

SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

RAYNERS LANE ESTATE, RAYNERS LANE

1/01

P/2209/03/CFU/TW

Ward: ROXBOURNE

RAYNERS LANE REGENERATION PHASE B: PROVISION OF 106 HOUSES AND FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING SPACE

MEPK ARCHITECTS for WARDEN HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD

RECOMMENDATION

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

Plan Nos: P-01; P-02/A; P-03/A; P-04/A; P-05/A; P-06/A; P-07/A; P-08/A; P-09/A; P-10/A; P-11/A; P-12/A; P-13/A; P-14/A; P-15/A; P-16/A; P-17/A; P-18; P-19/A; P-20/A; P-21; P-22; P-23/A; P-24; P-25; P-26/A; P-27/A; P-28/A; P-29/A; P-30/A; P-31/A; P-32/A; P-33; P-34; P-100

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
 - 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
 - 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, T13); (SD1, D4, D5, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, T13
Density:	77 dph 271 hrph
Council Interest:	Land formerly owned by Council

continued/

b) Site Description

- Application relates to an area of the Rayners Lane Estate at its north western end
- The site encompasses properties within Thackeray Close, Goldsmith Close and bounded to the rear by Rayners Lane
- The site to the east/south east is currently under construction being the first phase of the redevelopment of the Estate

c) Proposal Details

- Details of reserved matters, pursuant to outline approval W/112/02/FUL
- Demolition of the existing properties and construction of 50 houses and 56 flats with car parking
- Generally, the flats would be 4 storeys in height and are proposed to be sited adjacent to the road junctions. The houses would generally be of two storeys, many with rooms within the roof space

d) Relevant History

WEST/112/02/OUT	Outline: Regeneration of estate, demolition of 515 of flats, construction of 329 houses, 406 flats with parking, community building, public open space.	GRANTED SUBJECT TO S.106 AGREEMENT
-----------------	---	---

e) Consultations

TWU: No Objections

Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry 20-NOV-03
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Notifications	Sent 818	Replies 0	Expiry 12-NOV-03
----------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Character of the Area

As was acknowledged at the outline stage the redevelopment of the estate as a whole provides the opportunity to address a number of current concerns with the estate – improving housing conditions, providing accommodation better suited to

Continued/.....

residents needs, and, by radically changing the built form and layout, making better use of the site to secure an addition to the Borough's housing stock. Unlike the present estate, the proposals (including those for the wider estate) would provide a residential environment more characteristic of suburban Harrow.

The proposal shows a more traditional pattern of development with dwellings fronting and being accessed from the street.

The proposal contains areas within the site designated as 'Home Zones'. These are areas where, although vehicular access is permitted, priority through the layout and design, is given to pedestrians, and vehicle speeds are reduced.

The density of the proposed development would be 77 units per hectare or 271 habitable rooms per hectare which is only marginally above that envisaged for the remainder of the redeveloped estate as a whole of 72 and 248 respectively, one reason being that this phase does not contain any of the elements of public open space, which would reduce the overall density.

The design and external appearance of the proposals are traditional in form and detail and follow those of the flats under construction in phase A. The proposed houses would have brick and render elevations and tiled hipped and pitched roofs. Many of the houses make use of the roofspace to provide additional accommodation.

2) Car Parking

A total of 85 spaces are proposed for the 106 new units (0.8 per unit). A recent survey of car ownership within the estate has shown an ownership of 174 cars for 259 householders ie a rate of 0.67 cars per household. The outline approval contained provision for 1.4 spaces for the properties for sale and 0.8 spaces per dwelling for the remainder of the dwellings. This application is therefore in accord with the outline approval.

3) Legal Agreement

As this application is for reserved matters pursuant to the outline consent, if approved, the development would be subject to the legal agreement.

4) Consultation Responses

None.

PARKVILLE HOUSE, RED LION PARADE, BRIDGE ST, PINNER P/2284/03/CFU/GM

Ward: PINNER

CHANGE OF USE: OFFICE TO RESIDENTIAL (CLASS B1 TO C3) ON FIRST AND SECOND FLOORS AND PROVISION OF ADDITIONAL FLOOR TO PROVIDE 21 RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED FLATS WITH EXTERNAL STAIRS

SANDERSON ASSOCIATE for AUGER INVESTMENTS PLC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 03632/01; 02A; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 00529/10.

