f)

#### Notifications

Sent  
2

Replies  
0

Expiry  
22-FEB-05

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Amenity Considerations**

The installation of a window at first floor level on the east flank is not considered to harm the residential amenities of the adjacent property No.34 Fauna Close, bearing in mind that the property has no flank windows that could be overlooked. However, should a window be installed in the west flank wall of No.34 in the future, issues of overlooking between these two properties could arise. Therefore a condition is recommended requiring the window to be of an obscurely glazed high opening type should this event ever happen.

The proposed window has been designed in a similar style to those on the existing house and would use matching materials. With this in mind the proposed window would blend in well, and not have a negative impact on the appearance of the existing dwelling.

As the proposed window is located on a side flank wall it will be largely obscured from view and therefore this application will have a minimal impact upon the streetscene and character of the area. Indeed, various properties in similar situations to the applicants have flank windows at first end second floor level.

### **2) Conclusion**

To conclude, the extension will cause no detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring residents. It is not out of character with the pattern of development in the locality and will have minimal impact upon the streetscene, complies with the relevant UDP policies and is recommended for grant.

### **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 comments received in response to notification and consultation as set out above:

This application is recommended for grant.

Continued/...

SINGLE/TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO PROVIDE NEW DWELLINGHOUSE  
(RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

N M ARCHITECTS for MR & MRS P HATHALIA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: AR-01 Rev A, AR-02 Rev A, AR-03 Rev A & Site Plan

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

- 1 FULL\_TIME3 - Time Limit on Full Permission - Three Years
- 2 MAT\_MATCH - Materials to Match
- 3 PD\_A-E - PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 4 LAND\_APPR - Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 LAND\_IMPL - 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  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- 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:**  
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.
- 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:

Continued/...



Item 2/21 : P/387/06/DFU continued/...

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](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

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

5 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) Amenity and Character of Extensions (SD1, D4 & D5)
- 2) Impact of proposed dwelling on character of area (SD1, D4, D5)
- 3) Residential amenity
- 4) Parking Standards (T13)
- 5) Consultation Responses

**INFORMATION**

Referred to DCC by Nominated Member.

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type:	Minor - Other	
Car Parking:	Standard:	1.4 (maximum)
	Justified:	00
	Provided:	00
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- Side section of garden to No.1 Glebe Road
- No.1 located at northern end of Glebe Road, on its eastern side
- Glebe Road consists of semi-detached residential dwellings
- Restricted hours parking on applicant's side of Glebe Road; limited permit bays on other side

Continued/...

**c) Proposal Details**

- Single / two storey side extension to comprise new dwelling with rear garden

**Revisions to Previous Application:**

Following the previous decision (P/1104/05/DOU) the following amendments have been made:

- Reduction from 2 self-contained flats to 1 dwelling
- Reduction of proposal from detached two-storey building to two-storey side extension

**d) Relevant History**

P/1104/05/DOU	Outline: 2 storey detached building to provide 2 flats with external staircase	REFUSED 23-AUG-05
---------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------

The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate setting space about the building and inadequate private amenity space, which would detract from the established pattern and character of development in the locality and the amenity of future occupiers.

P/1104/05/DOU	Single/two storey side extension to provide new dwelling house	WITHDRAWN 21-DEC-05
---------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

Withdrawn due to a legal issue. Issue has now been resolved.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- None

**f) Consultations**

- **Highways & Transportation:** No Objection. Recommend resident permit restriction.

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	13	0	14-MAR-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Amenity and Character of Extensions**

The proposed side extension would attach to the dwellings northerly flank and would span to a width of 4.9m. The extension would be to the depth of the main house and would be set back 1m to the front at first floor level with a subordinate hipped roof over.

It is considered that the provision of a 1m set back at first floor and a subordinate roof over would provide an appropriate relationship between the side extension and the original dwelling. The side extension would be over 1m shorter in width than the original dwelling and appear sufficiently subordinate to it.

