

SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

10-12 FORD CLOSE, SOUTH HARROW

1/01

P/2190/03/CFU/GM

Ward: WEST HARROW

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED THREE STOREY BUILDING WITH ROOMS IN ROOF TO PROVIDE 12 FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING.

ELEY & ASSOCIATES for S SOLANSKI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1162-10A; 11A; 12A; 15A and site plan.

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of excessive density, size of building and hard-surfaced parking areas, with the associated disturbance and general activity, would result in an over-intensive use and amount to overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 Refusal - Residential - Scale
- 3 Refusal - Residential - Inadequate Rear Garden Depth
- 4 Refusal - Parking and Amenity Impact
- 5 The proposed front parking would result in the loss of grass verge and require an excessive width crossover to the detriment of the visual amenity of the streetscene and highway safety.
- 6 The proposal would have unsatisfactory access arrangements with a steep ramp and steps at the front contrary to the Council's access policies.
- 7 The proposed development would give rise to overlooking of adjoining gardens and properties due to the height and position of windows, to the detriment of the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E30, E45, E47, H1, H8, T13, A4, A5); (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, D9, T13, H4, H5, C20)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Visual and Residential Amenity
- 2) Density
- 3) Parking and Highway Safety
- 4) Accessibility
- 5) Consultation Responses

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E30, E45, E47, H1, H8, T13, A4, A5
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SH1, D4, D5, D9, T13, H4, H5, C20
Car Parking	Standard: 16 (16)
	Justified: 16 (16)
	Provided: 11 (See Report)
Site Area:	0.045 ha
Habitable Rooms:	28
No. of Residential Units:	12
Density:	267 dph 622 hrph
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- Pair of semi-detached houses on south-western side of cul-de-sac
- Access to communal parking area adjacent to south-eastern boundary
- Ford Close comprises 2 storey houses with 3 storey flats at the far northern end
- Road rises to south-east
- On-street parking with no restrictions

c) Proposal Details

- Redevelopment to provide 'T'-shaped block of 12 flats comprising three storey development with mansard roof
- Steps up to front entrance and steep ramp
- 7 parking spaces at front, 4 at rear accessed off service road
- no usable amenity space at rear (SPG standards would be 480m²)

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Consultations

Thames Water Utilities Ltd:	Awaited
Environment Agency:	Awaited

Advertisement

Major Development

Expiry
06-NOV-03

Continued/.....

Notifications	Sent 29	Replies 10 plus petition of 44 signatures	Expiry 27-OCT-03
----------------------	------------	---	---------------------

Response: Out of character; insufficient parking; scale inappropriate- will dominate area; excessive height; overlooking/loss of privacy; loss of light; road often blocked for service access by cars; increased noise and disturbance; loss of grass verge, would add to traffic flow posing safety risk for children.

APPRAISAL

1) Visual and Residential Amenity

Whilst there are 3 storey flats at the far end of Ford Close, and 3 storey town houses on Springway to the rear, the immediate environs of the application site are comprised of 2 storey developments. The proposed block, with a large mansard style roof, including 5 dormer windows at the front, would appear unduly obtrusive on this prominent corner site and out of character with its surroundings. The scale and massing of the adjoining properties would not be respected. With the complete lack of usable amenity space it would appear a cramped overdevelopment of the site and constitutes an over-intensive use. This would be to the detriment of the visual amenities of neighbouring residents, the streetscene and the character of the area.

With regard to future occupiers of the site, they would have no usable amenity space with the 'garden' areas being given over to parking. The height of the building and short depth to the rear boundary would enable overlooking of adjoining rear gardens and give rise to an unsatisfactory relationship with neighbouring properties. There would also be overlooking of the rear gardens of nos. 14 and 16 Ford Close due to flank windows to living rooms.

2) Density

The density proposed would far exceed the guidance of PPG3 and the revised deposit draft UDP. It would bear no resemblance to the adjoining 2 storey housing and be detrimental to the character of the area. Such high densities are more appropriate in town centres and on secondary roads rather than in the centre of small cul-de-sacs.

3) Parking and Highway Safety

The proposal would give rise to a shortfall in parking with not even one space per unit provided and no visitor parking. In addition, the parking bays indicated on the submitted plan are deficient in size and manoeuvring space. The front bays are only 4m deep and would inevitably lead to vehicles overhanging the footpath. The rear bays vary in depth with one being only 3.5m deep in part. It would not be possible to

Continued/.....

access all the rear spaces as illustrated on the submitted plans. This would give rise to additional on-street parking requirements. Ford Close is already heavily parked and has no parking restrictions. Any additional demand for on-street spaces would add to the parking stress of existing residents.

The front parking bays would require two large crossovers either side of a street tree, with the loss of grass verge. It is considered that this would detract from the streetscene and be detrimental to pedestrian and vehicle safety, vehicles needing to enter or exit in reverse gear.

4) Accessibility

The proposed block of flats would not be sufficiently accessible, there being steps and a steep ramp at the front. It is not considered that this would be acceptable for a new residential development of the scale proposed.

5) Consultation Responses

These are all dealt with in the report.

OUTLINE: DEMOLITION OF GARAGES AND CONSTRUCTION OF 3 STOREY BLOCK OF 18 KEY WORKER UNITS

RANDHAWA for PARAGON HOMES

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1:1250 plan, 2002.08/001, 002, 003, 004A, 004B.

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 size, design and siting, would be an overintensive, inappropriate, obtrusive, and overbearing form of development, provide a poor level of amenities for the intended occupiers, give rise to a loss of light, outlook and privacy in relation to surrounding dwellings, and threaten the survival of an adjacent tree, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and residential amenity.
- 2 Refusal - Parking Insufficient

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, T13, H1, H3, H17, A5); (SD1, D4, D5, T13, SH1, H5, H7, H18, C20)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Housing Policy
 - 2) Character and Appearance of Area
 - 3) Residential Amenity
 - 4) Parking and Traffic
 - 5) Accessibility
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, T13, H1, H3, H17, A5
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, T13, SH1, H5, H7, H18, C20
Town Centre	Kenton
Car Parking	Standard: 23 (22)
	Justified: See Report
	Provided: 0

Continued/

Item 1/02 - P/2410/03/COU continued.....

Site Area: 220m²
Habitable Rooms: 18
No. of Residential Units: 18
Density: 818 dph 818 hrph
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- North-eastern side of Kenton Road within Kenton District Centre
- Occupied by single-storey row of 12 lock-up garages, accessed from Mayfield Avenue to the south-west
- Parade of shops with 2 floors of residential accommodation above fronting onto Kenton Road to the south-east
- 2-storey commercial building with higher lift tower at rear of site to north-east
- single-storey office building with side dormer window, Mayfield House, between front of site and Mayfield Avenue
- rear gardens of houses at 1 Mayfield Avenue and 2 Willowcourt Avenue abut north-western boundary

c) Proposal Details

- Outline application – means of access, siting, design and external appearance to be determined at outline stage
- Demolition of existing garages, provision of 3-storey building to accommodate 18 residential units with 6 on each floor, for key workers
- Each unit would comprise bedsit with one kitchen/living/sleeping area, shown as 'live/work' area, and separate wc/shower room
- Ground-floor units shown as wheelchair accessible
- 3 stair accesses to units on upper floors
- brick and tiled elevations, metal sheeted curved roof
- false balconies at second-floor level, obscure glass block windows in rear elevation
- building would be 7.8m high x 34.8m long

d) Relevant History

EAST/1257/02/OUT Outline: Demolition Of Garages And Construction Of 3 Storey Block Of 18 Flats WITHDRAWN 14-FEB-03

Continued/....

APPRAISAL

1) Housing Policy

Relevant policies in the adopted and draft replacement UDP's encourage the provision of accommodation which caters for people with special needs, including key workers, and the proposal complies with the thrust of these policies.

2) Character and Appearance of Area

Adopted Policy H1 and Draft Replacement Policy SH1 make clear that in seeking additional housing provision, surrounding residential areas will be protected in terms of character and amenity.

In this case, the location of the proposed in a service road with no street frontage would be inappropriate and out of character with the pattern of development in the area. The proposed size and scale of the building would be overbearing and obtrusive given the lack of setting space at the front, and its backland siting. It would rise above Mayfield House at the front and provide an unsatisfactory relationship in visual terms with that property and the streetscene.

In addition, the survival of a tall conifer in the adjacent garden would be threatened by the proposed building.

Overall it is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposal would breach the 45⁰ horizontal code in relation to No. 1 Mayfield Avenue, and by virtue of its siting along the entire side garden boundary would be detrimental to outlook and amenity.

The front windows of the proposed units would be some 18m from the rear windows of flats above the shops fronting Kenton Road, and about 7m from 1st floor terraces which serve the flats, giving rise to overlooking from the second-floor flats with a consequent lack of privacy.

In addition it is considered that the backland location of the proposed accommodation and lack of any amenity space would provide a poor level of amenities for the intended occupiers.

Continued/....

4) Parking and Traffic

The site is not within a Residents Parking Zone and hence cannot be defined as 'Resident Permit Restricted'. Although the accommodation is intended for key workers, the Council cannot control car ownership among the intended occupiers. Given the total lack of on-site parking, occupiers with cars would be competing for limited kerbside space in the locality resulting in illegal or injudicious parking to the detriment of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

5) Accessibility

The proposals show satisfactory access for persons with disabilities.

6) Consultation Responses

- No guarantee that flats would be occupied by key workers- were the scheme acceptable this issue could be addressed by S.106 legal agreement
- Inadequate access, especially for emergency vehicles

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 2 STOREY BUILDING
WITH ROOMS IN ROOFSpace TO PROVIDE 14 FLATS
WITH ACCESSES AND PARKING

ROBIN BRETHERICK ASSOCIATES for LINDEN HOMES CHILTERN LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: CH184/01/01B, 02, 03A, 04, 05A, 1194/D/01 (Rev.A)

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
(a) the extension/building(s)
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
(a) the frontage
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
The boundary treatment shall be completed:
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) CH184/01/01B have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

continued/

Item 1/03 - P/2219/03/CFU continued.....

8 Highway - Closing of Access(es)

9 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-

(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste

(b) and vehicular access thereto

has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

10 Water Storage Works

11 Before the approved development is occupied, the central median between the carriageways in Honeypot Lane shall be altered in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory passage of vehicles into and out of the site, and in the interests of highway safety.

12 No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of the proposed finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans, finished floor levels should be sited 300mm above the 1:100 year + 20% flood level of 60.88m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

REASON: To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding.

13 No building, raising of existing ground levels or deposition of spoil/materials shall take place within the area of land liable to flood located below the level of 60.88m AOD.

REASON: To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding.

14 Dry access/egress shall be provided to and from the 1:100 year + 20% flood plain as detailed in Drawing No.1194/D/01 (Rev.A).

REASON: To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding.

15 Any walls or fencing constructed within or around the site shall be designed to be permeable to flood water.

REASON: To prevent obstruction to the flow and storage of flood water, with a consequent increased risk of flooding.

16 Surface water drainage works and source control measures shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

17 Disabled Access – Buildings

18 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the cycle store have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The store shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development.

REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory cycle facilities.

continued/

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E4, E6, E45, E56, E58, H1, T13), (SD1, SEP5, EP12, EP13, D4, D5, T13, H5)
- 6 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for certain proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 8 metres of the brink of the Edgware Brook (Main River). This is required independent of any planning permission granted.
Please contact Development Control Engineer Lydia Bruce-Burgess on direct line: 01707 632402 for further details.
- 7 The applicant is advised that an agreement pursuant to S.278 of the Highways Act 1980 will need to be completed in respect of highway works to Honeypot Lane.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Appearance and Character of the Area
 - 2) Neighbouring Amenity
 - 3) Parking and Access
 - 4) Environment Agency
 - 5) Accessibility
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E4, E6, E45, E56, E58, H1, T13 SD1, SEP5, EP12, EP13, D4, D5, T13, H5
Car Parking	Standard: 21 (20) Justified: 21 (20) Provided: 18
Site Area:	0.18 ha.
Habitable Rooms:	43
No. of Residential Units:	14
Density - hrph:	78 dph 239 hrph

b) Site Description

- east side of Honeypot Lane just south of crossroads with Whitchurch Lane, Marsh Lane and Wemborough Road
- occupied by Green Man Public House, mainly 2-storied building with high pitched, hipped roof developed in inter-war period
- single storey former off-licence next to southern boundary (ex turf accountant)
- car parking in front of building, vehicle accesses at each end

continued/

Item 1/03 - P/2219/03/CFU continued.....

- garden behind building
- Honeypot Lane dual carriageway, opening in central median close to southern crossover
- Honeypot Lane open space to north of site
- Edgware Brook and open land at rear of site
- Bramble Close to south of site, trees along boundary
- 3-storied shopping parade on opposite side of Honeypot Lane

c) Proposal Details

- demolition of existing building, provision of new building to provide 14 flats
- 13 x 2 bed x 3 habitable room flats
- 1 x 2 bed x 4 habitable room flat
- proposed building 2 storeys high to eaves level
- additional floor in roofspace lit by front, rear and side dormer windows, together with front gable features
- building sited about 12m from footway in Honeypot Lane, 2-4m from boundary with open space, 6-9.5m from boundary with Bramble Close
- 18 parking spaces shown, 8 in front of northern part of building, 10 in front of and alongside southern part of building with separate access, planting between parking areas, minor realignment of existing accesses
- cycle store behind southern parking area
- approximately 680m² amenity space behind building, rear and north facing balconies also proposed

d) Relevant History

EAST/574/94/FUL	Demolition of turf accountants & garage & additional parking at side & rear & relocation of play area	REFUSED 04-NOV-94
-----------------	---	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

The proposed parking area and lighting would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of adjacent residents by reason of noise and general disturbance.

EAST/809/95/FUL	Demolition of turf accountants & garage additional parking at front/side, relocation of play area, road works at Honeypot Lane	GRANTED 12-FEB-96
-----------------	--	----------------------

EAST/662/01/FUL	3 storey block with accommodation in roof to provide 26 sheltered flats, ancillary facilities, access & parking	WITHDRAWN 11-SEP-01
-----------------	---	------------------------

EAST/645/01/FUL	3/4 storey building including accommodation in roof to provide 20 sheltered flats, ancillary facilities, access, parking at front and rear	REFUSED 14-DEC-01
-----------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

"1. The proposed building, by reason of its size, bulk and siting in this prominent location, would be obtrusive, overbearing and would overdevelop the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene, and the amenity of the adjacent public open space.

continued/

Item 1/03 - P/2219/03/CFU continued.....

2. The proposed building, by reason of its size and siting, would be obtrusive and overbearing in relation to the adjacent flats at Bramble Close, and would give rise to a loss of outlook, light and overshadowing, to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity.
3. The proposed development fails to provide affordable housing as required by Policy H9 of the UDP.

APPEAL DISMISSED : 25-JUL-02

e) Applicant's Statement

- application accompanied by Planning and Design Statement, conclusions as follows:
- excellent site for higher density housing development given 'brownfield' status, shape and size, available infrastructure, location, accessibility to public transport, ready availability of local shops
- new design fully addresses Inspector's criticisms, scale much reduced, elevations, siting, roofline and fenestration are substantial improvement on appeal proposal
- would not harm streetscene or amenities of neighbours
- would help to meet borough's overall housing needs and offset shortage of small dwellings in borough

f) Consultations

Thames Water	No objection
EA:	Conditions suggested

Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry
		14-NOV-03

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	56	2	23-OCT-03

Response: No objection; Overlooking, lack of affordable housing, overdevelopment, would dominate the public open space, overlooking, disturbance, design out of keeping, pays no attention to sustainability, green issues, energy conservation, unsatisfactory design, excessive parking.