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 Refuse Arrangements - Buildings

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 5 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 6 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E46, E47, H3, H8, EM1, New Employment Policy, T13); (SD1, D4, D5, T13, H4, H5, EM16)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Visual and Residential Amenity
 - 2) Density/Housing Policy
 - 3) Employment Policy
 - 4) Accessibility
 - 5) Parking
 - 6) Consultation Responses
-

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E46, E47, H3, H8, EM1, New Employment Policy, T13		
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, T13, H4, H5, EM16)		
Town Centre	Pinner		
Car Parking	Standard:	30	(28)
	Justified:	30	(28)
	Provided:	22	
Site Area:	0.12h		
Habitable Rooms:	54		
No. of Residential Units:	21		
Density:	175 dph	450 hrph	
Council Interest:	None		

} See Report

b) Site Description

- 3 storey building with flat roof over on eastern side of road at junction of Bridge Street with Love Lane
- comprises 8 retail/commercial units on ground floor with 2 floors of offices above
- planning permission granted 5 June 2002 for additional floor of offices within new pitched roof but not yet implemented
- rear car park of 28 spaces with access from Love Lane

c) Proposal Details

- Provision of additional floor within new pitched roof and a change of use of the 1st and 2nd floor offices to provide a total of 21 flats
- External staircase at rear with access walkways to 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors supported on steelwork frame
- Roof fronting Marsh Road would be of a mansard design with gable projecting features interspersed by dormer windows
- Rear parking for 30 cars, of which 8 are for the retail units on the ground floor and 22 for the residential units

d) Relevant History

HAR/3280/C	Erection Of 8 Retail Shops With 2 Floors Of Offices And Car Parking (Outline)	GRANTED 01-NOV-62
HAR/3280/D	Erection Of 8 Retail Shops With 2 Floors Of Offices And Car Parking Over	GRANTED 13-JUN-63
WEST/200/02/FUL	Provision Of Additional Floor Of Offices Within New Pitched Roof	GRANTED 05-JUN-02

Continued/.....

e) Applicant's Statement

- Proposal similar physically to previous consent with addition of new access decks at rear
- Ideal position for location of mixed 1 and 2 bedroom units
- Since original consent owners/applicants have sought to create a viable all office scheme to no avail
- Oversupply of office space in Pinner town centre
- Demand for residential use in location high
- There are currently 8 reserved parking spaces for the retail units and these are to remain
- The new layout at the rear will improve the existing arrangements introducing property turning space and refuse storage arrangements
- The applicant is willing to accept the residential permit restriction for the development

f) Advertisement

Major Development

Expiry
25-DEC-03

Notifications

Sent
83

Replies
1

Expiry
24-DEC-03

Response: No objection to change of use of 1st and 2nd floors but consider addition of a floor to an ugly building unacceptable; disruption from construction work; insufficient parking; precedent for similar development; concern at proximity to River Pinn; should build on empty fields of George V Avenue instead; concern at adequacy of foundations.

APPRAISAL

1) Visual and Residential Amenity

The existing building is of a rather bland 1960's design with a flat roof. It does not make a positive contribution to the streetscene, and is not in keeping with the more articulated frontages of much of the remainder of Pinner Centre. The Committee took the view with the previous proposal, which was identical at the frontage onto Marsh Road in physical terms, that the additional bulk helped improve the appearance of the building within the streetscene. The additional rear walkways would have no amenity impact and have been designed to take account of an approved extension and alterations to the adjacent terrace 4 – 12 Bridge Street (ref: P/478/03/CFU).

In terms of amenity of future occupiers, the lack of usable amenity space is considered to be outweighed by the considerable advantages offered by the town centre location. There is also the Pinner Memorial Park close by. Committee concurred with this view in allowing flats above the adjacent terrace 4-12 Bridge Street.

Continued/.....