The extension would be spaced 1m from the flank boundary, which is considered to sufficiently preserve the quality of spatial setting around the property at the top of Glebe Road.

Continued/...

## **2) Impact of proposed dwelling on character of area**

The proposed dwelling would be contained entirely within the proposed side extension. The dwelling would have a side entrance accessed via the side access. This would help to retain the appearance of no.1 Glebe Road, which would effectively become a middle terrace, as a single dwelling with side extensions, which is considered to be favourable as viewed from the street scene.

It is not considered that the new dwelling would have a detrimental impact on the street scene or the character of the area. Due to it being situated at the end of the dwelling row at the top of Glebe Road it is not considered to unreasonably disrupt the established pattern of development being semi-detached dwellings.

Being situated at the junction with Claire Gardens the new dwelling would be a corner-house. Being spaced a minimum of 1m from the site's flank boundary it is considered that there would be sufficient space around the building and the development would not appear unreasonably cramped.

## **3) Residential Amenity**

At ground floor the dwelling would comprise an open plan kitchen/dining & living space across the entire floor. Two bedrooms and a bathroom would be located on the first-floor. The accommodation is considered to comprise adequate room sizes, be of an appropriate layout providing a satisfactory level of living amenity for the future occupiers.

The allotted section of rear garden would have an area of approximately 45m<sup>2</sup>, which is considered to be satisfactory for a dwelling of this smaller size. The rear garden of no.1 Glebe Road would be reduced to an area of approximately 48m<sup>2</sup>, which is considered to be satisfactory.

## **4) Parking Standards**

Due to its insufficient depth, car parking cannot be provided in the new dwellings front garden. No objections were raised by Highways & Transportation regarding parking provision and it was recommended that new dwelling have parking permit restriction. The new dwelling's close proximity to Stanmore Underground Station and local bus services and the availability of shops/services within the local centre make the dwelling ideal for non-car owning occupiers. Accordingly no objection to the scheme on grounds of insufficient parking provided the development is specifically defined as "Resident Permit Restricted".

## **5) Consultation Responses**

- N/A

## **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 grant.

Continued/...

## SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

---

**464 - 472 ALEXANDRA AVE, SOUTH HARROW**

**3/01**

**P/752/06/CFU/OH**

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

SIX POLE-MOUNTED ANTENNA, HANDRAILS AND CABLE TRAYS ON ROOF

STAPPARD & HOWES for T-MOBILE UK LTD

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1168/564/001, supporting statement by Stappard & Howes, 2 G coverage plots x 4 unnumbered sheets

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

- 1 The proposal by reason of its prominent siting and unsatisfactory appearance, would lead to a proliferation of telecommunications equipment on the roof of this building, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the appearance and character of the neighbouring statutorily listed buildings, the locally listed buildings and this part of Rayners Lane conservation area.

### 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
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
- D12 Locally Listed Buildings
- D14 Conservation Areas
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- D24 Telecommunications Development

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Compliance with ICNIRP (D24)
- 2) Need for Installation (D24)
- 3) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Visual Amenity (SD1, SD2, D4, D14, D15, D24)
- 4) Impact on Locally Listed and Statutorily Listed Buildings (D11, D12, D24)
- 5) Consultation Responses

Continued/...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Other  
Conservation Area: Rayners Lane  
Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- Flat roof three storey building (10m high) fronting Alexandra Avenue and backing onto Rayners Lane comprising shops, commercial uses with residential uses above
- Nos. 464 to 468 (even) together with 470 to 472 (The Turret) locally listed for their group value
- In close proximity of this site there are two Grade II statutorily listed buildings: The (former) Ace Cinema to the south and Rayners Lane Underground Station across the road to the north
- Site lies within Rayners Lane District Centre
- Existing antennae equipment located on the south-eastern and south-western corners of the roof and there is further equipment sited on The Turret.