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance and Character of the Area

The previous building proposed in the appeal application was shown to be sited between 6.6 – 8.6m from the front boundary, and the Inspector considered that 'it would effectively have the appearance of a four storey building.'

He concluded, by reason of its size and siting, that the building would appear as a large, isolated, intrusive and incongruous structure in the streetscene and locality, harmful to both character and appearance.

continued/

This proposed building, however, occupies a similar siting in relation to Honeypot Lane as the existing pub, and would be at least 11m from the front boundary. Its total height would be one storey less than the previous scheme, and comparable to the pub, the main differences being the front gable feature and dormer windows. The latter however are shown as modest structures, and the gable features would not be excessively large or dominant. It is considered therefore that an acceptable relationship would be provided with Honeypot Lane.

While the proposal would be about 1 storey higher than the existing structure adjacent to the open space, the proposed 2 storey height would not be overbearing or obtrusive and would permit satisfactory screening by adjacent trees and vegetation.

The area in front of the existing building is completely hardsurfaced. The proposal would permit the introduction of planting and a more attractive form of landscaping.

In these circumstances it is suggested that the proposal would provide an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed building in the appeal application showed ground and first floor clear windows in the southern flank wall adjacent to Bramble Close.

The Inspector commented that although these windows 'would not face directly onto the rear of the nearest property in Bramble Close they would provide a view over its rear garden and windows.' He concluded that this would cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours.

This application shows ground floor windows only in comparable positions. Overlooking of Bramble Close would be prevented by boundary fencing and a large willow tree which is sited within the Close behind some of the proposed windows.

The one first floor window which is shown is set forward of The Close by some 7m and direct overlooking would not therefore result.

The proposed building would be sited between 13-14m from the flats in Bramble Close. Given its 2-storey height and the location of tree screening it is suggested that an acceptable relationship in terms of outlook would result.

3) Parking and Access

The proposed level of parking provision would be 2 spaces below the maximum standard in the draft Replacement UDP. This is considered acceptable in this location where unrestricted parking is available in the service road on the opposite side of Honeypot Lane. In addition, the site is served by 3 bus routes and Canons Park Underground Station is within 400m.

continued/

Item 1/03 - P/2219/03/CFU continued.....

The proposed minor realignment of the existing accesses into the car park would necessitate some alterations to the median strip between the Honeypot Lane carriageways. The applicant has agreed to fund the works by way of a S.278 agreement, and an appropriate condition is suggested.

4) Environment Agency

The applicant has provided a satisfactory Flood Risk Assessment, and in these circumstances the Agency has withdrawn previously expressed objections.

5) Accessibility

An appropriate condition is suggested.

6) Consultation Responses

Lack of affordable housing

- The proposal is below the threshold for affordable housing and there is therefore no requirement.

Disturbance

- Given the existing use of the site and the extent of car parking it is not considered that disturbance levels would adversely affect neighbouring amenities.

Pays no attention to sustainability, green issues, energy conservation

- The proposal represents a sustainable form of development in travel terms given the reduced level of car parking, proposed cycle parking facilities and the availability of public transport. Energy efficiency is covered by Part L of the Building Regulations. The proposal would introduce planting at the front of the site and thereby provide additional greenness.

**SAFWAY SUPERSTORE, 299 UXBRIDGE ROAD,
HATCH END**

**1/04
P/2319/03/CFU/TW
Ward: HATCH END**

EXTENSION TO STORE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL 1,382
SQ.M OF RETAIL FLOORSPACE WITH CHANGES TO
LAYOUT OF CAR PARK

RAPLEYS for SAFEWAY STORES PLC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 3354-PL-01C, 02A, 03A, 04H, 05C, 06C

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Noise from Plant and Machinery
- 6 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 7 The retail premises hereby granted planning permission shall only be open for the sale of goods to the public from:
08.00am to 08.00pm Mondays to Thursdays
08.00am to 09.00pm Fridays
08.00am to 08.00pm Saturdays
09.00am to 05.00pm Sundays
unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
REASON: To restrict the impact of the development on neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E17, E46, S6, T13), (S1, EP42, D4, T13, EM5)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Character of the Area
 - 2) Impact on the Green Belt
 - 3) Retail Impact
 - 4) Parking/Highways considerations
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E17, E46, S6, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	S1, EP42, D4, T13, EM5
Car Parking	Standard: 128 - 240
	Justified: 128 - 240
	Provided: 348
Site Area:	1.68 ha.
Floorspace:	1000m ²
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- supermarket located off the south side of Uxbridge Road
- access is from the roundabout which also serves Elliot Hall/Harrow Arts Centre
- the existing store provides 3,500 sq.m. of sales floorspace and 389 car parking

c) Proposal Details

- extension to store measuring 75m in length and 17m in width on the south west side of the store on land between the existing building and the railway track, on what is currently car parking
- re-configuration of some parking spaces to relocate the disabled spaces
- the extension would provide an additional 1000 sq.m. of sales floorspace and additional staff and warehouse areas

d) Relevant History

LBH/41023	Supermarket, Coffee Shop, ancillary services, access roads, car parking, service yard and landscaping, highway works on Uxbridge Road/Milne Field and The Avenue	GRANTED 05-NOV-91
-----------	--	----------------------

e) Consultations

EA:	No objection
TWU:	

Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry 13-NOV-03	
Notifications	Sent 60	Replies 5	Expiry 05-NOV-03

Response: Loss of car parking, out of character, increase in traffic, increased noise.
Hatch End Association: Loss of car parking, more difficult for disabled shoppers.
Loss of use by Arts Centre, possible additional signage.

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Character of the Area

The substantial supermarket is an established part of the character of the area. The proposed extension would contain features found on the existing building and with the use of appropriate materials, the proposal would appear as a sympathetic extension to the existing supermarket.

2) Impact on the Green Belt

The site has a boundary with the Green Belt on the south eastern side. The proposed extension would have its narrow elevation adjacent to the boundary. It is considered that in the context of this particular site with the existing supermarket, the impact of this relatively narrow extension between the supermarket and railway line would be acceptable in Green Belt terms.

3) Retail Impact

The applicants have submitted a retail impact assessment in support of the application. It is concluded that the proposed extension would be unlikely to result in any detrimental impact on the retail vitality of established centres, its impact is, therefore, judged to be acceptable.

4) Parking/Highways Considerations

The existing store has 389 car parking spaces which include 11 parent and child and 7 disabled spaces. The proposal would reduce this to 348 spaces which includes 11 parent and child and 10 disabled spaces.

The car parking standard for the whole site would be within the range of 140-280. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and would not lead to conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

**THE GRAIL & 1 WILLOW DENE, UXBRIDGE RD, P/2116/03/COU/TEM
PINNER**

Ward: PINNER

OUTLINE: DEMOLITION OF 1 WILLOW DENE, DEVELOPMENT OF 11 HOUSES,
ACCESS, PARKING

RICHARD CLARKE ARCHITECTS for BANNER HOMES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1:1250 site plan, 669/SP3A.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Outline - Reserved Matters (Design, Appear., Landsc.)
- 3 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 4 Levels to be Approved
- 5 Waste Arrangements - Buildings
- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development which would otherwise fall within Classes A to F in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the character of the area by restricting the amount of site coverage and size of dwelling in relation to the size of the plot and availability of:-
(a) amenity space
and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 7 PD Restrictions - Minor Operations
- 8 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
 - 4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E29, E34, E45, T13, H1, H8); (SD1, D4, D5, D11, D12, T13, H5, EP21)
 - 6 The applicant is advised that the landscaping proposals should include the provision of a semi-mature common hornbeam between plots 6 and 7, and anti-noise boundary treatment adjacent to No. 2 Willow Dene and No 641 Uxbridge Road.
-

Continued/....

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Principle of Development
 - 2) Setting of Listed Building
 - 3) Appearance and Character of Area
 - 4) Neighbouring Amenity
 - 5) Access and Parking
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E29, E34, E45, T13, H1, H8
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, D11, D12, T13, H5, EP21
TPO	
Listed Building	
Car Parking	Standard: 22 (20) Justified: } See Report Provided: }
Site Area:	0.71 ha
No. of Residential Units:	11
Density:	15 dph
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- 1 Willow Dene, detached 2-storey house on south side of Uxbridge Road, Pinner
- land within The Grail (former Waxwell Farm House) which is Grade II listed building, comprising open/partly overgrown field in north-west corner of site with preserved trees along southern and eastern boundaries
- detached houses in Willow Dene adjacent to northern boundary
- detached house fronting onto Uxbridge Road and land within curtilage of The Grail adjacent to eastern boundary and southern boundary
- woodland area abuts western boundary

c) Proposal Details

- outline application, siting and means of access to be determined at outline stage
- demolition of 1 Willow Dene to provide shared surface access
- provision of 11 detached houses on land rear of 1-4 Willow Dene within curtilage of The Grail, in L-shaped cul-de-sac
- 2-storey houses proposed, with accommodation in roofspace

Continued/....

- parking shown within individual curtilages
- application accompanied by Arboricultural Impact Appraisal, Noise Impact Report, Report on Impact on The Grail

d) Relevant History

P/284/03/COU Outline: Demol. Of 1 Willow Dene, Replacement CURRENT
House, 10 New Houses At Rear, Access, Parking APPLICATION
+ Parking For 'The Grail'.

e) Applicant's Statement

- Arboricultural Impact Appraisal conclusions:-
 - 3 trees would be lost, 1 Category A and 2 Category 2
 - all significant boundary tree cover remains intact
 - views into site not significantly altered
 - plenty of space for new planting
 - overall impact on local amenity would be low
- Noise Impact Report conclusions:-
 - noise levels from traffic using access road would be low compared with World Health Organisation guidelines
 - in context of Uxbridge Road proposal would not give rise to disturbance or loss of amenity
- Report on Impact on The Grail
 - row of trees is prominent landscape feature and is limit to setting of The Grail
 - proposals would leave setting unharmed

f) Consultations

Environment Agency: No Comments
Thames Water: No Objections

Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry 12-NOV-03
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

	Setting of Listed Building	Expiry 02-DEC-03
--	----------------------------	---------------------

1st Notification	Sent 86	Replies 4	Expiry 30-OCT-03
------------------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: Traffic congestion, loss of trees, harm to wildlife, detriment to environment, subsidence, noise and disturbance, harm to highway safety, density out of character with area, over-development, loss of green field site, overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing, adverse impact on listed building, increase in hardsurfacing.
Continued/

2nd Notification

Sent
86

Replies
Awaited

Expiry
08-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1) Principle of Development

The application site is not given any statutory protection in the Adopted or Deposit Replacement HUDP. It is considered that it comprises previously developed land as defined in PPG3 as that part of the site within The Grail is currently within the curtilage of a permanent structure. No. 1 Willow Dene is clearly a brownfield site. In these circumstances consideration of the application depends on the detailed impacts of the proposals.

2) Setting of Listed Building

The setting of The Grail generally consists of more formal landscaped gardens directly adjacent to the building complex, with a less formal but important open buffer zone around it. The application site is beyond the buffer zone and is shielded from it by mature trees and vegetation. It is located between 70 – 100m from the building complex and because of the screening can barely be seen. In this context it is not considered that the setting of the listed building would be detrimentally affected.

3) Appearance and Character of Area

The proposed development without doubt would change the character of this existing field. However, a low density of development is proposed and sufficient space is shown for planting along the frontages of the proposed houses. It is considered that levels of hardsurfacing would be acceptable.

None of the preserved trees within the boundary of The Grail would have to be removed as a result of the development, and they would provide a significant screen within the curtilage of the listed building.

A semi-mature hornbeam to replace a diseased hornbeam which was recently removed with the Council's approval is proposed at the head of the cul-de-sac where it would have more significant streetscene value.

Provision of the proposed access road would not have a significant visual impact, and space would remain for adjacent planting to ameliorate its appearance.

Overall it is considered that the proposals would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the area.

continued/....

4) Neighbouring Amenity

Although the view over the land of adjacent residents in Willow Dene would be impaired by the proposals, this is not a material planning consideration.

The house which is proposed nearest to Willow Dene would be sideways on, some 22m from the rear wall of No. 2. This would afford a reasonable outlook, greater than the previous SPG guidelines of 15m, and a condition is suggested to prevent the provision of windows in the flank wall. The houses shown behind Nos. 3 and 4 would be at least 42m from adjacent rear walls.

Buffer zones are shown between the new access road and the boundaries of 2 Willow Dene and 641 Uxbridge Road to the east to enable planting. Suitable boundary treatment such as acoustic fencing can be secured to reduce the impact on noise and disturbance from traffic, which in any case would be low from the 11 houses proposed.

5) Access and Parking

A shared surface access can be accepted for a development of this scale. The junction of Willow Dene and Uxbridge Road is adequate to cope with traffic generated by the net addition of 10 houses.

6) Consultation Responses

- harm to wildlife – the site is not defined as a Site of Nature Conservation Importance to justify the prevention of development
- subsidence – this is covered by other legislation
- loss of light, overshadowing – it is not considered that these would result from the proposals
- other issues discussed in report

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED TWO/THREE STOREY BLOCK OF TEN FLATS WITH BASEMENT PARKING AND BIN STORE AT FRONT.

ROBIN BRETHERICK ASSOCIATES for COSWAY LAND & NEW HOMES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: WES/03/01
5029-PL10; 11; 12; 13A; 14A; 15A; 16A; 17A

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to expiry of advertisement and receipt of no material objections and subject to the following condition(s)

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacing
 - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
 - (b) the boundary.of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 6 The window(s) in the first floor flank wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
 - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
 - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Continued/.....

- 7 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 8 Highway - Approval of Access(es)
- 9 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 10 Highway - Visibility - 3
- 11 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 12 Levels to be Approved
- 13 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plans have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.
- 14 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 15 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 19 – Flank Windows
- 3 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 5 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 6 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, H8, T13); (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Visual and Residential Amenity
- 2) Density
- 3) Trees
- 4) Parking and Highway Issues
- 5) Accessibility
- 6) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, H8, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, SH1, D4, D5, T13
TPO

Continued/.....

Item 1/06 - P/2564/03/CFU continued.....

Car Parking	Standard:	15	(15)
	Justified:	15	(15)
	Provided:	16	
Site Area:	0.18ha		
Habitable Rooms:	32		
No. of Residential Units:	10		
Density:	55.5 dph	178 hrph	
Council Interest:	None		

b) Site Description

- Pair of large semi-detached houses on western side of road, set back from road frontage by 10m
- Protected trees on site frontage and to rear
- Two storey block of 4 flats to north, Eaton Court
- Garages and access road serving properties in Oakdene Close abut southern boundary

c) Proposal Details

- Demolition of existing houses and redevelopment in form of largely 2 storey building with accommodation in crown roof to provide 10 flats
- 15 parking spaces in basement with 1 disabled persons space at front
- new vehicle crossover with existing crossover closed
- bin store at front
- removal of trees at frontage to create access and ash tree on flank boundary

d) Relevant History

P/1498/03/CFU Redevelopment: Detached 3 Storey Building To REFUSED
Provide 12 Flats With Access And Parking At The 12-SEP-03
Rear

Reasons for Refusal:-

- "1) The proposed development, by reason of excessive number of units and density, size of building and hardsurfaced parking areas, with the associated disturbance and general activity, would result in an over-intensive use and amount to overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.

Continued/.....

- 2) The proposed would result in the unacceptable loss of trees of significant amenity value which, in the opinion of the local planning authority, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality.
- 3) Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the cartilage 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)."

e) Applicant's Statement

- Proposal designed to overcome reasons for refusal of previous scheme
- Flats reduced from 12 to 10, hardsurfacing reduced by use of basement parking, building scale reduced with lower ridge and eaves lines and adjustments to siting and footprint, improved relationship with established trees and inclusion of landscaping scheme
- Density appropriate to location within 100m of shops and 250m of Hatch End station
- Proposal is for an attractive high cost scheme
- Full planning and design statement submitted

f) Consultations

Environment Agency:	Awaited
Thames Water Utilities Ltd:	Awaited

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry	
		11-DEC-03	
Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	46	2	03-DEC-03

Response: Loss of light to Oakdene Close; additional noise from development; concern at level of parking; do not wish basement to be under Oakdene Close; acknowledge reduction from previous application but concerns still remain.