2) Density/Housing Policy

In simple mathematical terms the density appears high at 175 dwellings per hectare. This is appropriate to the location within a town centre however where the units to be provided are relatively small. The provision of accommodation above shops accords with the Council's housing and retail policies as it serves to bring activity into the centre improving security and provides much needed smaller affordable accommodation.

3) Employment Policy

In strict terms there is a conflict with the Council's employment policies as there would be a loss of potential office floorspace. In practical terms however, the floorspace has not yet been built and there would thus be no loss of employment. The applicant has sought to market the property with the unimplemented office floorspace permission without success. Given the present availability of office space within the locality it is considered that the conflict should not be an overriding issue.

4) Accessibility

The property would have a lift as well as staircase access and parking for disabled persons. A planning condition and informative are proposed to ensure satisfactory accessibility.

5) Parking

There would be a total of 30 parking spaces of which 22 would be for the residential use with 8 for the existing commercial uses. There would be no change to the rear service area. Given the town centre location, access to public transport and the description of the flats as resident permit restricted it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal could be justified. Committee agreed with this approach in allowing flats above the adjacent terrace 4 –12 Bridge Street.

6) Consultation Responses

The additional floor has already been considered acceptable from a visual perspective by virtue of the earlier consent for offices. It is considered that it would improve the appearance of the building. All building work inevitably causes some disruption however this would not in itself constitute a justification for refusal. Parking is addressed in the report. Each planning application is assessed on its own merits and it is not considered there would be an issue of precedent. There have been no objections from the Environment Agency or the Council's Drainage Engineers. Foundations would be assessed as part of a building regulation application and not a planning application. Any future applications to develop on the open land off George V Avenue would be assessed on its merits.

REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 3 STOREY BLOCK OF 12 FLATS WITH BASEMENT PARKING

HOME PLANS for BERMA LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1038/1B, 2

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, excessive bulk and siting, would be visually obtrusive and out of sympathy with the scale of neighbouring properties, and by reason also of an excessive number of units and associated levels of activity, would result in an overdevelopment and over-intensive use of the site, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of its size, excessive bulk and siting, would be obtrusive in relation to neighbouring residential properties, result in the loss of outlook and give rise to overlooking of neighbouring properties, to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity.
- 3 An excessive amount of hardsurfacing would be provided at the front of the proposed building, and give rise to an excessive length of vehicle crossing, to the detriment of the appearance of the area and the safety and convenience of pedestrians.
- 4 The proposal fails to provide satisfactory access into the building for persons with disabilities.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, A4, T13); (SD1, D4, D5, C19, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, A4, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, C19, T13
Car Parking	Standard: 17 (16)
	Justified: See Report
	Provided: 13
Site Area:	1350 m ²
No. of Residential Units:	12
Habitable Rooms:	34
Density :	88dph 252 hrph
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- East side of Brooke Avenue on lower slopes of Hill
- Occupied by pair of semi-detached houses, front gable feature
- No. 31 extended by 2 storey side and single storey rear extensions
- Rendered, brick and pebble-dashed elevations, tiled roof
- Terrace of houses to north, front wall of which lines up with rear wall of No. 29
- Woodland at rear of Valleyfield within Mount Park Estate Conservation Area adjacent to rear boundary
- Detached house No 37 to south of No 31
- Detached and semi-detached houses opposite site
- Levels fall from south to north and east to west
- Site within Residents Parking Zone

c) Proposal Details

- Demolition of existing houses
- Development of 3 storey block of 12 flats
- 3 x 1 bed x 2 habitable rooms, 8 x 2 bed x 3 habitable rooms, 1 x 3 bed x 4 habitable rooms
- front wall would mostly occupy position of front wall of existing houses
- proposed rear wall would line up with rear wall of single-storey projection behind No 37, and then step further back to project 2.5m beyond rear wall of No 27 to north
- flank walls 1.2m from side boundaries
- pitched, hipped roof with front and rear gables
- subordinate wing with lower ridge height adjacent to No 37 to south
- top floor partly in roofspace
- balconies at front and rear
- basement car park containing 10 parking spaces and cycle parking area
- 3 parking spaces on frontage plus bin store
- stepped approach to main front entrance
- rear garden terrace

Continued/.....