### c) Proposal Details

- Installation of six antennae located on three separate poles at various locations on the roof
- Installation of associated handrails and cable trays

### d) Relevant History

LBH/11494	Erection of two way radio mast on flat roof	GRANTED 19-NOV-75
LBH/11494/1	Retention and continued use of two way radio mast on flat roof	GRANTED 21-NOV-78
LBH/20059/W	Two way radio mast	GRANTED 21-AUG-81
WEST/419/98/DTD	Determination: Provision of 5m slimline mast with 3 antenna and 2 microwave dishes and equipment cabin	PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED 3-JUL-98
WEST/992/99/DTD	Determination: Provision of 3 cross polar antennae, 4 dish antennae and radio equipment housing and ancillary development	REFUSED 18-JAN-00

#### Reason for Refusal:

- 1) The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the locally listed building and the character of the area.

Continued/...

WEST/80/01/FUL            8m tower with 6 antennae, 4 dishes and REFUSED  
equipment cabin on roof (replacement 06-APR-01  
installation)

**Reason for Refusal:**

1) The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

WEST/550/01/FUL            6m tower with 6 antennas and 4 microwave REFUSED  
dishes, equipment cabin, 2 antennas on pole 18-SEP-01  
mast and ancillary equipment (replacement  
installation on roof)

**Reason for Refusal:**

1) The proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- There is an operational need for the development
- Alternative sites have been looked at but the applicant site represents the most suitable option
- The proposal complies with ICNIRP guidelines

**f) Consultations**

- **CAAC:** The development ruins the concept of the 1930s design of the building. There are already too many telecom masts on the building. These ruin the view of the building as you walk from Rayners Lane station. We do not want these added too.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area Setting of a Listed Building	Expiry 04-MAY-06
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 90	Replies 0	Expiry 25-APR-06
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** None

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Compliance with ICNIRP**

The proposal includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming compliance with the public exposure guidelines.

**2) Need for Installation**

The applicant provides technical information with regards to the current capacity and coverage. They state that the site is required to provide 3G-network coverage within the South Harrow area where none currently exists and to improve their service of the existing 2G network in this area. As such, the applicant shows both technical justification and an operational need for the works proposed.

Continued/...

### **3) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Visual Amenity**

The Rayners Lane Conservation Area appraisal recognises nos. 468-472 Alexandra Avenue as “some of the most striking buildings in the conservation area representing “fine examples of the ‘International’ and ‘Art Deco’ strands of inter-war modernist architecture”. The addition of the six pole mounted antenna, handrails and cable trays on the roof of these buildings would be out of character with this style and design. It does not use bold modernist shapes typical of this modernist design. The proposed appearance of the development therefore does not respect the character of the area and is contrary to policy 1 of the Rayners Lane management study.

It is considered that the prominence of this location, facing two thoroughfares (Rayners Lane and Alexandra Avenue) exacerbates the harm. It is considered that the proposed masts would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area as a result of the prominent location.

It may be argued that the existing antennae have set a precedent and the character of the area is already affected. However, the existing masts were erected before the conservation area was designated and therefore before the relevant policies of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and the Rayners Lane Conservation Area management strategy came into force, which protect buildings and the surrounding locality from the clutter and visual harm caused by such developments.

### **4) Impact on Locally Listed and Statutorily Listed Buildings**

464-472 Alexandra Avenue are locally listed buildings. As outlined above, the proposed development would disrupt the architectural interest and visual unity, which provides group value. The proposal would therefore be a negative alteration and contrary policy D12 of the HUDP.

As well as the impact on the locally listed buildings, it is considered that due to the proximity of the site in relation to two statutorily listed buildings, for the same reasons as above (in section 3) this proposal would have detrimental impact on their settings and contrary to policy D11 of the HUDP.

### **5) Consultation Responses**

- None

### **CONCLUSION**

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

Continued/...