APPRAISAL

1) Visual and Residential Amenity

At present Westfield House in particular has a high pitched roof and the pair of houses have an imposing frontage. They are set back from the road frontage however where there is mature screening.

Continued/.....

The proposed block of flats would have a reduced ridge height to the existing buildings and has also been reduced by a minimum of 1.5m from the previously refused scheme. The building has also been reduced in width, to allow for hedge planting on the boundary with Oakdene Close, and set back a little further from the frontage. The previously proposed extensive hardsurfacing at the rear has been omitted in favour of basement parking, thus ensuring the retention of the trees to the rear of the site and a large usable rear amenity space in excess of the Council's SPG standards. Whilst there would be flank windows, these would be obscure-glazed and would not directly overlook adjacent habitable room windows or private gardens. Eaton Court to the north has no habitable room windows on the flank. Nos. 45 and 46 Oakdene Close lie some 17m from the flank boundary and No. 44 some 8m and to the rear of Hillside.

Clearly the proposal would represent a change in the streetscene however it is considered that the amendments made compared to the refused scheme overcome the concerns with regard to visual and residential amenity.

2) Density

The density now proposed would fall within the range set out in Policy H5 of the revised deposit draft UDP and is considered appropriate for the locality. There are flatted developments of similar density in close proximity.

3) Trees

The deletion of the rear parking area and access road has removed the previous conflict between the hardsurfacing of the site and trees to the rear. The slightly deeper front building line provides greater clearance from the frontage trees to be retained. Of those trees to be removed the ash is not a good specimen and those at the front are either small scale or of poor quality. A full landscaping scheme including replacement trees is included with the application. Substantial new planting of either trees or hedges is proposed to all boundaries.

4) Parking and Highways Issues

The proposal complies with the adopted and revised deposit UDP parking standards.

5) Accessibility

The proposal would incorporate a level access and a disabled persons parking space at surface level. A planning condition and informative are proposed to ensure satisfactory levels of accessibility.

Continued/.....

6) Consultation Responses

These are largely dealt with in the report. The basement would be solely under the new building and not adjacent land.

1/07

**ASSEMBLY ROOMS AND 2 BYRON HILL RD, P/1915/03/CFU/TW
HARROW**

Ward: HARROW ON THE
HILL

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 10 DWELLINGS IN A 3 STOREY BUILDING WITH
ROOMS IN ROOFSPACE AS EXTENSION TO DEVELOPMENT ALLOWED ON APPEAL
REF. W/143/02/FUL, WITH ACCESS AND PARKING.

ARCHER ARCHITECTS for FAIRBRIAR MACLEOD

1/08

**ASSEMBLY ROOMS AND 2 BYRON HILL RD, P/2265/03/CCA/TW
HARROW**

Ward: HARROW ON THE
HILL

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF DETACHED SINGLE STOREY
WORKSHOP BUILDING

ARCHER ARCHITECTS for FAIRBRIAR MACLEOD

P/1915/03/CFU

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 247/P01, P02, P03, PO4, PO5, PO6, PO7.

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

- 1 The proposal, by reason of unsatisfactory size and design, would be unduly
obtrusive and detract from the character and appearance of this part of the
Conservation Area.
- 2 The proposal by reason of unsatisfactory size and siting would be detrimental to the
visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(E6, E38, E45, T13); (SD1, D4, D5, EP19, T12)
 - 2 The applicant is advised that the proposal requires Listed Building Consent and that
such consent would be unlikely to be granted.
-

Continued/.....

P/2265/03/CCA

REFUSE conservation area consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the

1 Refusal - Conservation - Demolition

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E38, E45, T13); (SD1, D4, D5, EP19, T12)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
- 2) Amenity of Neighbours
- 3) Parking/Highway Considerations
- 4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E38, E45, T13	
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, EP19, T12	
Area of Special Character Conservation Area:	Harrow on the Hill Village	
Car Parking	Standard: } Justified: } Provided: }	See Report
No. of Residential Units:	5	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- The site is located on the north west side of Byron Hill, close to its junction with High Street
- The site is the former Harrow Motors workshop, immediately adjacent to the Kings Head site
- The site consists of a narrow forecourt and the workshop building

Continued/.....

c) Proposal Details

- Demolish the workshop building and replace with a building which would partly bridge the access road to the Kings Head site and attach to the approved building on the Kings Head site
- Some modifications are proposed to the scheme, in comparison with the approved building
- The proposal, including the already approved element for the Kings Head site would be for 10 flats, 5 of which are new and 5 within the modified approved scheme. Two additional car parking spaces are proposed

d) Relevant History

For the Kings Head site:-

WEST/143/02/FUL	Conversion of Existing Buildings, Provision of New Houses and Flats. Total of 29 Units and Car Parking	APPEAL AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION APPEAL ALLOWED 06-JUN-03
-----------------	--	---

e) Consultations

Thames Water Utilities Ltd:
CAAC:

No Objection
Issues in relation to parking and possible loss of amenity space need to be considered. The proposal aesthetically impairs the character of the proposed building and the listed building, it is extremely bland, especially the common ridgeline and tedious elevations. The loss of the decorative chimney stack to the listed building is unacceptable. The proposed entrance archway is too heavy. The left hand side building is essentially a 4 storey structure which will overpower and overshadow the residential properties set further down Byron Hill Road. The rear right hand dormer is too close to the hip of the roof and in general the changes to the rear of the building do not appear to have been considered sympathetically. It is suggested that any amended plans should colour up proposed changes to the approved scheme.

Continued/.....

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry
		23-OCT-03

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	132	4	16-OCT-03
	9	1	

Response: Lack of parking, out of character, affects on amenity, overdevelopment.
Harrow Hill Trust: Impact on Conservation Area, undue mass, effect on amenity of neighbour.

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

The character of the Conservation Area is a mixture of commercial properties, mainly centred around the green and residential properties. The residential properties display a degree of variety, from flats above commercial premises, small, tightly sited terraced houses, and more substantial detached houses.

The approved scheme contained a replacement for the existing assembly rooms which was subservient to the retained buildings and provided a degree of separation at roof level and retained the chimney at the end of the retained building. The current proposal contains a roof which is a continuation of the retained building and proposed the removal of the aforementioned chimney. The separation between the existing and new elements would be lost and the important chimney would be removed. In addition, the roof over the remainder of the proposal would be a continuation of this roof line, which would result in the same roof line extending for 29m in length. The subservience of the additions to the retained building would be lost and the proposed element would have an undue dominance in the streetscene. It is considered that this would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The existing workshop building is not considered to have such intrusive merit that its loss would be resisted. However in the absence of a suitable replacement the proposed demolition is not considered to be acceptable.

2) Amenity of Neighbours

The south west boundary of the site shares a common boundary with No. 2a Byron Hill Road, which is one of a pair of semi-detached houses. These houses are set well back from the road and the existing workshop building is approximately 4.5m forward of these houses. This existing situation would not comply with the Council's

Continued/.....

45⁰ Code, employed in such situations. The proposal would extend approximately 10m forwards of the existing workshop and 4m higher, at the boundary. It is considered that the proposal is a worse infringement of the 45⁰ Code than the existing situation and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours.

3) Parking/Highway

The car parking provision for the approved scheme amounted to 1.5 spaces per unit. The proposal would result in the provision for the site of 1.38. Notwithstanding that car parking did not form the basis for a reason for refusal of the appeal scheme, it was a matter raised by third parties and therefore considered by the Inspector and found to be acceptable. The proposal would also comply with the Council's maximum standard of 1.4 spaces per unit for units of this size.

4) Consultation Responses

None.

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

291 BURNT OAK BROADWAY, EDGWARE

2/01

P/1196/03/CFU/TW

Ward: EDGWARE

CHANGE OF USE: RETAIL TO HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY (CLASS A1 TO A3) ON GROUND FLOOR WITH PARKING AT REAR, REPLACEMENT SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

CES ASSOCIATES/ W.SAUNDERS for M.U.AHAMED

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: CS/MU/01, CS/MU/02.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 4 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 5 Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
- 6 Restrict Storage to Buildings

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 21 – Bottle Recycling
 - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (S16, T13); (EM20, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Policy
 - 2) Car Parking
 - 3) Amenity of Neighbours
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	S16, T13		
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EM20, T13		
Car Parking	Standard:	3	(1)
	Justified:	1	(0)
	Provided:	2	(2)
Council Interest:	None		

b) Site Description

- Vacant former second-hand shop with flat above
- Two small single storey rear additions
- Within a parade of local (non-designated) shop units on the western side of the road
- Served by rear vehicular access between nos. 285 and 287 Burnt Oak Broadway
- The uses in the parade are as follows: cash and carry grocer (A1), application site (A1), chemist (A1), newsagent (A1), hair and beauty (A1)

c) Proposal Details

- Replace single storey additions with a single storey extension across the rear elevation of 3.3m in depth
- Change the use of the premises to a hot food take-away
- Two car parking spaces are proposed in the rear yard
- An extract duct is proposed which would be sited in the middle of the rear elevation

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Consultations

London Borough of Barnet: No Objection

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	9	5	30-JUN-03

Response: Lack of parking, increased noise and disturbance, cooking smells.

Continued/.....

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy

Both the Adopted and Revised Draft UDPs allow for such changes of use subject to: i) the appropriateness of the use, ii) not losing necessary retail provision, iii) highway safety.

The use is appropriate in principle to the retail parade. Since the property is vacant it is considered that the proposal would not result in necessary retail provision and, furthermore would improve the appearance of this parade.

2) Car Parking

The proposal makes the provision for two car parking spaces within the rear of the site, where none exist at present. Parking on Burnt Oak Broadway is only restricted for an hour in the morning and an hour in late afternoon. If some parking associated with the use were to take place on burnt Oak Broadway this would not be likely to prejudice highway safety.

3) Amenity of Neighbours

With respect to residential properties within close proximity of the application site, conditions are proposed to protect the amenity of nearby residents by restricting noise, odour/fumes and hours of use.

The extension proposed at the rear is only of limited size and would not be as deep as extensions at either side. It is concluded that no detrimental impact would result from the proposal.

4) Consultation Responses

Concerns raised are addressed above.

49 HIGH ST, HARROW ON THE HILL

2/02

P/1449/03/CFU/TW

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CHANGE OF USE: RETAIL TO A3 (FOOD AND DRINK) ON GROUND FLOOR AND BASEMENT, WITH PARKING AT REAR

J R ANDREWS for T J HARRISS ESQ

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 49/01A, 49/02C

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Use
- 3 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 4 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s)..... have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.
- 6 No activity associated with the A3 use hereby permitted shall take place on the rear patio area or other areas at the rear of the building, with the exception of the car parking areas.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbours.
- 7 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

Continued/....

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E38, T13); (SD1, EP19, T13)
- 2 The applicant is advised that Listed Building Consent is required for internal alterations shown on the approved plans and such permission should be granted before works commence.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Vitality/Character of the Conservation Area
- 2) Amenity of Neighbours
- 3) Car Parking
- 4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

The use of the first floor of this property as offices (Class B1) is the subject of an enforcement investigation. It is considered that this should not prejudice consideration of the current application for the use of the ground floor and basement, which should be treated on its own merits.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E38, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, EP19, T13
Area of Special Character	
Listed Building:	Grade II
Conservation Area:	Harrow Village
Car Parking	Standard: 6 (4)
	Justified: 5 (4)
	Provided: 4 (4)
Council Interest:	Applicant is related to Councillor

b) Site Description

- 3 storey terraced building with rooms in the roof
- situated on the eastern side of High Street opposite the triangular green
- the ground and basement floors were last used as retail
- the upper floors have been used as a combination of office and residential
- the site lies within the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area, and is Grade II listed

continued/

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use of the ground floor and basement to A3 use
- Four car parking spaces are proposed at the rear of the site

d) Relevant History

WEST/851/00/FUL Change Of Use: Retail To Financial & REFUSED
Professional Services(Class A1 To A2) At 10-JUL-01
Basement And Ground Floor. Use Of First Floor
As Offices (Class B1), Parking At Rear And
Extractor Flue On Roof

Reason for Refusal:-

“The separate use of the first floor as B1 offices would result in an overintensive use of the site by reason of associated noise and activity, would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents.”

e) Consultations

CAAC: Object – contrary to shopping policy which should be upheld vigorously. Gothic arches in shopfront appear too crowded and overdone with different proportion of arch over the entrance door inappropriate. Horizontal panel of stallover doesn't work.

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 28-JUL-03
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

1st Notification	Sent 82	Replies 3	Expiry 22-JUL-03
------------------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: 1st Response: Lack of clarity on plans, use of patio could lead to noise, flue obtrusive.

2nd Notification	Sent 82	Replies Awaited	Expiry 28-NOV-03
------------------------------------	------------	--------------------	---------------------

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Vitality

At its meeting on 3rd October 1996 the Development Services Committee agreed to define a shopping core area and 2 new related policies to replace Policy 2 in the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area Policy Statement.

The agreed policies are as follows:-

Policy 2A WITHIN THE DEFINED SHOPPING CORE AREA THE FOLLOWING WILL NORMALLY BE ACCEPTABLE:

(A) CHANGES OF USE BETWEEN ANY OF THE USES IN CLASS A

(B) CHANGES OF USE FROM OTHER USES TO USE CLASSES A1 SHOPS, AS FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND AS FOOD AND DRINK USES

SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS:

(I) THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE USE TO THE PHYSICAL LAYOUT AND APPEARANCE OF THE BUILDING

(II) THE APPEARANCE OF ANY ADVERTISEMENTS AND SIGNS

Policy 2B WITHIN THE DEFINED SHOPPING CORE AREA THERE WILL BE A PRESUMPTION AGAINST THE CHANGE OF USE FROM USE CLASSES A1 SHOPS, AS FINANCIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND A3 FOOD AND DRINK, TO USES OUTSIDE THESE CLASSES

It is considered that the proposed use satisfies these policies as the A3 use would be appropriate to the core area and would maintain the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

continued/

2) Amenity of Neighbours

The property to the south is 'Café Café', a substantial café/bar. The premises to the north is a clothes shop. The café premises has residential use on the upper floors.

It is considered that the principle of the change of use is acceptable and that restrictions should be placed by conditions in order to limit any impact on the amenity of nearby residents. In addition to conditions to control noise, music and the system of extraction/ventilation, it is considered that a condition to prevent the use of the rear patio by the proposed A3 use is necessary in order to prevent noise emanating from this part of the site which may have an impact on the amenity of residents.

3) Car Parking

There is space available within the rear of the site which can accommodate 4 cars. The car parking standards within the Revised Draft Deposit UDP state that retail and A3 uses are subject to the same standard. A requirement for additional spaces cannot, therefore be justified.