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Applicant's Statement

- Building set into existing site which rises steeply to the rear
- Finished in facing brick and render, with tiled roof

f) Advertisement	Major Development		Expiry 01-JAN-04
Notifications	Sent 21	Replies 0	Expiry 23-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of Area

The proposal would give rise to a 3 storey high building with a width of 25m, contrasting with the 2 storey character of the locality and more modest width of buildings. As a result, the proposal would appear excessively bulky and out of sympathy with adjacent buildings exacerbated by the prominent front gable feature. The northern flank wall and front gable, by virtue of the proposed siting in front of the adjacent terrace, together with their height and bulk, would be obtrusive in the streetscene, to the detriment of visual amenity.

The proposed number of flats would give rise to general levels of activity which would be out of keeping with surrounding properties, notwithstanding the fact that there are several pairs of maisonettes in Brooke Avenue.

The proposed front garden parking spaces, pathway, bin store and ramp to the basement car park would allow for insufficient planting and provide an excessive amount of hardsurfacing which would be harmful to the appearance of the area.

The rear wall of the proposed building would be sited over 20m from and at a lower level than land in the Mount Park Estate Conservation Area. The area behind the site is also heavily treed so that it is considered that harm to the character of the Conservation Area would not result.

2) Residential Amenity

The existing house at No. 29 by virtue of its forward siting currently breaches the 45⁰ horizontal code in relation to No 27. Although the proposed building would occupy the same siting, its additional height and bulk would make it more obtrusive than the existing house and exacerbate the difficult relationship with the adjacent house.

Continued/.....

Item 1/03 - P/2516/03/CFU continued....

On the other side the proposal would breach the 45⁰ code in relation to No 37. In addition, proposed first and second floor windows and balconies would enable overlooking of neighbouring houses, with a resultant loss of privacy.

3) Parking

The proposed level of car parking can be accepted in this location which is close to South Harrow District Centre and within a controlled parking zone. The provision of a cycle parking area is welcomed. However, the 3 front garden spaces would give rise to an excessively long crossover, to the detriment of pedestrian safety.

4) Accessibility

Although lift access is shown from the basement car park, a stepped access only is shown to the main entrance, denying satisfactory access to persons in wheelchairs.

5) Consultation Responses

Awaited.

154-156 EASTCOTE ROAD, PINNER

1/04

P/2392/03/CFU/TW

Ward: PINNER SOUTH

DETACHED 3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 15 FLATS WITH BASEMENT AND FORCECOURT PARKING.

JOHNSON & PARTNERS for WISTDALE DEVELOPMENTS LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 3173-01, 401A 402, 403, 405A.

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

- 1 The proposal, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale and bulk, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.
- 2 The proposal, by virtue of its size and siting would have an undue impact on the amenity of the occupiers of No. 73 Bridle Road.

INFORMATIVES

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

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Character of the Area
 - 2) Impact on Neighbours
 - 3) Parking/Access
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, T13	
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, T13	
Car Parking	Standard: 22	(20)
	Justified: 22	(20)
	Provided: 21	(21)
Site Area:	0.26 ha	
Habitable Rooms:	45	
No. of Residential Units:	15	
Density:	57 dph 173 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

continued/

b) Site Description

- Two substantial detached houses on the north side of Eastcote Road, adjacent to its junction with Rochester Drive
- The area is made up of a mix of semi-detached and detached house

c) Proposal Details

- Redevelopment to provide 15 flats in a two storey building with accommodation in the roof
- Car parking would be provided by means of a basement area containing 15 spaces and an area of six spaces on the site frontage
- Revised access would be from Eastcote Road
- The proposed building would have a width of 36m and a depth of 20m

d) Relevant History

For 156 Eastcote Road

WEST/752/01/FUL	Redevelopment to Provide 3 Detached Houses with Access and Parking	GRANTED 14-DEC-01
-----------------	--	----------------------

e) Consultations

Thames Water Utilities Ltd: No Comments

Advertisement	Major Development	Expiry 27-NOV-03
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

Notifications	Sent 16	Replies 32	Expiry 27-NOV-03
----------------------	------------	---------------	---------------------

Response: Out of character, highway safety, overlooking, lack of parking, overland drains, effect property prices.