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PAVILION

DENNIS GRANSTON for PINNER BOWLING CLUB

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: PB/01/1-3 and Site Plan

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

- 1 R\_DIS\_ACC1 - Disabled Access - Inadequate Provision

## **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
- SEP5 Structural Features
- R3 Public Open Space
- R4 Outdoor Sports Facilities
- EP28 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
- EP47 Open Space
- C17 Access to Leisure, Community and Retail Facilities
- T13 Parking Standards

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant is reminded of the duties set out in the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 with regard to employment and service provision. An employer's duty to make reasonable adjustment is owed to an individual employee or job applicant. However, the responsibility of service providers is to disabled people at large, and the duty is anticipatory. Failure to take reasonable steps at this stage to facilitate access will therefore count against the service provider if or when challenged by a disabled person from October 2004. The applicant is therefore advised to take full advantage of the opportunity that this application offers to improve the accessibility of the premises to people with mobility and sensory impairments.

- 3 **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.

Continued/...



### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Standard of Design and Layout (SD1 & D4)
  - 2) Structural Features, Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity, Open Space (SEP5, EP28 & EP47)
  - 3) Outdoor Sports Facilities (R4)
  - 4) Access to Leisure, Community and Retail Facilities (C17)
  - 5) Parking Standards (T13)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

Referred to DCC as application is within a Site of Nature Conservation Importance.

#### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type:	Minor Other	
Car Parking:	Standard:	See report
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	See report
Council Interest:	None	

#### b) Site Description

- Single storey pavilion set within the enclosed grounds of the Pinner Bowling Club, next to the club's bowling green
- The club grounds are set within Pinner Memorial Park which is designated as 'Open Space' and a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance' in the UDP
- The existing pavilion has pebble dashed rendering
- There is an existing detached wooden shed housing toilets for the use of club members and guests
- To the south and west of the club pavilion and shed is a row of mature trees and behind them are dwelling houses.

#### c) Proposal Details

- Demolition of the existing wooden shed
- Extension of the club pavilion to provide extended changing and toilet facilities and storage for club equipment

#### d) Relevant History

WEST/733/93/FUL	Single Storey Replacement Club House	GRANTED 15-MAR-94
-----------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------

#### e) Applicant's Statement

- None

f) Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 17-NOV-05
------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

Continued/...

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	7	0	10-APR-06

**Summary of Responses:** none

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Standard of Design and Layout

The design of the proposed extension would be in keeping with the existing pavilion. The existing roofline would be continued and the proposed windows would match. It is considered that there would not be any unacceptable impact on the character of the existing pavilion.

The proposed extension would encroach closer to the neighbouring houses. The existing pavilion is set approx 17m from the rear of the neighbouring houses. With the extension the pavilion would be 12m from the rear wall of the houses. The existing detached shed, although smaller than the proposed extension is closer to the houses. There are mature trees on the boundary between the club pavilion and the rear of the houses.

The extension would have windows facing the neighbouring houses. However the houses are set below the level of the pavilion and the vegetation and fence on the boundary, the pavilion is single storey and the distance between the houses would mitigate any perceived or actual overlooking.

It is considered that the distance between the houses and the proposed extension is sufficient to mitigate any unacceptable impact on the occupiers of those properties.

### 2) Structural Features, Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity, Open Space

Pinner Memorial Park is designated as 'Open Space' and a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance' in the UDP. This designation acknowledges the local and regional importance of the Park.

#### 2.1 Site of Nature Conservation Importance

As Site of Nature Conservation Importance, the development proposed is to be assessed to ensure that the proposal has taken account of Nature Conservation where relevant with regard to any potential impact on wildlife and ecology of the site.

The proposed extension would be on a piece of grassed lawn that already has a small shed. It is therefore considered that in this particular case that there would not be a significant impact on wildlife as a result of this development.