4) Consultation Responses

- Proposal has been amended to remove any physical works to the building
- Use of patio – see condition 6

**GROUND FLOOR SHERWOOD HOUSE,
176 NORTHOLT ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/03
P/1573/03/CFU/TW
Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL**

CHANGE OF USE: OFFICES (B1) TO
PHYSIOTHERAPISTS CLINIC WITH 2 CONSULTING
ROOMS & ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION WITH
PARKING

KDB BUILDING DESIGNS FOR MRS S SANGHVI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: NORR176/1, Site Plan

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

1 Time Limit - Full Permission

INFORMATIVE:

1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (EM4, C1, C9, T13), (EM14, C12, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Loss of Employment
 - 2) Car Parking
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: EM4, C1, C9, T13

Deposit UDP Key Policies: EM14, C12, T13

Car Parking Standard 4 (1)

Justified: 4 (1)

Provided: 4 (4)

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- part of ground floor of this office block, which is located at the junction of Northolt Road with Sherwood Road
- the site is within a 'Business Use' area as identified in both the adopted UDP and the Revised Draft Deposit UDP
- car parking is available at the rear of the premises 4 spaces of which are available for this part of the site

continued/

c) Proposal Details

- change of use of offices to use as a physiotherapists suite

d) Relevant History

None

e) Notifications

Sent
29

Replies
0

Expiry
29-AUG-03

APPRAISAL

1) Loss of Employment Use

The application premises form part of a building that is within a "Business Use Area" where, generally, the policy presumption would be to retain such uses. However, the premises have been vacant for some considerable time and there is, under the terms of Policy C12, a requirement to provide for sufficient social and health care facilities in accessible locations. It is therefore concluded that the proposed change of use is acceptable in principle.

2) Car Parking

The proposal contains the provision of 4 car parking spaces at the rear of the site. This provision catered for the office use. The Councils standards require less for a healthcare use than for office use. The provision is therefore considered to be acceptable.

3) Consultation Responses

None

PAIR OF SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES AND DETACHED BUNGALOW WITH ACCESS AND PARKING.

WHITE ASSOCIATES for R & J LANDSCAPES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 393/01a, 04a, 05a, 06a.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacingThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 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:
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 6 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 7 PD Restrictions - Minor Operations
- 8 Water Storage Works
- 9 Highway - Approval of Access(es)
- 10 None of the existing trees on the site or overhanging the site shall be lopped, topped, felled or uprooted without the prior written permission of the local planning authority. Any topping or lopping which is approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard 3998 (Tree Work).
REASON: The existing trees represent an important amenity feature which the local planning authority considers should be protected.

Continued/....

- 11 Measures to protect the walls of Nos. 130 and 132 Butler Road from vehicle damage shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, and implemented before commencement of the development hereby approved, and shall be retained thereafter.
REASON: To safeguard the neighbouring properties.
- 12 Before the development is commenced a detailed site investigation shall be carried out to establish if the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and nature of the contamination present, and to determine its potential for the pollution of the water environment. The method and extent of this site investigation shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of the work. Details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of groundwater and surface water, including provisions for monitoring, shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved.
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 13 The construction of the site drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences.
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 14 No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground.
REASON: To prevent pollution of groundwater.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall Etc Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 40– UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, E55, H1, EM1, EM9, T13, T22); (SD1, D4, D5, EP23, EM16, T7, T13, H5)
- 4 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (eg watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld.
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632300 for further details.
- 5 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632300 for further details

Continued/....

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Employment Policy
 - 2) Means of Access
 - 3) Appearance of Area
 - 4) Residential Amenity
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, E55, H1, EM1, EM9, T13, T22
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, EP23, EM16, T7, T13, H5
Car Parking	Standard: 5 (4)
	Justified: 5 (4)
	Provided: 5
Site Area:	750m ²
Habitable Rooms:	10
No. of Residential Units:	3
Density:	40 dph 133 hrph
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- north side of Butler Road, to the east of junction with Drury Road
- roughly triangular plot of land, in use as landscape contractors office and yard, using light trucks and cars
- single storey buildings, compounds for open storage of materials
- single carriageway access, about 2.5 - 3m wide, leading from Butler Road
- rear boundaries of 2-storey houses in Butler Road to south
- flank boundaries of houses in Wilson Gardens to west
- rear gardens of 2 storey houses in Drury Road to north and east
- large trees in north-west corner of site

c) Proposal Details

- redevelopment of site for 3 dwellings
- existing access from Butler Road
- bungalow in south-west corner behind houses in Butler Road, 2 bedrooms x 3 habitable rooms, hipped pitched roof with front dormer window
- 2 x semi-detached 2-storey houses towards northern boundary, 1 x 2 bedrooms x 3 habitable rooms, 1 x 3 bedrooms x 4 habitable rooms, hipped pitched roof
- 5 parking spaces, 3 in a row behind houses in Drury Road, 1 at end of turning head alongside proposed houses and the bungalow

Continued/....

d) Relevant History

LBH/38644	Two-Storey Building For Office And Business (Class B1) Use, With Accommodation In The Roofspace	GRANTED 20-SEP-89
WEST/329/94/REN	Renewal Of P.P LBH/38644	GRANTED 05-AUG-94
WEST/374/99/REN	Renewal Of Planning Permission WEST/329/94/REN	GRANTED 23-JUL-99
WEST/543/02/OUT	Outline: Pair of Two Storey, 2 Bed Semi-Detached Houses and Detached 2 Bed Bungalow with Access and Parking	GRANTED 17-SEP-02

(Means of access determined).

e) Applicant's Statement

- Substantially the same as outline permission
- Marginally larger footprint than on illustrative layout accompanying outline consent
- Orientation of houses and bungalow same as illustrative drawing

f) Consultations

Environment Agency: Conditions suggested

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	37	3	24-SEP-03

Response: Overshadowing, loss of security, trees should be retained, overdevelopment, 2 bungalows should be developed, noise and disturbance from parking.

APPRAISAL

1) Employment Policy

The planning permission for B1 use of this site has not been implemented, and its current occupation by a landscape contractors yard is considered to be a sui generis use. The land is not therefore protected for employment by policies EM1 and EM16, and the use of the site for residential development would be in character with the area and is considered acceptable in principle.

Continued/....

2) Means of access

The access into the site has a minimum width of 3m between Nos 130 and 132 Butler Road. Measures would be needed to protect those walls from vehicle damage, but a wide enough access would still be provided to serve the proposed development, as accepted in the outline consent.

3) Appearance of Area

This site is surrounded by housing on all sides. The proposed development would provide a more appropriate appearance given the location of the site, and its current use as a landscape contractor's yard.

4) Residential Amenity

The proposed layout is very closely based on the illustrative layout which accompanied outline consent WEST/543/02/OUT, and was accepted as demonstrating that 3 dwellings could be accommodated on the site.

As shown on the illustrative layout, the proposed bungalow would be located within 3m of the rear garden boundaries of nos. 132 – 136 Butler Road, and within 10m of their rear walls. This is considered to be an acceptable separation distance given the modest height of the proposed dwelling.

A clear glazed front dormer window is shown to light a bedroom in the roofspace. This however would be 1.7m above floor level and would not give rise to overlooking of rear gardens in Drury Road, albeit that they are over 12m away.

The only other window shown to light the roofspace is an obscure glazed velux window, thereby preventing overlooking.

The 2 houses in the northern corner of the site would be located within 7.6 – 10m of the rear garden of No. 28 Drury Road due to a staggered siting. This is similar to the illustrative layout but significantly less than the 15m former Supplementary Planning Guidance requirement. However, the extant office permission shows a 2 storey building within 2.5 – 4.5m of this boundary. In addition, the proposed houses would be screened by a large tree which would largely obviate overlooking of the far end of the neighbouring garden. It is therefore considered that a better relationship would be provided within No. 28 than the existing office permission.

The houses would be located between 3 – 10m from the rear boundaries of houses in Drury Road, sufficient to prevent excessive overshadowing.

The proposals would also provide an improved impact on No. 15 Wilson Gardens in comparison with the office permission which would allow a building with a length of 27.5m along its side boundary, breaching the 45⁰ at both front and rear. Both houses proposed in this application met the 45⁰ code.

Continued/....

Acceptable parking and turning arrangements are shown, with areas available for planting.

Existing trees both within and adjacent to the site are shown to be retained, and an appropriate condition is suggested in this regard.

In conclusion, it is suggested that the proposed development would provide a better impact in terms of appropriateness and activity than the existing use, which is uncontrolled and has the potential to be unneighbourly.

5) Consultation Responses

- Loss of security – the existing site is mostly well-fenced but a condition is suggested to fully deal with boundary fencing
- Noise and disturbance from parking – it is not considered that the small number of units proposed should give rise to unneighbourly levels of activity
- Other issues discussed in report

DETACHED TWO STOREY BUILDING WITH ROOMS IN ROOFSPACE TO PROVIDE DOCTORS SURGEY WITH DETACHED BIN STORE, ACCESS AND PARKING.

LAING HOMES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2106-1000A, 2106-DRS-10 Rev A, 2106-DRS-Bin-11 Rev P1

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

- 1 Time Limit – Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (b) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacingThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 A maximum of 6 consulting rooms shall be provided within the development hereby approved.
REASON: To ensure an acceptable scale of use in relation to the location of the site.
- 4 Disabled Access – Buildings
- 5 No development shall take place until details of fencing around the air conditioning unit have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the approved fencing shall be installed before the building is occupied.
REASON: To safeguard the character of the locality.
- 6 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 2106-DRS-10 Rev A have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

continued/

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall Etc Act 1996
 - 4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(E6, E46, T13, C10); (SD1, D4, T13, C13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Scale of Use
 - 2) Appearance of Area
 - 3) Residential Amenity
 - 4) Parking
 - 5) Accessibility
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

At the meeting of 5th November 2003, consideration of this item was deferred for a Members site visit. This took place on 6th December 2003.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E46, T13, C10	
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, T13, C13	
Car Parking	Standard: 25	(No Standard)
	Justified: See Report	
	Provided: See Report	
Site Area:	477m ²	
Floorspace:	335m ²	
Council Interest:	None	

b) Site Description

- north side of William Drive, opposite Carr Close, within RAF Stanmore Park development
- planning permission for doctors surgery on site
- nursery school under construction to west with car park
- residential premises on other 3 sides
- levels fall from west to east

continued/

c) Proposal Details

- revised proposal for doctors surgery
- detached 2-storey building, pitched hipped roof
- brick elevations and tiled roof to match surrounding properties
- 3 consulting rooms, nurses and waiting rooms, plus office on ground floor
- 3 consulting rooms, conference and treatment rooms on 1st floor
- lift access to 1st floor
- 3 offices in roofspace, lit by velux windows
- bin store on western side of building
- 2 parking spaces between building and nursery school site

d) Relevant History

EAST/1058/99/FUL 411 Dwellings In 2 – 4 Storey Houses And Flats; GRANTED
Community Facilities; Access; Parking; Public 26-APR-01
Open Space

e) Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	26	1	02-OCT-03

Response: Support proposals.

APPRAISAL

1) Scale of Use

The approved doctors surgery on this site showed the following accommodation: 2 consulting rooms, 2 treatment rooms, ante-natal classroom, minor surgery room, meeting room, records room, office, waiting room. No condition or legal agreement was imposed to restrict the accommodation to the above level, and it

would be possible, were the approved building provided, for the rooms to be converted to provide at least 4 consulting rooms.

It would also be possible for additional rooms to be provided in the roof. In the light of this, it is considered that the proposed scale of use can be accepted, subject to a condition limiting the number of consulting rooms to 6.

continued/

2) Appearance of Area

The proposed building would have the same width as the approved one, and a similar elevational treatment fronting onto William Drive. Given this, and the proposed use of materials to match neighbouring buildings, the building would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the area. The proposed bin store with air conditioning unit behind would be set back from the site frontage by at least 5m and would be acceptable.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposal would provide the same relationship with the adjacent house in William Drive as the approved building.

Although the western flank wall would be deeper than approved, this would have no impact as this side of the building would be adjacent to the car park.

Replacement UDP Policy C13 accepts that doctors surgeries are traditionally located within residential areas, it is therefore considered, given this, and the satisfactory physical relationship, that the proposal is acceptable in residential amenity terms.

4) Parking

The Replacement UDP contains no standards for doctors surgeries, and confirms that account should be taken of the proposed location in relation to public transport, traffic flow and off-street parking.

In terms of the latter, a car park with 7 spaces would be provided between this site and the nursery school, plus two on the site. This site is within walking distance of Stanmore District Centre where there is public transport, and the site is located on a secondary access to the development.

As a major intensification in the scale of use is not proposed it is suggested that the above parking provision would satisfactorily serve the development.

5) Accessibility

The relevant condition and informative are suggested.

6) Consultation Responses

See report.

LAND R/O ALEXANDRA SCHOOL, 273 ALEXANDRA P/2409/03/CFU/TEM
AVE, SOUTH HARROW

Ward: ROXBOURNE

PROVISION OF TEMPORARY BUILDING TO ACCOMMODATE DENTAL PRACTICE
DURING CONSTRUCTION OF PERMANENT ACCOMMODATION

NORMAN & DANBARN LTD for HARROW PRIMARY CARE TRUST

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2313.3/A/050/003 Rev C, 140/003 Rev A

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The building(s) and car parking area hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition within 2 year(s) of the date of this permission, in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.
REASON: To enable restoration of the land to educational use.
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking area has been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.
- 4 Details of the bicycle rack shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before commencement of the development hereby approved. The facilities shall be provided before occupation of the development.
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory bicycle parking facilities.
- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details indicating adequate access to, and egress from, the building(s) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority to include provision of a dropped kerb to serve the main entrance ramp. 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 that the development will be accessible to people with disabilities.

Continued/...

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 - Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 35 - CDM Regulations 1994
- 5 Standard Informative 40 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals : (E6, E46, T13, C9, A4); (SD1, D4, T13, C12, C20)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1. Community Services Policy
2. Appearance of Area
3. Neighbouring Amenity
4. Accessibility
5. Parking
6. Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E46, T13, C9, A4	
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, T13, C12, C20	
Car Parking	Standard:	9 (no standard)
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	5 additional
Floorspace:	136m ²	
Council Interest:	Owner of site	

b) Site Description

- west side of Alexandra Avenue behind Alexandra Clinic and adjacent offices
- comprises single-storey Nursery School with access on northern side of Clinic
- parking in front of building
- rear gardens of houses in Malvern Avenue to south
- open space to west and north

c) Proposal Details

- temporary permission for two years sought for Dental Practice displaced from adjacent Clinic while site is being redeveloped.
- single-storey portacabin type building proposed, 22.6m long and 6m wide, dove grey elevations, flat roof
- main entrance with steps and ramp, ramped secondary exit
- proposed to be located between southern flank wall of Nursery School and southern boundary of site, on hardsurfaced area forming part of playground
- 5 additional parking spaces proposed, including 1 for disabled badge holders, together with new bicycle rack for 5 bicycles.

Continued/

d) Relevant History

Alexandra Avenue Primary Care Clinic:

P/1875/03/COU Outline : Redevelopment : 3-storey Primary Care GRANTED
Centre (Class D1) with lower ground floor 12-SEPT-03
parking, up to 2,900m² floorspace, access

e)

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	28	1	13-NOV-2003

Response : Support

APPRAISAL

- 1. Community Services Policy**
The proposal would enable continued use of the existing Dental Practice in the adjacent Clinic while redevelopment of that site is taking place, in accordance with the thrust of community services policy.
- 2. Appearance of Area**
The single-storey character of the proposed building would be sympathetic to adjacent buildings. Its design and appearance can be accepted given the temporary nature of the permission which is sought.
- 3. Neighbouring Amenity**
The building would be screened from adjacent gardens by trees and vegetation. In addition, most of the structure would be sited beyond a rear service road so that no detriment to residential amenity would result.
- 4. Accessibility**
Ramps of acceptable gradients are shown to the front and rear entrances, and an appropriate condition is suggested to secure provision.
- 5. Parking**
The provision of 5 additional spaces, together with bicycle parking facilities, can be accepted given the modest scale of the proposed facilities.
- 6. Consultation Responses**
Noted.