APPRAISAL

1) Character of the Area

The prevailing character of the area is of detached and semi-detached houses of varying styles. There are individual examples of significantly larger buildings at the former Gas Board site and the church within Rusdene Road (Hillingdon).

Continued/.....

Whilst it is accepted that a redevelopment of this site for flats could be acceptable, it is considered that the proposed building, due to its excessive width, bulk and scale with no visual breaks to lessen its impact and depth, would have an unacceptable effect on the streetscene and the character of the area in general.

2) Impact on Neighbours

The proposal would be sited approximately 6m from the boundary with No. 73 Bridle Road (LB Hillingdon). This would be further away from the boundary than the approved proposal for detached houses but would also be deeper, such that there would be an infringement of the 45⁰ Code in relation to No. 73. In this regard, therefore, it is considered that the amenity of the occupiers of No. 73 Bridle Road would be prejudiced.

Those main room windows facing neighbouring properties would be at least 15m from the common boundaries. Such a relationship is considered to be acceptable.

3) Parking/Access

The proposed access to Eastcote Road would be sited sufficiently far from the junction of West Towers/Rochester Drive/Eastcote Road in order that there would be no traffic conflict or highway safety concerns.

The proposed 21 spaces is considered to be sufficient for a proposal of this size.

4) Consultation Responses

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| • Character of Area | } | Addressed above |
| • Overlooking | | |
| • Highway Safety | | |
| • Drain Capacity | - | Not material to planning |

SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

2/01

P/2629/03/CFU/GM

Ward: GREENHILL

4-10 COLLEGE RD, HARROW

PROVISION OF 3RD FLOOR COMPRISING 6 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

DAVID R YEAMAN & ASSOCIATES for MR N SHAH & MR R SONI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 484/001; 002; 003; 004 and site plan.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 Refuse Arrangements - Buildings

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 19 – Flank Windows
- 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 5 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 6 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 7 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 8 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E45, T13); (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E45, T13		
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SH1, D4, D5, T13		
Town Centre	Harrow		
Car Parking	Standard:	8	(8)
	Justified:	8	(8)
	Provided:	0	
No. of Residential Units:	6		
Council Interest:	None		

b) Site Description

- Three storey building with pitched roof over and three storey flat roof element on northern side of road, within secondary shopping frontage of Harrow town centre
- Ground floor comprises Class A1/A2 units, with two floors of offices above accessed from Station Road but with fire escape staircase at rear
- Rear yard with parking for ground floor uses
- Three storey building with rooms in roof in office use to west, single storey A3 building to east

c) Proposal Details

- Replacement of existing pitched roof with mansard style roof to provide 4 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats
- Extension of existing rear fire escape staircase to third floor

d) Relevant History

HAR/6407/B	Erection of a Block of 3 Shops with Offices on 2 Floors Above	GRANTED 21-APR-55
------------	---	----------------------

e) Notifications	Sent 59	Replies 3	Expiry 11-DEC-03
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: Support construction of residential accommodation as leading to a reduction in the overnight vandalism in the area provided rear unloading facility for shops not affected; concern that proposal will be detrimental to existing and long term occupier of 1st floor of building; loss of security through shared access; lack of parking leading to added competition for rear spaces already existing; concern at effect on rear access for ground floor shop.

Continued/.....

APPRAISAL

1) Visual and Residential Amenity

The proposed alterations to the roof would have no discernible effect on the streetscene or general visual amenity. The ridge height would be lower than that existing.

The nearest existing residential properties are above commercial premises on Station Road and further along College Road. It is not considered that there would be any loss of residential amenity to these properties. Indeed, the provision of further residential uses should add to the overall level of security of the area as well as adding to local vitality. For occupiers of the new flats, the lack of amenity space would be offset by the benefits afforded by the town centre location.