#### 2.2 Open Space

The Council is under obligation to protect and where appropriate enhance any space benefiting from a designation in the UDP as Open Space. Policy EP47 states that: "development, apart from small scale ancillary facilities needed to support or enhance the proper functioning of the open space will not be permitted on open spaces identified..."

Continued/...

This proposal is to provide the Bowling Club with improved facilities for their members. It is considered that the extension would be small in scale and support the use of the surrounding land as a Bowling Green.

### **3) Public Open Space, Outdoor Sports Facilities**

Policy R3 encourages the full use of public open spaces by all sections of the community through supporting and encouraging proposals to improve the quality, accessibility and variety of such spaces.

The reasoned justification to Policy R4 states that the Council will consider providing additional outdoor facilities in parks... where there is no detrimental effect on the environment or amenity of local residents. Any built development should be ancillary to outdoor recreational uses.”

As noted above it is considered that there would not be any unacceptable impact on the environment or on the amenity of neighbours.

The use of the extension to the existing pavilion would be to enhance the changing facilities for the club members and provide a disabled toilet for members and their guests accessible from outside the club. There are also storage facilities shown. This would be ancillary to the existing outdoor recreational use of the site. It is considered that the access of the disabled toilet from outside the club is unacceptable as it would create undue difficulty for any disabled users of the clubhouse. Therefore it is considered that the development would not improve the existing quality of the current use and not provide accessibility by providing a range of facilities to meet the needs of existing and potential users as required in the policy.

### **4) Access to Leisure, Community and Retail Facilities**

Policy C17 seeks to address the needs of disabled people, parents with children, the elderly and people with special needs. The reasoned justification to Policy C17 states that the “need to improve accessibility for all has been reinforced by the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the the Council acknowledges that improved access benefits a wide range of people, including those temporarily disabled or those accompanied by children or carrying heavy loads. The Council attaches great importance to the need for easy access to public facilities such as... recreation facilities, and other community facilities and regards these as integral components of a more accessible environment.”

The proposal shows a ramp to assist access to the main pavilion of the club as well as a disabled toilet accessible from outside the property. Subject to agreement of details such as handrails and surface materials, this is considered not acceptable.

It is considered that there should also be provision for a disabled toilet that can be accessed from the internal space within the pavilion. This is so as to comply with the requirements of the above policy in providing for a wide range of people, including those temporarily disabled or those accompanied by children. As there is no internal access shown to a toilet suitable for disabled people it is considered that this application is unacceptable and therefore should be refused.

Continued/...

**5) Parking Standards**

The extension is in response to a need to upgrade internal changing and bathroom facilities for the members of the club. There are no parking spaces within the red outline existing or as part of this proposal. It is considered however that the close proximity to the Underground Station and bus routes at Pinner, as well as existing car parking facilities in the Memorial Park provide adequate parking for the bowling club.

**6) Consultation Responses**

None

**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.

Continued/...

**THE BLACK PEPPER RESTAURANT, 461 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH END**

Ward: HATCH END

REMOVAL OF CONDITION 11 ON PLANNING PERMISSION WEST/122/96/FUL RESTRICTING HOURS OF USE (10.30 - 23.00 HRS MON-SAT AND 10.30 - 22.30 HOURS ON SUNDAYS)

DAVID WINEMAN for IVERIA LIMITED

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site plan

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

- 1 The proposed removal of condition to allow extended opening hours would give rise to additional noise, activity and disturbance at unsocial hours detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
T13 Parking Standards  
EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Licensing Act 2003
  - 2) Residential amenity (EM25)
  - 3) Parking and highway safety (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type:	Other	
Car Parking:	Standard:	2 (maximum)
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	0
Council Interest:	None	

Continued/...