105 WHITCHURCH LANE, EDGWARE

2/07

P/1843/03/CFU/PDB

Ward: CANONS

SINGLE STOREY SIDE TO REAR
EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF
DWELLING HOUSE TO THREE SELF-
CONTAINED FLATS (REVISED)

DAVID BARNARD for CITY & COUNTY LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 3

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 4 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
 - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
 - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 6 Landscaping to be Approved
- 7 Landscaping to be Implemented

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall Etc Act 1996
 - 3 Standard Informative 19 – Flank Windows
 - 4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, D4, D5, H10, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Amenity and character of proposed conversion
 - 2) Amenity and character of proposed extension
 - 3) Parking and access
 - 4) Consultation responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

Details of this application were first reported to the Committee on 5th November, but a determination was deferred pending the consideration of the UDP Advisory Panel on the recommended omission of a conversion threshold from Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP. At its meeting the review panel voted to recommend that the threshold be omitted from the policy, in accordance with the Inspector's findings.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, H10, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	S1, SD1, D4, D5, H10, T13
Car Parking:	Standard: Justified: Provided:
Habitable Rooms:	7
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- two storey Victorian semi-detached dwelling (vacant) with original net floor area of 142m² and a single storey rear kitchen addition of some 7.5m² (balcony over)
- single width crossover serves the forecourt and drive to side of dwelling; rear garden area of 185m²
- adjoining semi to east, no. 103, not converted
- neighbouring property to west, "Thorndale", a three storey residential flat block; facing flank wall contains bathroom windows only, common boundary delineated by 2m high concrete wall
- rear of application site bounded by garage blocks serving Norfolk House residential flats
- Whitchurch Lane on-street parking prohibited Mon-Fri 2-3pm; designated as a secondary road on adopted UDP proposals map and as a Borough distributor road on the emerging replacement UDP proposals map

c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension and conversion to three self contained flats
- extension details comprise:
 - located on west side of existing rear projection
 - 4m wide by 8m deep; 3m high to flat roof
 - external finish in brick to match existing
 - flank wall, to be sited 1.1m from the boundary with Thorndale, to contain bedroom window and main access to flat 3
- conversion details comprise:
 - one flat on first floor with access from front; net floor area 71m², living accommodation to front and two bedrooms to rear
 - one flat on ground floor within original main building; net floor area 48m², living accommodation to front and one bedroom to rear (new bedroom and kitchen window in flank wall)

continued/

Item 2/07 - P/1843/03/CFU continued.....

- one flat on ground floor within extended rear projection; net floor area 53m², living accommodation to rear and one bedroom to side
- remaining garden area to be subdivided into two areas of 60m² and 77m² respectively; existing first floor balcony to be retained (but not expanded)
- forecourt shown as garden/planting area; nil parking provision

d) Relevant History

P/1045/03/DFU	Single storey side to rear extension and conversion of dwellinghouse to 3 self-contained flats	REFUSED 23-JUN-03
---------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for Refusal:-

- “1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property.
2. The number of converted properties in this road is already in excess of that considered appropriate, and additional conversions would result in the further loss of character of the road, and an imbalance in the mix of dwelling types and sizes, contrary to the adopted conversion policy of the local planning authority.”

e) Applicant's Statement

- The length of the proposed extension has been reduced to mitigate the impacts on the adjacent property.
- Section 22 of GDPO 1995 requires all reasons to state clearly Council's entire case for resisting development and therefore the only matter outstanding is the principle of conversion.
- There is no material difference in the character of properties on both sides of the road and the locality.
- The conversion rate between Montgomery Road and the Canons Park junction is 25.8% and would increase to 27.5%.
- There is no change in character up to no. 204, which adds 18 houses reducing the conversion rate to 26.3%.
- The policy threshold of 25% is not prescriptive and no demonstrable harm would result.
- The scale and concentration of conversions in the area is not excessive.
- The site is sustainably located and is therefore suitable to add to the wider housing stock.

f) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
13	1	29-AUG-03

Response: 70% flats odd number side and 70% shops/flats/hotel/converted flats on even number side; if permission given only 50% family houses from 91-105; pressure from profit making builders; traffic and parking problems; needs of large families should be considered; conversion totally opposed; builders claim to influence planning department.

continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and character of proposed conversion

Both the adopted and emerging UDPs recognise the contribution that conversions make to the increase of housing supply within the Borough and to this end Policy H10 of both plans start by supporting such proposals. In doing so, however, the policy seeks to spread the parking, amenity and character implications of conversions across the Borough by placing a ceiling on the number of conversions permissible in individual roads. For the purposes of applying the policy to specific cases schedule 7 of the adopted UDP, and schedule 8 of the emerging replacement UDP, provide a working methodology. They both state that for the purpose of calculating the proportion of conversions on unreasonably long roads, changes in character and other clear extensive breaks in residential frontage will be used to determine the stretch of road to be considered. They also state that in the case of secondary roads, each side of the road will be treated individually and split in length, where appropriate, on the basis of the aforementioned factors.

It is considered that the whole of Whitchurch Lane is unreasonably long for the purposes of the application of the policy, and it is therefore necessary to determine an appropriate stretch of development frontage. The area to the east of Montgomery Road can be discounted as being transitional between the predominantly residential character of the road and its more commercial character in the approach towards Edgware. Whilst more arbitrary, it is considered that the junction of Whitchurch Avenue and St. Lawrence Close with Whitchurch Lane to the west forms an appropriate cut-off point in that direction, and is perceptible in the streetscene by the clear visual break of Canons Park on the north side of the road. Excluding purpose built flatted developments, in accordance with the policy, this leaves a discrete frontage on the north side comprising (all odd): 87-105 (includes 89A – a house), 123-145, and 151-165 (includes 153A – a house). The proportion of conversions within this stretch exists at 28% and would increase to 31% with the application proposal.

For the purposes of the adopted UDP Whitchurch Lane is a secondary road, and accordingly it is only necessary to consider the north side. For the purposes of the emerging replacement UDP, however, there are no “secondary roads” but Whitchurch Road has been downgraded from the equivalent of a London distributor to a Borough distributor road. It is considered that, unlike other main roads, Whitchurch Lane is not so wide as to divorce one side from the other and that the intensity and form of development on both sides is sufficiently consistent to constitute a single, inter-related character. If the opposite side of the road is therefore included, to incorporate (all even) 94-116, 126-152 and 162-168 the conversion rate for both identified sides of the road is 25.8% and would increase to 27.4%.

continued/

In view of the re-classification of Whitchurch Lane, for the purposes of the emerging replacement UDP, it is considered most appropriate to include both sides of the road (contrary to assessment of the previously refused application). It therefore follows to consider the application as increasing the conversion rate of the identified part of the road to 27.4% as described above.

In his assessment of the 25% ceiling set out in the replacement Policy H10, the Inquiry Inspector reported that he considered such a limit to be arbitrary and unjustified, and should be removed. Whilst only advisory in capacity, nevertheless the UDP review panel voted to recommend that the threshold be omitted from the policy, in accordance with the Inspector's findings. For the time being the default position is therefore the adopted Policy H10, with its 15% ceiling, to be interpreted in the light of PPG 3 advice and local housing need.

The increase in conversion rate clearly exceeds the 15% ceiling. It is evident from the established conversion rate that the character of the road has already changed from one of predominantly single family dwellinghouses. Spatially much of this change has taken place towards the eastern end of the subject area where access to local shops and public transport links is relatively good; the application site is located at eastern end of Whitchurch Lane. In the context of this existing character it is not considered that the exacerbating effect of one additional conversion would be so readily perceptible as to result in demonstrable harm to visual amenity, residential amenity (by reason of additional activity) or the social balance of the locality.

Even if harm were identified, it is not considered that this would be so significant in this instance as to warrant refusal having regard to PPG 3 advice, that local planning authorities should cease to apply unduly restrictive ceilings on residential development. The continuing need for additional housing in the Borough is also a significant consideration.

In all of the above circumstances it is considered that the previous reason for refusal relating to conversion concentration, based on an assessment of only one side of the road, is not sustainable.

The original dwelling has a net floor area in excess of the threshold of 110m² set down in Policy H10 of the adopted UDP. It is not considered that there can be any objection to the loss of the building as a single family dwelling.

The nature of the flats is such that they are likely to be occupied only by single persons or couples. As such it is considered that their size, circulation and general layout is acceptable. The arrangement of the flats within the building would help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to maximise the amenities of future occupiers of the proposed flats, however, it is recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

continued/

The provision of two separate areas of rear garden for each of the ground floor flats would provide for the external amenity space requirements of future occupiers, and the level of provision is also considered to be acceptable. The first floor flat would have access to the existing rear balcony and while this is much smaller than the garden areas (9m²) would not be so inadequate having regard to the likely needs of future occupiers as to warrant refusal. Expansion of the balcony over the proposed rear extension should be controlled in the interests of the privacy amenities of neighbouring occupiers and a condition is therefore suggested.

It is recognised that the extent and character of the use of the rear garden area is likely to change as a result of the proposal. However it is not considered that the resulting usage would be so significantly more intensive or different in terms of noise and disturbance as to be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

The application drawing shows the forecourt, currently untidy, to be made available for planting. The implementation of a scheme that can be agreed, by condition, would enhance the appearance of the property in the streetscene and would help to safeguard the character of the locality.

Similarly details of refuse storage arrangements can be adequately dealt with by condition, in the interests of amenity and character.

2) Amenity and character of proposed extension

The proposed extension would project rearward of the rear main wall of Thorndale 4.5m and its flank wall would be sited at a distance of some 4.5m from the adjacent rear main corner of that neighbouring property. Such a relationship would secure compliance with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines and together with the modest height of the extension (3m) would be sufficient to safeguard against any unreasonable overshadowing, loss of light or outlook. Neither is it considered the extension would appear unduly bulky when viewed from surrounding vantage points.

By the omission of the rearward projection of the extension, there would be no impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining semi, no. 103, and it is considered that the previous reason for refusal relating to the extension has been adequately overcome.

The formation of an access to proposed flat 3 in the flank elevation is as previously proposed and to which no objection was raised. Whilst this would introduce some activity to the boundary with the neighbouring garden at Thorndale, it is not considered that the level of such activity associated with a single, one bedroom flat would so significantly affect the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers as to justify refusal of permission.

continued/

The bedroom window in the flank wall of the proposed extension would mainly face the blank part of the flank wall of Thordale. Again, this situation is as previously proposed, to which no objection was raised, and with the presence of the 2m high boundary wall would not give rise to any unreasonable actual or perceived overlooking. As the flats would have no permitted development rights, future openings can be controlled.

In all other respects and subject to the conditions suggested, it is considered that the proposal would have no detrimental effect on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring property or the character of the locality.

3) Parking and access

It remains, therefore, to consider the parking and highway safety implications.

The adopted UDP requires a minimum of two spaces (one space per additional residential unit on secondary roads) and the emerging replacement UDP sets a maximum standard of two spaces. As a single family dwellinghouse, the property (unextended) would generate a standard requirements for a minimum of three spaces or a maximum of two spaces respectively. In these circumstances together with the locational advantages of the site and central Government advice, it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal based on nil provision could be justified or sustained in this instance. (Again, it should be noted that no objection on parking grounds was raised at the time of the refused application).

It is not considered that the conversion would, on its own, materially affect highways conditions.

4) Consultation Responses

The methodology and number of conversions for the purposes of the assessment of the application is as set out in the main report. The motive of the applicant is not a material consideration and future proposals for conversions can be considered on their own merits. The loss of the property as a large family unit is not objectionable. The allegation that the builders influence the department is refuted.

All other matters as set out in the appraisal.

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE FOUR TWO STOREY TERRACED HOUSES WITH PARKING AT FRONT

GEOFFREY T DUNNELL for MESSRS JD & PJ FLANNERY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 0305/1

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
 - 2 Water Storage Works
 - 3 PD Restriction - Classes A to D
 - 4 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
 - (a) siting of the building(s)
 - (b) design of the building(s)
 - (c) external appearance of the building(s)
 - (d) means of access
 - (e) landscaping of the site
- REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
 - 3 The applicant is advised that this permission is on outline form only and that the illustrative 1:200 site plan shown on drawing no.0305/1 is not hereby approved.
 - 4 The applicant is advised that the design details should include a traditional hipped roof on the terrace and that the walls should be mainly finished in render, to match the prevailing character of development in this locality.
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (H1, H8, E6, E30, E45, T13); (SD1, SH1, H4, H5, D4, D5, D9, T13)
-

Continued/.....

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1. Impact on amenity and character
 2. Parking
 3. Consultation responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	H1, H8, E6, E30, E45, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SH1, H4, H5, D4, D5, D9, T13
Site Area:	0.079 ha
No. Residential Units:	4
Density:	51 dph
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- detached 1930s 'L' shaped bungalow with hipped roof and finished in render; attached garage but otherwise unextended
- site area of 790m² and frontage to road of 23m width
- no. 5, to south, a matching detached bungalow sited off the common boundary with attached garage to part adjacent side (two detached sheds to rear of garage) but unextended at rear
- property to north is Kenton Evangelical Church; sited off boundary with car park to adjacent side and common boundary delineated by 1.8m close boarded fence
- nos. 16 & 18 Westfield Drive both of single storey detached rear garden buildings adjacent to common boundary; no. 20 has smaller detached timber shed at rear but otherwise delineated by 1m fence
- nos. 1, 3 5 & 7 had formed a group of matching detached bungalows, however no. 1 redeveloped to form two detached houses 1989 (LBH/39107) and no. 3 redeveloped to form two yellow brick and render detached houses 1998 (EAST/43/98/FUL)
- surrounding area characterised by inter-war semi-detached and four-dwelling terraces finished in brick and render with hipped roofs
- on-street parking not controlled but there is a width restriction across road the road opposite the site

c) Proposal Details

- outline application for residential development
- four two storey terraced houses with forecourt parking

Continued/.....

d) Relevant History

LBH/9413: Existing Premises and Erection of Ten Two-Storey Terraced Houses with Integral Garages (Outline)	Demolition of GRANTED 09-OCT-73
HAR/7141/A: Four Flats and Four Garages (Outline);	Erection of GRANTED 08-JUL-60

e) Notifications

Sent: 11 Replies: 1 Expiry: 24/10/2003

Response: Cumulative impact of the proposal with the redevelopment of no. 3 on light and air, tree shown on the drawing to be retained should be removed due to damage to property (copy of structural report provided).

APPRAISAL

1. Amenity and Character

The application is in purely outline form, with all detailed matters reserved.

The existing detached bungalow, on a relatively spacious site, is out of character with the prevailing pattern and character of development in this locality. In this context it is not considered that there can be any objection to the loss of the existing bungalow, which is of no special merit in its own right, or the principle of redevelopment. The redevelopment of nos. 1 and 3, that has already taken place, further supports the planning potential for residential redevelopment of the application site.

The application seeks permission for the principle of four terraced houses with associated parking. Such a level of development would exceed that already allowed in respect of nos. 1 and 3, which each accommodate two detached houses. Redevelopment to four houses would equate to a density of 50.6 dwellings per hectare – within the range identified by PPG 3 as a more sustainable use of land. If four habitable rooms per terraced dwelling proposed is assumed, this equates to a density of 202.5 habitable rooms per hectare. Policy H5 of the emerging replacement UDP recommends a density range of between 125 and 200 habitable rooms per hectare. It is not considered that such a marginal excess above the upper threshold is so significant as to warrant refusal, having regard to central Government objectives for the provision of housing on brownfield land and in particular the continuing demand for small residential units within the Borough. The proposal would result in a density of development on the site more in keeping with that of the surrounding locality than the existing bungalow. In all of these circumstances the proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in density terms.

Continued/.....

As a development of four terraced houses, it is also considered that the proposal would be more in keeping with the form and pattern of development in the locality than the existing bungalow.