2) Accessibility

The only access to the flats would be by staircase. Given the existing form of the building it would not be possible to add a lift and it is considered it would be unreasonable to refuse permission on this basis. A planning condition and informative are proposed to ensure access is as satisfactory as possible.

3) Parking

The flats would have no parking but would be resident permit restricted. Given the town centre location and the excellent access to public transport facilities it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal could be justified.

4) Consultation Responses

The provision of a shared front access is not uncommon in such town centre locations where mixed uses are encouraged both from a sustainability and vitality point of view. It is not considered that there should be a detrimental loss of security for the existing businesses, this is a management issue rather than a planning one. The presence of residents could be argued to actively increase security of the building. Parking is addressed in the report and there would be no impact on the present use of the rear yard.

7 CHARLTON RD, HARROW

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

At the meeting of the Committee on 10th December, consideration of this application was deferred to enable a Members site visit. This took place on Saturday 10th January.

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

Continued/.....

c) Proposal Details

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

d) Relevant History

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

Continued/.....

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.

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

Continued/.....

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.

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.

3. 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.

SINGLE STOREY REPLACEMENT BUILDING FOR USE AS PLACE OF WORSHIP AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION (REVISED)

DEREK & ALAN NASH for MAHAVIR FOUNDATION LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 703/8-1B; 2B; 3B; 4B
703/7A; 703/10

GRANT variation(s) in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans as follows:

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 3 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(E1, E2, E4, E6, E8, E9 Revised, E10 Revised, E11 Revised, E46, T13, C11);
(SEP5, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4, T13, C13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Green Belt, Area of Special Character and Visual Amenity
 - 2) Traffic Safety
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E1, E2, E4, E6, E8, E9 Revised, E10 Revised, E11 Revised, E46, T13, C11

Deposit UDP Key Policies: SEP5, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4, T13, C13

Area of Special Character

Green Belt

Continued/.....

Item 2/03 - P/2677/03/CVA continued.....

Site Area: 0.26 ha
Floorspace: 225m²
Council Interest: The Council owns adjacent land

b) Site Description

- Vacant site, formerly occupied by a detached chalet bungalow, on western side of Brookshill
- Formerly used as clinic with 5 consulting rooms, permission granted for replacement building (to be used for religious purposes) in December 2002
- Abuts Harrow Weald Park
- Within Green Belt and Area of Special Character

c) Proposal Details

- Revision to scheme refused in September 2003 comprising deletion of raised ground levels
- Full details as follows:-
 - replacement of chalet bungalow with single storey building with flat roof with side parapet and front canopy
 - siting similar to original building and previously approved scheme
 - differs from approved scheme by virtue of revised roof treatment and additional ornamentation to front elevation consisting of marble columns and door/window surrounds with reconstructed stone cornice
 - there would also be a new footpath laid from the car park to facilitate disabled persons access to the building
 - there would be no increase in the footprint or floorspace of the building over that previously approved.

d) Relevant History

The site has a long planning history as a site for a dwelling and a doctors surgery. The most recent applications are as follows:-

EAST/641/01/CLE	Certificate Of Lawful Existing Use: Use As Clinic	GRANTED 14-AUG-01
EAST/113/02/FUL	Single Storey Rear Extension And Removal Of Existing Dormer Windows	GRANTED 05-JUN-02
EAST/1286/02/FUL	Single Storey Replacement Building For Use As Place Of Worship And Religious Instruction	GRANTED 12-DEC-02

Continued/.....

Item 2/03 - P/2677/03/CVA continued.....

P/1362/03/CVA Single Storey Replacement Building For Use As REFUSED
Place Of Worship And Religious Instruction 16-SEP-03
(Revised)

Reason for Refusal:-

“The proposed ornamentation, together with the increase in height of the building, would give rise to a loss of visual amenity to the neighbouring properties to the detriment of this Area of Special Character located within the Green Belt.”

e) Consultations

Environment Agency:	No Comments to Make
Thames Water Utilities Ltd:	No Objection
London Green Belt Council:	Comments Awaited

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	49	115 objections 20 support	24-DEC-03

Response: Object due to traffic safety concerns; object due to Council's notification process, not all previous objectors notified, insufficient time for response over Christmas and New Year; object to developers submitting revised proposals; site inappropriate for a temple although as approval already given objection is to new building being out of place in Green Belt by virtue of ornate design. Support, changes necessary to allow a proper place of worship for Jains.