**b) Site Description**

- 3-storey mid-terraced building on south on south side of Uxbridge Road within Hatch End district centre
- ground floor in A3 (restaurant) use with residential above
- neighbouring properties fronting Uxbridge Road have similar arrangement of commercial ground floors with residential above

**c) Proposal Details**

- Remove condition 11 of planning permission WEST/122/96/FUL to permit unlimited opening hours
- Opening hours would be controlled solely through premises license which allows: 10:00-00:30 Sunday-Thursday and 07:00-01:30 Friday-Saturday

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/122/96/FUL Change of use: Class A2 (betting shop) to class GRANTED  
A3 (restaurant) on ground floor with link 08-JUL-1996  
enclosure and parking at rear

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- none

**f) Consultations**

**Community Safety:**

no response

**Hatch End Association:**

Oppose removal of condition due to proximity of residential flats. Concerned that removal would result in use becoming like a wine bar/pub.

**Notifications**

Sent  
14

Replies  
0

Expiry  
17-MAR-06

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Licensing Act 2003**

The proposal if granted would remove the existing condition controlling opening hours, thereby removing any planning control over the hours of use. This would enable the premises to operate from 10:00-00:30 Sunday-Thursday and 10:00-01:30 Friday-Saturday as allowed by the premises license granted under the Licensing Act 2003.

Notwithstanding the above, the remit of the licensing panel is restricted to the 4 licensing objectives defined by the Licensing Act, namely preventing crime and disorder, public safety, preventing public nuisance, and protecting children. Significantly, they do not include the affect of increased noise and disturbance on private amenity, for example of neighbouring residents.

Had the applicant applied to vary the condition in line with the licensing hours, then due consideration could have been given to that proposal.

Continued/...

## **2) Residential Amenity**

Policy EM25 of the adopted Harrow Unitary Development Plan requires that the Council seeks to ensure that proposals for food, drink and any late night uses do not have a harmful affect on residential amenity. The policy requires, inter-alia, that the location of the premises, the proximity of residential properties, and hours of operation be taken into account when assessing applications for such uses.

In this case, the site is situated on a street corner within a designated district centre. Although the club occupies the ground floor, it has residential premises on its upper floors as do neighbouring commercial premises on both sides of Uxbridge Road. It is therefore considered that whilst operating the premises until 11:30pm may be acceptable, an extension beyond this time would be likely to give rise to additional noise, activity and disturbance at unsocial hours and would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties. In respect of this resulting in differing hours being permitted under planning and licensing controls, this situation was anticipated by the Inspector at the time of the against the refusal of planning permission for a late night use in Northolt Road (Ref. WEST/617/95/FUL) who reasoned that although opening hours were also subject to licensing controls, these controls could be relaxed in future and that a planning condition restricting hours of operation was necessary in view of the residential accommodation on upper floors in the vicinity. The maintenance of the current restrictions on hours in regard to late night opening would also be consistent with other late night operations in the vicinity, at nos. 250-252, 282, 302, 310, 348-350, 353, 371, and 423, all of which have conditions requiring closure by, at the latest, 11:30pm. Indeed, it is considered that were the late night restrictions on the application property to be relaxed, it might be difficult for the Council to resist applications for similar relaxations of the restrictions on these other late night uses in the vicinity.

## **3) Parking and highway safety**

The application property has 2 off-street parking spaces at the rear, which are accessed via the service road. There are no proposals to increase the level of off-street parking and on-street parking in the vicinity is subject to daytime restrictions. It is not considered that permitting an extension of opening hours beyond the current 11pm closing time would result in significant problems in terms of highway safety as traffic levels are likely to be substantially lighter in the late evening than during daytime hours, and the site is well served by public transport, being within walking distance of several bus routes and Hatch End station.

## **4) Consultation Responses**

- none

## **CONCLUSION**

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

Continued/...

## SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

None

Continued/...