The submitted drawing includes a suggested site layout that is for illustrative purposes only. Whilst not, therefore, part of this determination, it is a useful indicator of the likely siting and size of a terrace on this site. It shows that a building could be sited on the site within 45° lines drawn, on plan, from the adjacent corners of no. 5 (there are no windows in the facing side elevation of no. 5) and that gaps of 1m (min)

between the flank walls and the site boundaries could be maintained. Accordingly it indicates that development of the site is achievable without necessarily causing detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring residential occupiers, by reason of excessive bulk, undue loss of light/outlook, nor the spatial character of the locality. While some overshadowing of the adjacent part of the site to the north may occur, as this is only used as a car park such a situation is not considered to be unacceptable.

The illustrative site layout also indicates an area of rear amenity space of (collectively) 360m². Such a level of provision would meet supplementary planning guidelines assuming four habitable rooms per dwelling and would not be significantly inconsistent with prevailing levels of provision for terraced dwellings in this locality. Accordingly it is considered that the site is capable of the level of development proposed without detriment to the character of the locality in this regard nor substandard living conditions for future occupiers. A rear garden depth reduced to 14m in places on the illustration is also indicative of a reasonable spatial and privacy relationship to property at the rear, again having regard to the existing local pattern of development.

2. Parking

A forecourt parking layout of six spaces is suggested, with manoeuvring space and a small landscaped area. Assuming three or four habitable rooms per dwelling proposed, the development would require a minimum of seven off-street parking spaces to meet the relevant standard of the adopted UDP. The emerging replacement UDP standards, when applied to the development, equate to a maximum of seven spaces. In view of the proximity of the site to local shops and services on Kenton Road, and accessibility to local bus routes using that road, it is considered that provision a little below seven spaces would be acceptable in highway safety terms. The size of the site is such that acceptable off-street provision could be

made at the front, after development to form four terraced houses, without detriment to highway users' convenience/safety and with sufficient space to provide some forecourt landscaping.

Continued/.....

A refuse and cycle storage facility is hinted at on the illustration. Its siting adjacent to the boundary with the car park would be acceptable in amenity terms and details of size/design would be the subject of the relevant reserved matters application.

In all other respects this outline application is considered to be acceptable.

4. Consultation responses

- Tree shown on the drawing to be retained should be removed due to damage to property: a civil matter between the objector and the applicant, not material to the planning decision.

All other matters as dealt with in the main report.

THE VAUGHAN CENTRE, 20Z WILSON GARDENS, P/2010/03/CRE/TW
HARROW

Ward: WEST HARROW

RENEWAL OF P.P W/780/00/LA3 FOR DET 2 STOREY BLOCK TO PROVIDE TWO 6
PLACE RES. UNITS ON VAUGHAN ROAD FRONTAGE WITH ACCESS AND PARKING.

DESIGN & BUILDING SERVICES for SOCIAL SERVICES DEPT

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: AR/S4476/10,/11

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Outline - Reserved Matters (Design, Appear., Landsc.)
- 3 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
 - (b) the boundary of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 5 Highway - Approval of Access(es)
- 6 Highway - Visibility - 3
- 7 Landscaping to be Approved
- 8 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 9 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.

Continued/.....

- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) AR/S4476/10, /11 have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.
- 11 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
(b) and vehicular access thereto
has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 12 The premises shall be used for the purpose specified on the application and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification).
REASON: (a) To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 13 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:
c: in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authority
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, and thereafter retained in accordance with those details.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 14 Water Storage Works
- 15 The proposed parking spaces shall be used only for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby approved and for no other use.
REASON: To ensure adequate parking provision is available for use by the occupants of the site.

Continued/.....

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, E51, H3, H15, T13, A4, C1, C9); (SD1, D4, D5, T13, C9)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

Application seeks renewal of permission WEST/780/0/LA3 there has been no change in circumstances since permission was granted.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, E51, H3, H15, T13, A4, C1, C9
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, T13, C9
Car Parking Standard: No standard
Justified: No Standard
Provided: 14
Site Area: 0.3 ha.
Council Interest: Freeholders

b) Site Description

- rectangular shaped plot of land at the junction of Vaughan Road and Wilson Gardens
- the site measures approximately 42m in width and 20m in depth
- the site is currently used in association with the day care use of the adjacent main building

c) Proposal Details

- outline application with siting and access to be considered at this stage
- proposed two storey building across the Vaughan Road frontage of the site
- the building would measure 35m in width and 9m in depth
- the building would accommodate 2 x six bedroom residential units for people with learning disabilities
- the proposed building would complement the services to be provided in the Vaughan Centre which would be refurbished

continued/

Item 2/09 - P/2010/03/CRE continued....

- rearrangements to the site as a whole would include revisions to the vehicular access and new landscaped and parking areas at the rear of the site to provide 13 car parking spaces and a mini-bus space
- the proposed residential units would have garden areas of 196m² and 182m²

d) Relevant History

W/780/00/LA3	Outline: Demolition of Extensions and Provision of Detached 2 Storey Building To Provide 2 Residential Units, Access and Parking	GRANTED 27-NOV-00
--------------	--	----------------------

e) Applicants Statement

A lengthy statement was submitted with the previous application.

Item 2/09 - P/2010/03/CRE continued....

f) Consultations

EA: No comments
TWU: No comments

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	181	2	05-OCT-2000

Response: 1 letter of no objection, subject to conditions, additional activity, loss of greenery, loss of light, out of character

APPRAISAL

There has been no material change in circumstances since the original report.

1) Consultation Responses

Addressed above.

CHANGE OF USE: CLASS C3-C2 (RESIDENTIAL TO CARE HOME) WITH SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO NUMBER 36.

MR J BENAİM for QFCC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: SB/176/2 dated 1/11/03; SB/H176/2 dated 13/10/03; SB/H176/3 dated 28/10/03

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 3 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 4 Noise from Plant and Machinery
- 5 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 6 The games room hereby permitted shall not be used outside the following times:-
 - (a) 09:00 hours to 19:00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive,
 - (c) 09:00 hours to 19:00 hours, Sundays or Bank Holidays,without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 7 The outbuilding hereby permitted shall only be used by residents/staff of 34 and 36 Shooters Avenue as a games room and not for any other purpose.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
 - 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H15, T13), (SD1, SH2, EP25, D4, T13, H15)
 - 5 The applicant is advised that this permission does not cover the crossover for vehicles at the front of the site.
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Housing Policy
 - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity
 - 3) Parking
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, E51, H15, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SH2, EP25, D4, T13, H15
Car Parking	Standard: 2 (no standard)
	Justified: 2 (no standard)
	Provided: 4
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- pair of mid-terrace houses on southern side of Shooters Avenue
- both properties are used separately to house 3 people with learning disabilities each
- both properties have hardsurfaced front gardens with space for 2 vehicles but no dropped kerbs
- no.34 has a single storey rear extension and rear dormer

c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension to no. 36, 2.9m in depth with monopitch roof over, to adjoin that existing at no.34
- detached building at far end of rear garden of both properties measuring 9.7m in width by 3.65m in depth by 4m in height to top of a pitched roof; building to provide games room for residents only
- change of use of properties from 2 separate dwellings into one combined care home
- dropped kerbs at front

d) Relevant History

EAST/191/93/FUL	Rear dormer window (to no.34)	GRANTED 16-JUL-93
-----------------	-------------------------------	----------------------

P/11/03/CFU	Change of Use: Class C3-C2 (residential to care home) with single storey rear extension and detached games room in rear garden	REFUSED 15-APR-03
-------------	--	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed games room in the rear garden would result in increased disturbance and general activity to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residents.”

e) Applicant's Statement

- games room would be for sole use of residents of 34 and 36 Shooters Avenue

f) Notifications	Sent 11	Replies Awaited	Expiry 03-DEC-03 continued/
------------------	------------	--------------------	-----------------------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Housing Policy

Use of the two properties as separate homes for people with learning difficulties has not required planning permission to date as each property had 6 or less residents living as a single household. Permission is now required as the properties would be formally combined, resulting in more than 6 residents (including staff) living together. There are no 'in-principle' conflicts with the Council's Housing Policies. The use has effectively occurred for several years and the provision of an additional rear extension and outbuilding would not in themselves affect the housing policy issues. The number of properties already converted in the road does not exceed the Council's policy guidelines.

2) Visual and Residential Amenity

The single storey rear extension would be the same size as those already existing at both no.34 and no. 38 adjoining. It would thus be in character and not give rise to any loss of visual amenity. This aspect of the proposal was not considered objectionable when the previous application was refused.

The garden outbuilding would be sited at the bottom of a 35m deep rear garden. No.38 adjoining has a building in a similar position as do other properties backing onto the site. The intended use is now solely for residents of nos. 34 and 36, previously visitors from other sites were proposed users. The building has also been reduced in size and an office deleted. Subject to restrictions on hours of use it is considered that this aspect of the proposal as now amended is acceptable.

3) Parking

The use of the two houses as a single care home would require 2 parking spaces under the approved UDP standards and 4 are provided. The revised deposit draft UDP has no specific standard but recommends a restraint-based approach. There are no parking restrictions on the road and it is not considered that there are any parking issues arising. The front gardens are already hardsurfaced and the provision of dropped kerbs will ease access.

4) Consultation Responses

Awaited

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION CONVERSION OF OUTBUILDING TO PROVIDE GRANNY ANNEXE, 2 REAR DORMERS

SUREPLAN (SOUTH BUCKS) LTD for MR & MRS SONI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Unnumbered locality plan; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton0a; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton1a; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton0h (amendment 02.11.03); HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton1h; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton2h; HA1 3PF/winw-hillmorton5h (amendment 02.11.03)

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Restrict Use of Extension

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals : (E5, E6, E38, E45), (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17)
 - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Use and Appearance of the Premises and Character of the Area
 - 2) Residential Amenity
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

Continued/....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17
Conservation Area	
Area of Special Character	
No. of Residential Units:	1
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- hipped-roof detached dwellinghouse on southern side of side-street off Orley Farm Road;
- to east: detached house;
- to west: cricket ground;
- to side/east of the house: detached pitched-roof garage with store to rear, along boundary with neighbouring property;
- gap of approx. 1.5m between house and outbuilding, but high-close-boarded gate between;
- neighbours have flat-roof extension to the side of their house that extends up to the shared boundary;
- some boundary vegetation is located forward of the structures;
- an area of hardstanding is located in front of garage.

c) Proposal Details

- construct two individual rear dormer windows (both featuring pitched/ hipped roof design);
- install two rooflights in the front roofslope;
- install a rooflight in each of the side roof slopes;
- construct a new front entrance porch, including pitched and tiled roof;
- construct an extension to the side of the dwelling, sited in the same location as the existing garage outbuilding, however the new extension would extend for the full width between the dwelling and side boundary. The extension would accommodate a recessed door to the front elevation, and would be internally linked to the main house. The design proposes a low pitched roof, whilst the external parapet wall of the extension has a maximum height of 3.0 metres;
- the extension is intended for use as a granny-annexe with the extension accommodating a single garage, shower, W.C, kitchen, bedroom and sitting room;

continued/

d) Relevant History

None

e) Consultations

CAAC: 1st Notification: design needs improving, bulk unacceptable, dormer too large & overpowering, balcony unsightly, velux windows on front elevation unacceptable, chimney to be removed, front door poorly designed, gap would be infilled, blank wall less than 1 metre from neighbouring property, concern that the annex could be sold off as separate unit which would be detrimental to character of conservation area, suggest legal agreement to prevent this from happening should the application be approved.

CAAC: 2nd Notification: does not meet previous objections, porch, dormer and balcony are totally unacceptable, annex is too large and unattractive, object to velux windows at front.

CAAC: 3rd Notification: dormers too large and should be set down from the ridge. Porch is poorly designed. Object to loss of gap between the buildings. Previous comments to earlier revisions of the proposal still apply where relevant.

Advertisement		Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 05-JUNE-03
1st Notification	Sent 5	Replies 4	Expiry 22-MAY-03

Response: Obtrusive, loss of space around building between buildings, works do not harmonise with existing building, out of character in the area, proposed hardsurfacing detrimental to visual amenities, proposed porch forward of building line and therefore out of character, roof dormer windows unsympathetic in terms of size, bulk and design, dormers overbearing and obtrusive, velux windows obtrusive, balcony obtrusive, proposal may be harmful to trees, demolition of building would require planning permission, overdevelopment, through-views would be lost.

continued/

2nd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	8	2	28-AUG-03

Response: Proposal would require demolition of existing garage and loss of open space to either side, this infilling of space is out of character of the area, would form an incongruous terrace with its neighbour, velux windows to the frontage would drastically change the appearance of the existing property and are obtrusive and out of character, although amended plans take into account some objections it however does not address the main issues of infilling of space and velux windows in the frontage roofslope. Other objections relating to hardsurfacing & character of area remain.

3rd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry

APPRAISAL

1) Use and Appearance of the Premises and Character of the Area

If question is to be raised about the loss of open space between buildings, it is highlighted that there is currently a single-storey building in the same location close to the plot boundary, filling almost the entire space between the dwelling houses. Therefore, there would only be a minimal and negligible loss of open space between the existing dwelling and neighbouring property if the proposed extension were constructed. Any concern regarding the prominence of the proposed extension has been reduced by the fact that it would be slightly set back from the front façade of the building (including a recessed front entrance door), and that the height of the extension has been minimised by proposing a low pitched roof. The associated parapet wall (with brick on edge and tile creasing), has been limited in height to 3.0 metres.

With respect of the use of the extension, this would be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse, ensuring that no separate residential unit would be created. A condition requiring the use of the extension to only be ancillary to the use of the main dwellinghouse will prevent it from being used a separate and self contained dwelling.

Although the rear dormer windows, are acknowledged as being quite prominent within the rear roofslope, they would nevertheless comply with design guidance and have space around them, whilst their design replicates the form and design of the existing roof.

continued/

The proposed front porch generally matches the style and design of the existing dwelling, and would not constitute an obtrusive addition to the front elevation of the existing dwelling.

Overall it is considered that the proposed scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2) Residential amenity

It is considered that the proposed building would not block out light to the neighbouring property or appear overbearing to the residents thereof. This conclusion is reached by virtue of the neighbouring property having been constructed up to the common boundary, whilst the design of the proposed extension has been limited in height by a low pitched roof and 3.0 metres external wall.

The proposed rear dormer windows would enable some increased overlooking of parts of the rear gardens of neighbouring residential properties. However, privacy could still be enjoyed given the proposal would not result in a level of overlooking and associated loss of privacy which would justify an objection to the scheme.

3) Consultation Responses

With respect of the demolition of the existing outbuilding, Conservation Area Consent would not be required as the building is under 115m³.

PROVISION OF NEW ROOF

MSK DESIGN ASSOCIATES for MR R MORTALI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 310-03-02, 310-03-02, OS Site Plan.

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

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E4, E5, E6, E38, E39, E45); (SD1, SD2, D4, D13, D16, D17, D18)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area
 - 2) Neighbouring Amenity
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E4, E5, E6, E38, E39, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D13, D16, D17, D18
TPO	
Conservation Area:	Canons Park Estate
Council Interest:	None

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- Located on the North side of Canons Drive;
- Comprises a 2 storey detached, 4 bedroom dwelling set on a large plot;
- Situated within the Canons Park Estate conservation area;
- The street scene comprises mainly large detached dwellings on sizeable open plots;
- Tudor style dwellings are a predominant design in the street which is also characterised by the large mature Redwood trees fronting properties;
- Canons Park and the North London Collegiate School are situated nearby.

c) Proposal Details

- The application proposes alterations to the roof design that would change it from the current hip-crown form to a basic hip form. The alterations would increase the overall height of the roof by 0.362m.

d) Relevant History

LBH/43336	Single and two storey side and front extensions	GRANTED 04-OCT-1991
LBH/18382	Erection of first floor extension to side of dwelling House	GRANTED 09-FEB-1981
LBH/15918	Erection of new front porch, two storey front and side extension And garage extension to other side of dwelling house	GRANTED 01-FEB-1980
LBH/9273/1	Erection of new front porch entrance	GRANTED 05-JUN-1978
LBH/9273	Erection of single storey rear extension to kitchen	GRANTED 23-AUG-1973

e) Consultations

CAAC: The drawings are inaccurate as the proposed side and front elevation drawings show a roof of a different height. Welcome the idea of improving the roof, which has unattractive flat sections, but suggest a steeper pitch and a higher roof would look better.