## SECTION 5 - PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS

---

5/01

**LAND AT JUNC. ROXBOROUGH PARK & LOWLANDS RD, HARROW** P/1118/06/CDT/KMS

Ward: GREENHILL

PRIOR APPROVAL DETERMINATION: 12.5M COLUMN WITH 3 ANTENNAS & GROUND BASED EQUIPMENT CABINET

WALDON TELECOM LTD for O2

---

### RECOMMENDATION 1:

**PRIOR APPROVAL of details of siting and appearance IS required**

### RECOMMENDATION 2:

Plan Nos: P/16503E/GEN/050, P/16503/GEN/051, supplementary supporting information dated April 24, 2006

**GRANT** prior approval of details of siting/appearance for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the following conditions:  
reason(s):

- 1 The ground level equipment cabinet shall be painted green to match the existing equipment cabinet  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality

### INFORMATIVES

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Compliance with ICNIRP
  - 2) Need for Installation
  - 3) Character of Area and Visual / Residential Amenity (S1, D4, D26)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Statutory Return Type: Not categorised  
Council Interest: None

Continued/...

**b) Site Description**

- Land opposite junction of Lowlands Road and Roxborough Park
- Site forms part of footway along north side of Lowlands Road and is currently occupied by a 12.5m high mast and associated ground level equipment cabinet
- Existing mast is grey in colour. Existing cabinet is dark green colour
- Site is bounded by railway tracks to north which are screened by c.2m high timber panel fences
- Development on opposite side of street comprises residential dwellings fronting Roxborough Park

**c) Proposal Details**

- Remove existing 2G 12.5m 2G high mast
- Installation of 12.5m high 3G mast with 3 antennas
- Provide additional ground level equipment cabinet measuring 1.402 x 0.79 x 1.3m sited midway between mast and existing equipment cabinet, at back of footway
- Mast and additional cabinet to be grey in colour

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/8/02/DTD	Determination: 12.5m monopole mast	REFUSED 13-FEB-2002	but decision issued out of time and the mast was therefore installed by default
---------------	------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1) The proposed development, by reason of scale, siting and appearance, would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the locality

New members may not be aware that the above decision overturned the officer's recommendation, which was that prior approval was not required

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- There is an operational need for the development in relation to the provision of 3G services
- Alternative sites have been examined. Application site considered most suitable as already in use as mast/base station
- Policy analysis shows compliance with ICNIRP

**f) Consultations**

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 29	Replies awaited	Expiry 25-MAY-2006
----------------------	------------	--------------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Responses:** awaited

Continued/...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Compliance with ICNIRP**

The proposal includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming compliance with the public exposure guidelines

### **2) Need for Installation**

The applicant provides technical information with regards to the current capacity and coverage. They state that the replacement mast and antennas are necessary in order to provide 3G as well as 2G services, and that the alternative option of adding additional antennas to the existing mast would result in significant extra bulk being added to its head frame. As such, the applicant shows both technical justification and an operational need for the works proposed.

### **3) Character of Area and Visual / Residential Amenity**

Given the scale and nature of the proposal, it is not considered that the works would have a negative visual impact on the character of the area or the visual amenity of nearby residents.

The proposed replacement mast would be to the same height and colour as the existing structure and would therefore have no greater visual impact. As with the existing installation, both the mast and equipment cabinet would be located at the back of the footway running along the north side of Lowlands Road. As such, the installation would minimize the degree of obstruction of the footway to pedestrians. Furthermore, it is considered that the siting of the proposed equipment cabinet midway between the mast and the existing equipment cabinet, would not result in it appearing unduly obtrusive in terms of clutter. Although the plans show both the mast and equipment cabinet as being grey in colour, the applicant has stated the cabinet could be painted in any colour agreeable to the Council. A condition is therefore attached requiring the proposed cabinet to be painted green to match the existing cabinet.

### **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 comments received in response to notification and consultation as set out above prior approval of details of siting and appearance is required and this application is recommended for grant.

Continued/...

---

**OUTSIDE 539 PINNER RD, HARROW, 539-545**

**5/02**

**P/1168/06/CDT/KMS**

Ward: HEADSTONE  
NORTH

PRIOR APPROVAL DETERMINATION: 10M COLUMN WITH 3 ANTENNAS AND  
GROUND BASED EQUIPMENT CABINET

MASON D TELECOMS for ORANGE COMMUNICATIONS LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION 1:**

**PRIOR APPROVAL of details of siting and appearance IS required**

**RECOMMENDATION 2:**

Plan Nos: 01(B), 02(B), supplementary supporting information received April 3, 2006

**REFUSE** approval of details of siting/appearance for the following  
reason(s):

- 1 The proposed column by reason of inappropriate siting would result in the obstruction of a traffic regulatory sign to the detriment of highway safety
- 2 The proposed column and equipment cabin by reason of inappropriate siting would reduce the visibility of traffic emerging from the access road immediately north west of the site and would therefore be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety
- 3 The proposed column and equipment cabinet by reason of their close proximity to an existing bus stop shelter, bus stop sign and traffic sign, would create an undue proliferation and clutter of street furniture to the detriment of the visual appearance of the locality

**INFORMATIVES**

---

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

- 1) Compliance with ICNIRP
  - 2) Need for Installation
  - 3) Character of Area and Visual / Residential Amenity (S1, D4, D26)
  - 4) Highway safety considerations
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Statutory Return Type: Not categorised

Council Interest: None

Continued/...

**b) Site Description**

- Land outside 539 Pinner Road (Allied Carpets) at junction with access road to rear of 539 Pinner Road
- Site located within North Harrow district centre
- Site currently forms part of pedestrian footway. There is a 2-sided traffic regulatory sign c.0.6m to the south east and a bus stop (and shelter) c.2m to the south east of the site
- Site located c.12m from residential properties occupying upper floors of 547-557 Pinner Road
- Development on opposite side of Pinner Road is predominantly residential

**c) Proposal Details**

- Installation of new 10m high mast with 3 antennas and 1 associated cabinet at ground level
- Cabinet would be sited 1m north west of the mast. It would measure 1.45 x 0.65 x 1.25m high and would be sited 0.575m from the edge of the kerb
- Mast would be painted black. Equipment cabinet would be painted dark green

**d) Relevant History**

- None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- There is an operational need for the development due to deficiencies in local network coverage
- Alternative sites have been examined but landlords consent could not be obtained
- Appeal inspector commented that Pinner Road would be the most likely location for a suitable site
- The proposal complies with ICNIRP guidelines

**f) Consultations**

- **Highways:** unacceptable due to masking of traffic regulatory sign and reduced visibility from access road to north west of site

**Notifications**

Sent  
47

Replies  
AWAITED

Expiry  
25-MAY-2006

**Summary of Responses:** awaited

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Compliance with ICNIRP**

The proposal includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming compliance with the public exposure guidelines

Continued/...

## **2) Need for Installation**

The applicant provides technical information with regard to the current network capacity and coverage. They state that there is limited coverage along the A404 and within the surrounding commercial and residential areas, and that as a consequence, there is a requirement to improve their service coverage. As such, the applicant shows technical justification and an operational need for the works proposed.

## **3) Character of Area and Visual / Residential Amenity**

Whilst the appearance of the proposed mast and equipment cabinets would be typical of street furniture found in the locality, it is considered that the cumulative impact of the proposal and the existing street furniture in the immediate vicinity of the site, would amount to excess clutter and be harmful to the areas visual appearance.

## **4) Highway safety considerations**

However, the siting of the proposed mast is such that it would obscure views of a traffic regulatory sign to drivers approaching from the north. Furthermore, the proximity of both the mast and the equipment cabinet to the corner of the access road serving the rear parking lot to 539, would result in visibility of and from vehicles waiting to emerge onto Pinner Road being severely limited. It is considered that both the obstruction of the traffic regulatory sign and the reduction in visibility at the street corner would be unacceptable in terms of giving rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

## **5) Consultation Responses**

Awaited

## **CONCLUSION**

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

Continued/...