Notification	Sent 05	Replies 0	Expiry 30-OCT-03
---------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Continued/....

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area

The proposed roof alterations would change the basic roof form from a hip/crown to a hip form. This would alter the focal point from the front roof section to the hipped roof behind. The overall roof height would be increased by 0.362m from the highest point.

The existing dwelling is not of significant age or design being of a basic two-storey brick design with attached garage. The adjoining dwelling to the west is a newly constructed modern villa with a roof height similar to that proposed. The other neighbour to the east also has a roof height similar to that proposed.

The appearance and character of the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area is unlikely to be affected by the proposal and would therefore be preserved or maintained in accordance with plan policy.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

There are no significant impacts such as loss of light or privacy envisaged to neighbouring properties. The proposed roof form would not be significantly different from the existing form and the separating distances between properties are maintained.

3) Consultation Responses

The agent has been contacted relating to CAAC comments and drawing inaccuracies.

ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO FORM END GABLE AND REAR DORMER.

E HANNINGAN for MR & MRS WHITTINGTON

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 186A, Site Plan

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

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45); (S1, SD1, D4, D5)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Amenity and character
 - 2) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

This application is reported to the Committee as the applicant is an employee of the Council.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	S1, SD1, D4, D5
Council Interest:	Employee

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- Semi-detached dwelling on Vernon Drive, Stanmore with existing single storey rear extension
- Vernon Drive characterised by similar semi-detached properties
- Existing garages for Nos. 72 and 74 at end of shared driveway, to rear of dwellings
- Existing dormers at Nos.78 (including end gable), 84 and 88 (including end gable and front roof windows) on Vernon Drive
- Rear garden depth of 25m, with 10m trees forming part of boundaries with No.76 and open space to rear
- Rear garden boundaries with neighbouring dwellings formed by 1.8m timber fence

c) Proposal Details

- Extension of existing hipped roof to form gable
- Insertion of two front roof windows
- Rear Dormer
- Dormer cheeks 0.5m from party boundary with neighbouring dwelling and 1m from roof edge
- Rear face of dormer set back 1m measured externally along the roofslope from the eaves

d) Relevant History

LBH/8040	single storey rear extension	GRANTED 1972
----------	------------------------------	-----------------

e) Notifications

Sent: 3	Replies: 0	Expiry: 05-NOV-03
------------	---------------	----------------------

APPRAISAL

1. Amenity and character

The dormer and end gable would be perceptible from the adjoining rear gardens and the street, but in view of its modest bulk and careful siting would have no overbearing impact or adverse visual effect. In view of the precedent set by the existing dormers at Nos. 78, 84 and 88 the proposal could not be said to be out of character, and as a continuation of that neighbouring design detail neither could it be said to have an adverse visual impact.

The siting of the dormer in relation to the boundaries with the adjoining dwelling, the roof edge and the roof eaves would comply with the Council's guidelines. The cumulative effect of these relationships is to visually contain the dormer within the roofslope and to confine its bulk within the context of the roof over this and the neighbouring dwellings.

Continued/....

The windows in the rear dormer, which would serve a bedroom and en-suite, would be directed to look down the applicant's own garden. Overlooking of adjacent rear gardens would occur at only an oblique angle, consistent with existing first floor windows and as is perfectly normal in a residential setting. It is not considered that there is an unacceptable impact on the privacy amenities of the neighbouring occupiers – whether from actual or perceived overlooking.

2. Consultation Responses

None

FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION.

J HOBAN for K CHAUHAN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Job No. 1319 Drg No. 1; Site Plan Drg. No. 139/2

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

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E5, E6, E38, E45, H11); (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17, H11)
 - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance
 - 2) Residential Amenity
 - 3) Consultation Response
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45, H11
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17, H11
Conservation Area:	Canons Park Estate
Council Interest:	None

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- A semi-detached two storey house on eastern side of Lake View, north of the junction with Canons Drive;
- Site lies within Canons Park Estate Conservation Area;
- A covered carport and single storey garage/ outbuilding are located between the subject dwelling and the side boundary with the adjoining neighbour. The adjoining property has a similar covered carport and garage located between the common boundary and the neighbouring dwelling;

c) Proposal Details

- The construction of a first floor extension to the north east (rear) corner of the building;
- The first floor is to be constructed over an existing single storey extension and would create approximately 25 square metres of additional floor area;
- The roof form of the extension is proposed to be subservient to the main roof, retaining incorporating both hips and eaves;

d) Relevant History

EAST/44629/93/FUL	first floor rear extension	
GRANTED		22-
MAY-1992		

e) Consultations

CAAC: no objections.

Advertisement

Character of Conservation Area Expiry
10-JUL-03

Notification

Sent	Replies	Expiry
2	0	6-NOV-03

APPRAISAL

1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance

The proposed extension replicates design elements and materials that are complimentary to and in keeping with the character of the conservation area. The extension is sited to the rear of the existing building, with the roof form set below the main ridge to create a subservient addition. Overall the proposed extension would compliment the general style and design of the existing dwelling to ensure that the character and appearance of the conservation area would be preserved.

Continued/....

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed first floor extension would be sited between 2.7 metres to 3.6 metres from the side boundary, and would be sited adjacent to the neighbour's garage. Accordingly there are no concerns of the extension causing detrimental impacts of visual bulk, loss of light or overshadowing. Additionally no windows are proposed within the flank elevation that faces the neighbouring property. Therefore there are no concerns of detrimental overlooking impacts being caused.

3) Consultation Response

None

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOFSPACE.

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCIATES for MS K BURLEY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drawing No.: 1354/11, Drawing No.:1354/12A

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

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E1, E4, E5, E6, E8, E38, E39, E45, T13); (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, D4, D5, D16, D17, T13, H11)
 - 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance
 - 2) Residential Amenity
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E1, E4, E5, E6, E8, E38, E39, E45, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, D4, D5, D16, D17, T13, H11
Area of Special Character	
Conservation Area:	South Hill Avenue
Site Area:	1150m ²
Floorspace:	97m ²
Council Interest:	None
EARA	

Continued/.....

b) Site Description

- A detached two storey house sited on the northern side of South Hill Avenue, east of the junction with Mount Park Road;
- The dwelling on site is oriented towards the eastern side boundary
- Site lies within South Hill Avenue Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details

- Construct an extension to the north east rear corner of the building. The extension takes on the form a rear wing extending into the rear garden, sited generally parallel with the east side boundary. Due to the rise in natural ground level, an area would be excavated, including new garden retaining walls;
- The adjoining neighbour to the east accommodates a large outbuilding along to the common boundary, site in the immediate vicinity of the proposed works. This boundary wall is in excess of 2.0 metres in height, including a steep pitched roof that increases the overall height of the neighbouring building;
- The pitched roof design of the extension would accommodate a breakfast room, games room and w/c at ground and bedroom and bathroom within the roof space

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Consultations

CAAC: It is critical that the materials and detailing match. Design style is appropriate but concern that the extensions are disproportionately large in respect of existing building.

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area		Expiry 23-OCT-03
Notifications	Sent 4	Replies 1	Expiry 23-JUN-03

Response: The extension seems entirely in keeping with the house and the area and does not seem to present an overdevelopment of the site.

Harrow Hill Trust: As far as we can judge the extension appears to be well hidden at the rear of the house and appropriately designed. My Committee's concern is with the degree of overlooking of adjacent homes, something which can only be ascertained by inspection on site.

Continued/.....

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance

In response to the original concerns raised by Council's conservation officer, a site inspection was undertaken with the agent, conservation officer and the case officer. Whilst the site visit placated many of the initial concerns raised by the conservation officer, the on site meeting did result in some minor cosmetic modifications being made to the design of the building.

Despite the proposed additions being quite large, they would remain in character with the existing building and would generally harmonise with it. Likewise while the proposed additions would extend into the rear garden, its siting ensures that the buildings on site are generally oriented to eastern side of the property.

With respect of the proposed extension to the rear dormer, although it is acknowledged that it is large in scale it would retain a 1.0m metre offset from the edge of the roof hip to ensure that its roof slope is visible around it.

Lastly it is highlighted that none of the proposed works would be visible from the frontage of the site, thus it is considered that the proposal would protect the appearance and character of this part of the conservation area.

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed rear extension would accommodate two upper floor windows within the east flank (stairwell & bathroom). As these windows would have direct views onto the pitched roof of the adjoining outbuilding, there is no concern of these windows posing overlooking impacts. Likewise neighbouring outbuilding sited along the common boundary prevents the proposed works causing any visual bulk or overshadowing impacts.

With respect of the extended dormer within the rear roof slope, there is no concern of this causing detrimental overlooking impact as it is site 23 metres from the rear boundary.

3) Consultation Responses

All relevant planning issues are addressed in the report.

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER

A D A ARCHITECTURE for MRS ADA LUI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 02A, 03, 04, 05, 06, 09A, 10; 07B and 08 received 13-NOV-03.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no 09A. shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 5 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.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall Etc Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45); (S1, SD1, D4, D5)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Residential amenity and character
 - 2) Consultation responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to the Planning Committee at the request of a nominated Member on 15 October, but determination was deferred at officers request to obtain revised drawings showing a parapet detail to match that the adjoining property and then re-notification. Revised drawings have now been received and are the subject of consultation.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	S1, SD1, D4, D5
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- mid-terrace dwelling on east side of Elm Park, Stanmore; unextended but with outbuilding at end of rear garden
- neighbouring end of terrace property to south, no. 76, has two storey rear projection across full width of dwelling to depth of 1.2m; rear elevation contains glazed door and side windows to galley kitchen 0.91m from adjacent rear corner
- neighbouring mid-terrace property to north, no. 72, has single storey lean-to at nearest part of rear with flank wall adjacent to the boundary est. 1-2m deep; two storey extension beyond
- Manor House Estate to rear

c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension
 - 2.4m deep across a width of 2.23m from the boundary with no. 72 (flank wall adjacent to boundary); projects an additional 1.2m thereafter
 - back door faces boundary with no. 72 at a distance of 2.23m
 - 2.4m deep adjacent to boundary with no. 76
 - flat roof to height of 2.95m
- first floor rear extension
 - 1.2m deep across a width of 2.37m from the boundary with no. 76
 - north flank wall sited 2.4m from boundary with no. 72
 - flat roof to overall height of 6m above ground level
- rear dormer
 - dormer cheeks 0.5m from boundaries with neighbouring dwellings
 - rear face of dormer set back 1.2m measured externally along the roofslope from the eaves
 -

continued/

d) Relevant History

None.

e) 1st Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	3	4	05-SEP-03

Response: Overshadowing, loss of light and loss of outlook to no. 76, impact on views from dining room, kitchen and bedroom at no. 76, enjoyment of patio and garden adversely affected, lack of existing boundary treatment between 74 and 76 exacerbates impact, overlooking of gardens of 72 and 76 from dormer window (rooflights more suitable), over-development (esp. in view of rear outbuilding and restricted size of site), out of keeping with character and appearance of area, extensions not in scale with terrace, height over-dominates original and neighbouring buildings, dormer is alien feature to terrace, original building makes positive contribution to terrace, flat roof of dormer detrimental to appearance of terrace, contrary to UDP policies and SPG guidelines, letter should be made available to committee, request to speak to committee, conditions suggested (to cover non-use of roof as balcony, matching materials, trellis & landscaping to be provided on boundary with 76), guidelines state that proposals should be assessed against site circumstances and proposal is not acceptable in these regards, nature of terrace fundamentally altered, occupiers of no. 72 are abroad, property value affected, garden aspect changed; no objection subject to right to light survey.

2nd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	5	0	09-OCT-03

Response: Awaited.

3rd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	5	Awaited	09-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1. Residential amenity and character

The rearward projection of the single storey extension would comply with the Council's guidelines for such developments to terraced dwellings. In this circumstance and having regard to its modest height, it is considered that the effect of the single storey extension on ambient light to, and outlook from, the adjoining properties would fall within acceptable parameters.

Continued/....

The extension would be located north/north west of no. 76 and would not, therefore, give rise to any significant overshadowing of that neighbouring property. Conversely, the extension would be located south/south-west of no. 72; whilst some overshadowing would therefore occur, in view of the circumstances described above it is again considered that this would not exceed that which is considered to be acceptable in respect of a residential terrace.

The applicant's agent has undertaken to supply an amended plan omitting the flank door facing no. 72. Subject to the receipt of such a drawing it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of that neighbouring property by reason of noise/disturbance or overlooking.

The depth of the first floor extension would match that of the two storey projection at no. 76. Accordingly there would be no impact on light to, or outlook from, that property. In relation to no. 72, the first floor would fall well within a 45° line drawn, on plan, from the adjacent first floor corner of that neighbouring property. In this circumstance and in view of the siting of the flank wall from the common boundary, neither is it considered that there would be any detriment by reason of lost light and outlook when viewed from the adjacent rear windows.

The extension would be perceptible from the adjoining rear gardens, but in view of its modest bulk and careful siting would have no overbearing impact of adverse visual effect.

The Council's supplementary planning guidelines advise that a pitched roof will normally be required on two storey extensions to reflect the design of the existing roof. In view of the adjacent flat roof two storey addition at no. 76, however, the proposal could not be said to be out of character, and as a continuation of that neighbouring design detail neither could it be said to have an adverse visual impact. In these circumstances a reason for refusal on the basis of the roof form would not be reasonable and would be unlikely to be sustained.

The siting of the dormer in relation to the boundaries with the adjoining terraced dwellings and the roof eaves would comply with the Council's guidelines. The roof of the dormer would be set below the ridge. The cumulative effect of these relationships is to visually contain the dormer within the roofslope and to confine its bulk with the context of the roof over this and the neighbouring dwellings.

continued/

The windows in the rear dormer, which would serve a bedroom, would be directed to look down the applicant's own garden. Overlooking of adjacent rear gardens would occur at only an oblique angle, consistent with existing first floor windows and as is perfectly normal in a residential setting. Whilst the level of the windows is elevated relative to those existing at first floor, this is also a situation that commonly occurs as part of the incremental change in character of residential areas. It is not considered that the resulting impact on the privacy amenities of the neighbouring occupiers – whether from actual or perceived overlooking – would be so significant as to warrant refusal.

The rear garden depth would be reduced, at its shortest point, to some 21m. Such a distance would reasonably reflect the depth of gardens prevailing in this locality, where extensions have taken place, and would therefore safeguard the character and amenity of the locality.

The external finish of the extension and future window openings in the flank walls could be reasonably controlled by condition. Similarly the use of the roof area as a balcony can also be prevented by condition.

Notwithstanding that the extensions comply with guidelines and are considered to be acceptable, Members are reminded that some of the individual elements – the dormer and single storey extension – may on their own be permitted development. In the event of a permitted addition there would be no control of the siting of the rear dormer in relation to the eaves and roof edge, and the permitted height limit for a single storey extension is 4m – lower than that the subject of this application.

In all other respects, having regard to the Council's updated supplementary planning guidance "Extensions: A Householders' Guide", and subject to the conditions suggested, it is considered that the proposed extensions would have no unreasonable effect on the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers or the character/amenity of this locality.

An amended plan re-siting the door to the rear elevation has been received. It has been substituted with a window, which subject to the suggested considerations is considered to be acceptable.

4. Consultation Responses

- impact on views from dining room, kitchen and bedroom at no. 76 – loss of views not a material planning consideration (impact on outlook addressed above)
- lack of existing boundary treatment between 74 and 76 exacerbates impact – the proposal is considered to be acceptable in its own right
- over-development – it is not considered that the proposal would result in the over-development of the site

continued/

Item 2/16 - P/1708/03/CFU continued.....

- extensions not in scale with terrace – the relationship of the extensions with the terrace is as outlined above and is considered to be acceptable
- dormer is alien feature to terrace – although this is a new feature to the terrace, such additions are considered to be acceptable in residential localities
- original building makes positive contribution to terrace – it is not considered that the changes to the original building would harm the character or appearance of the terrace
- flat roof of dormer detrimental to appearance of terrace – considered acceptable
- contrary to UDP policies and SPG guidelines – the proposal would comply with guidelines and UDP policies
- letter should be made available to committee – material points of letters summarised in report in accordance with established procedure
- request to speak to committee – opportunity available
- right to light survey – impact on light incorporated within Council guidelines
- conditions suggested (to cover non-use of roof as balcony, matching materials, trellis & landscaping to be provided on boundary with 76) – as suggested; trellis and landscaping on boundary not necessary or reasonable as the proposal is acceptable in its own right and having regard to the domestic nature of the development proposed
- occupiers of no. 72 are abroad – impact on all neighbouring occupiers considered
- property value affected – not a material planning consideration

All other matters as set out in the appraisal.

24 & 26 HEADSTONE DRIVE, HARROW

2/17

P/2117/03/CFU/GM

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CHANGE OF USE: SHOP (CLASS A1)
TO A3 (FOOD & DRINK).

THRESHOLD LAND & ESTATES LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: TP1; 2; 3; 4; 5

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 3 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 4 Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
- 5 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 6 Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Use
- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
 - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
 - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

- 8 Shop Window Display

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 21 – Bottle Recycling
 - 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 3 Standard Informative 37 - Litter Bin Outside Premises
 - 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E51, S14, T13, A4), (EP25, SD1, T13, EM18, EM28, C20)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Policy
 - 2) Parking
 - 3) Residential Amenity
 - 4) Accessibility
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E51, S14, T13, A4
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EP25, SD1, T13, EM18, EM28, C20
Town Centre	Wealdstone
Car Parking	Standard: 11 (no additional)
	Justified: 7 (no additional)
	Provided: 0
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- ground floor terraced commercial premises within secondary retail frontage of Wealdstone District Centre
- 2 floors of office floorspace above however recent permission for conversion to residential including an additional floor
- terrace currently comprises the following uses on the ground floor: post office (A1), off-licence (A1), hairdressers/beautician (A1), cake shop (A1), vacant (A1, the application site, was art shop), computer shop (A3, the application site, unimplemented permission exists for the A3 use), electrical shop (A3, unimplemented permission granted recently, restaurant A3); 5 x A1, 3 x A3
- parking available in pay and display spaces at front in lay-by off cul-de-sac, servicing available from rear yard

c) Proposal Details

- change of use of ground floor of no.24 in conjunction with no.26 for use for Class A3 purposes

d) Relevant History

EAST/1279/02/FUL	Change of use: 1st/2nd floor offices to residential, new 3rd floor (total 33 flats), new shop/restaurant (ground floor), parking, bin/bike store	GRANTED 17-JAN-03
------------------	--	----------------------

e) Applicant's Statement

- premises are in a secondary shopping frontage
- new access to residential use above granted planning permission involves loss of floorspace of no.24, making remainder of unit non-viable
- proposal seeks to combine unit with no.26 and appeal to wider market
- active use will promote economic activity

continued/

f)	Notifications	Sent 63	Replies 1	Expiry 22-OCT-03
	Response: Object to additional A3 use due to competition.			

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy

The recent permission for change of use of the upper floors to residential also involved a renovation of the ground floor, an additional A1/A3 unit and a new entrance for the residential use. This would involve the loss of part of no.24, effectively reducing the unit in size particularly at the front. The current proposal seeks a change of use of the remainder of no. 24 and its amalgamation with no. 26 (the latter already has an unimplemented planning permission for A3 use). There would therefore be only a limited loss of retail frontage. The total percentage of non-retail use in the Centre would still be below the 50% threshold of Policy EM18 of the revised deposit draft UDP.

In terms of concentration, whilst there would be a run of 4 units (and possibly 5 including the new unit to be constructed under permission EAST/1279/02/FUL) in A3 use, these would be in a peripheral location at the far end of the terrace from the main high street. In these circumstances it is not considered that there would be a harmful concentration. The main A1 use in the parade with the largest frontage would remain the post office, situated at the other end of the parade, closest to the key retail frontage.

In the above circumstances it is not considered that there would be any conflict with the Council's retail policies.

2) Parking

Notwithstanding the lack of parking for the proposed use, the site lies within a district centre location where there is very good public transport accessibility. There are also public pay and display parking spaces in the vicinity and no objections are raised on parking grounds.

3) Residential Amenity

The use proposed is appropriate for a town centre location and the relationship with adjacent residential premises is to be expected in such areas. Conditions relating to noise, odours and hours of use are recommended to safeguard residential amenity.

4) Accessibility

No changes to the previously approved shopfront are proposed at this stage. The unit is accessible with double width doors to the street.

5) Consultation Responses

Competition with other A3 uses in the vicinity is not a legitimate planning issue.

3/01

9 BUCKINGHAM PARADE, THE BROADWAY, P/2279/03/CFU/JH
STANMORE

Ward: STANMORE PARK

CHANGE OF USE: RETAIL TO FOOD AND DRINK (CLASS A1 TO A3)

STANWOOD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES for BUCKINGHAM BOULANGERIE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drawing No.0111 received 25 Sept 2003, OS Site plan.

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

- 1 Loss of Retail Frontage – Centre - Concentration

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E51, S5, S14, T13 & A4); (EP25, T13, EM18, EM26 & C20)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Policy
- 2) Neighbouring Amenity
- 3) Accessibility
- 4) Parking
- 5) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E51, S5, S14, T13 & A4	
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EP25, T13, EM18, EM26 & C20	
Town Centre	Stanmore	
Car Parking	Standard:	} See Report
	Justified:	
	Provided:	
Floorspace:	92.06m ²	
Council Interest:	None	

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- North-east side of Buckingham Parade adjacent to Stanmore Hill;
- Occupied by ground-floor retail unit (Bakery) with two floors of offices above;
- Site located within secondary frontage of Stanmore District Centre in parade 1-12 Buckingham Parade. Starting at No.1 existing uses are as follows: Public House (A3), Charity (A1), Florist (A1), Travel Agent (A1), Chemist (A1), Clothes Shop (A1), Clothes (A1), Betting Shop (A2), Bakers (A1), Hairdresser (A1), Restaurant (A3), Restaurant (A3).

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use from retail to food and drink, consumption on premises (A1-A3). The applicant proposes the use of part of the premises for a patisserie with a few tables. The application does not propose any external modifications to the building, hours of operation, staff numbers, or proposed signage.

d) Relevant History

LBH/41932	Shop Front	GRANTED 04-DEC-1990
-----------	------------	------------------------

e) Consultations

Notification	Sent 06	Replies 1	Expiry 3-FEB-03
---------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------

Response: The premises are totally unsuitable for the proposed change of use and will have an adverse affect upon business and the parade generally.

1) Retail Policy

Policy S14 of the adopted UDP and EM18 of the Deposit Replacement Plan allow for changes of use in the secondary frontages of District Centres provided that a harmful concentration of non-retail uses is not created or added to and an appropriate window display is maintained.

The proposal would give rise to 7 x A1 uses and 5 non-A1 uses in the designated parade. The proposed use would be located between an A2 and A1 unit followed by two A3 units at the end of the parade. Policy EM18 states that the form of concentration may vary according to circumstances. A harmful concentration is most likely to arise when a cluster or group of non-retail uses, not all of which may necessarily be consecutive, begin to predominate within a significant length of frontage and so prejudice the retail function of that frontage.

Continued/....

In these circumstances it is considered that although the non-retail uses are not strictly in consecutive order, a harmful concentration of non-A1 uses would be created where four out of the five non-retail uses within the parade would be situated to the northern end. This could adversely impact on the retail function of the frontage at that end of the parade.

Both policies (S14 & EM18) require the need to maintain the majority of frontage in retail use. With this in mind the draft UDP stipulates that the length of secondary frontage in non-retail use should not exceed 50% of the total. The existing percentage in both the current and replacement UDP would increase from 45.32% to 46.37% if the application were granted. In this respect the resulting figures would satisfy the plan requirements.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

While there is no immediate residential use adjoining the location, were the proposal to be acceptable in other respects, conditions could be imposed to take account of noise, fume emissions and hours of use, in order to safeguard the amenities of the area.

3) Accessibility

The current application is for a change of use only and does not propose any modifications to the shopfront or layout. Were the proposal to be acceptable in other respects, conditions could be imposed to take account of Access obligations.

4) Parking

In the revised Deposit Draft UDP the parking requirement for an A3 use is the same as for a retail unit. The subject property is an existing retail unit therefore the parking requirements would remain the same. Sufficient parking is provided on Buckingham Parade adjacent to the shop. A large service area together with parking is also provided to the rear of the units on Buckingham Parade.

5) Consultation Responses

Addressed by report.

CHANGE OF USE: SHOP TO RESTAURANT (CLASS A1-A3) ON GROUND FLOOR AND BASEMENT WITH PARKING AT REAR.

K HANDA for MR V KATARIA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordinance survey plan
KH/VK/COU/PLNG/0903/01

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

- 1 Refusal - Loss of Retail Frontage - Parade

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E5, E6, E 38, E39, E51, S13, T13, A4); (EP25, T13, EM17, EM26, C20, SD1, SD2, D4,D16,D17,D18)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Policy
 - 2) Parking
 - 3) Residential Amenity
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E 38, E39, E51, S13, T13, A4
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EP25, T13, EM17, EM26, C20, SD1, SD2, D4,D16,D17,D18)
Town Centre	Rayners Lane
Council Interest:	None

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- A1 retail unit (supermarket) located in the primary retail frontage of Rayners Lane District Centre. The site currently uses the frontage of 3 shop units. Adjacent to main road, residential units above;
- Located approximately 170 metres south of the Rayners Lane Station within the Rayners Lane Conservation Area;
- Property lies in a parade of 33 units consisting of the following uses: Laundrette (SG); Post Office (A1); Greengrocer (A1); Take Away (A3); Window Shop (A1); Photo Shop (A1); Vacant (A1); Super Market (A1); Optician (A1); Charity (A1); Restaurant (A3); Tile Shop (A1); Restaurant (A3); Stationers (A1); Curtain Shop (A1); Rest./Take Away (A3); Estate agents (A2); Restaurant (A3); Vacant (A1); Print Shop (A1); Lawyers (A2); Hardware Shop (A1); Bakery (A3); Grocer (A1); Sandwich Bar (A3); Restaurant (A3); Hairdressers (A1); Dry Cleaners (A1); Nail Shop (A1); Vacant (A1) (19 x A1, 2 x A2, 8 x A3, 1 x SG).
- On the opposite side of Alexandra Avenue lies a parade of shops with secondary frontages within the Rayners Lane District Centre;
- To the rear of the site is a heavily used service lane with a notable rubbish problem.

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use from shop to 100-seat restaurant (Class A1 to A3). The application does not propose any external modifications to the building, nor provides detail of the restaurant type, hours of operation, staff numbers, or proposed signage. The proposal relates to two out of three units currently in use as a supermarket. The remaining unit will presumably remain in A1 usage.

d) Relevant History

None

e) Consultations

Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	28	3	22-OCT-03

Response: Area currently suffers from noise pollution and disturbance 7 days a week from 6am - midnight, attributable to shops; increasing vermin problem caused by food shops in service road; increased problem of fly tipping in service lane periodically cleaned up by the Council; additional parking proposed would increase problems of noise and manoeuvrability; an increase in the number of restaurants has caused traffic problems in the area; addition of another restaurant is unnecessary and would further impact on quality of life.

Continued/....

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy

Given the location of the site within a primary frontage, the relevant policies in considering the proposed change of use are S13 of the adopted UDP and EM17 of the UDP – Revised Deposit Draft, March 2002.

Both of the above policies require that:

- “The proposed use provides a service that is directly related to a shopping trip and supports the retail function of the centre” – An A3 use is appropriate for this town centre location.
- “A harmful concentration of non-retail use is not created or added to” – The parade has 33 units, consisting of 19 A1 uses (including the application site encompassing 3 shop frontages), 2 A2 uses, 8 A3 uses and 1 SG use. Directly adjacent to either side of the subject property lie A1 use premises. Therefore the conversion of 2 out of 3 of the units currently used as A1 retail to A3 would not be considered a harmful concentration.
- “The length of the primary frontage in non-retail use at street level in the centre (including any outstanding permissions) would not exceed 25% of the total.” The percentage of non-retail use in the Rayners Lane District Centre is currently 33.94% and therefore already exceeds the allowable total. Any further change of use such as that proposed would further exceed the allowable total and potentially impact upon the retail function of the district centre.
- “In other respects a window display or other frontage appropriate to the shopping area would be maintained” – and were the application acceptable in other respects, this could be controlled by a condition.

In addition the emerging UDP (2002) requires that:

- “Parking is provided in accordance with the councils standards” – see parking discussion below.
- “The premises can be adequately serviced without causing harm to highway safety and convenience” – a service lane to the rear of the site would satisfy these requirements.

Continued/....

Therefore, although the proposal would not conflict with a number of the key points outlined by the retail policy, the total length of the primary frontage allowable in non-retail use would be further compromised contrary to plan policy. The cumulative effect of the growth of non-retail uses could adversely impact on the character of the centre and undermine its vitality and viability.

6) Parking and Highway Considerations

In the revised Deposit Draft UDP the parking requirement for an A3 use is the same as for a retail unit. Although there is a lack of parking along the parade, a number of parking spaces associated with the A1 usage exist at the rear of the site off the service lane.

7) Residential Amenity

Although there is residential accommodation above properties in the parade, were the proposal to be acceptable in other respects, conditions could be imposed to take account of noise and fume emissions and hours of use, in order to safeguard the amenities of the occupants.

8) Consultation Responses

Were the proposal acceptable in other respects, conditions could be imposed to take account of noise and fume emissions and hours of use, in order to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residences.

664 VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP, UXBRIDGE

4/01
P/1727/03/CNA/TEM
Ward: None

CONSULTATION: PROVISION OF CAR SHOWROOM (2985M SQ) AND 2 RETAIL UNITS (1796M SQ) WITH PARKING AND ACCESS.

LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 4157 P30, P31, P32, P33

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

INFORMATIVE:

1 Standard Informative 34 – Consultation as a Neighbouring Local Planning Authority

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Retail Impact
 - 2) Visual Impact
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- site is to the west of Victoria Retail Park between Victoria Road and Central line railway
- occupied by disused warehouses

c) Proposal Details

- Redevelopment of site to provide car sales/showroom and 2 retail units
- 2-storey high buildings, metal clad and glazed elevations
- total floorspace of approximately 4781m²
- two new retail units 1796m²
- car showroom with workshop 2985m²
- car parking for 300 vehicles
- creating 40 new jobs

d) Relevant History

None

continued/

Item 4/01 – P/1727/03/CAN continued.....

e)	Notifications	Sent 2	Replies 0	Expiry 03-SEP-03
-----------	----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

- 1) Retail Impact**
The proposal has no material retail implications for this Borough.
- 2) Visual Impact**
This proposal to redevelop a disused warehouse would have no impact on the appearance of this Borough given its location some 700m from the Borough boundary.
- 3) Consultation Responses**
None.