APPRAISAL

1) Green Belt/Area of Special Character and Visual Amenity

The issue of appropriate/inappropriate development has already been dealt with by virtue of the planning permission granted in 2002 for a replacement building. This proposal does not alter the overall footprint of the building and no new issues in relation to the Green Belt are introduced.

Compared to the most recently refused scheme, the current proposal has deleted the raising of ground levels which revert to their original position. The new ornamentation has been restricted to the front elevation only. The level of ornamentation is not considered to be excessive and with the deletion of the proposal to raise ground levels would not be so prominent. The revised roof treatment compared to the original permission would enhance the building's appearance with a mansard replaced by a flat roof.

The new footpath would facilitate access from the car park and would not be obtrusive. This aspect of the proposal was not previously considered unacceptable.

Continued/.....

Overall it is not considered that there are sound objections on Green Belt/Area of Special Character grounds given the amendments made and the original permission.

2) Traffic Safety

Much of local residents objections to the most recent scheme related to traffic generation and car parking. It must be remembered however that the use as a place of worship did not require planning permission as it falls within the same use class as previous uses at the site (Class D1). What did require consent was a replacement building. The application now proposed would not increase the capacity of the building over that of the originally approved scheme for a replacement building. Members previously have accepted this view and the most recent scheme was not refused on traffic/parking grounds. It would therefore be unreasonable to take a different view for the current scheme.

3) Consultation Responses

The Council's notification process has been properly complied with. All individual objectors to the previous application who supplied full names and addresses have been notified and the head petitioner for the petition received (where more than one objection was received from one household only one notification letter has been sent this time). Those who simply sign a petition are not individually notified when a subsequent application is received. The Council has no control over when an application is submitted or how many times an applicant submits revised applications. In practice the Council allows far longer for consultation than the statutory minimum 21 day period, in this instance the Committee date of 14th January is 21 days after the minimum period. The level of ornamentation proposed to the front of the building is not considered to be excessive or to detract from the Green Belt.

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

MR J BENAIM for QFCC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: SB/176/2 dated 1/11/03; SB/B156/5 dated 11/11/03; SB/H147/3 dated 10/10/02; 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.
 - 8 Highway - Frontage Enclosure
- 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)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

continued/

INFORMATION

At the meeting of the Committee on 10th December consideration of this application was deferred for a Members site visit. This took place on 10th January 2004.

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
- 3.6m wide dropped kerb to front of both properties to facilitate vehicular access

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.”

continued/

e) Applicant's Statement

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

f) 1st Notification	Sent 11	Replies 7	Expiry 03-DEC-03
---------------------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: why has use been allowed to operate up to now without planning permission; previous objections still apply - quiet street, commercial activities out of character, disturbance, risk for children, large number of vehicles come and go from site causing obstructions and hazard for others; restrictive covenants apply; does not comply with Council policy.

2nd Notification	Sent 11	Replies 6	Expiry 25-DEC-03
------------------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: Previous objections still apply, would like to know how use developed and if planning permission required; overcrowding inevitable if allowed; traffic generation unacceptable; inappropriate for terraced properties; commercial activities unsuitable in residential street; noise and disturbance from use; concerns at safety of local residents; does not comply with Council planning guidelines.

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.

continued/

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 may be accommodated in the front gardens which are already hardsurfaced. 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 would ease access.

4) Consultation Responses

The report sets out why planning permission has not previously been required for the use. The location of the use within a residential street fully accords with both local and national policy, the purpose being for people with learning difficulties to live in normal residential environments. The site meets the Council's parking standards and there are no concerns raised by the Council's Highways Engineer with regard to vehicular activity. Restrictive covenants are not a planning matter. Policy issues are dealt with in the report.

**6 ALEXANDRA PARADE, NORTHOLT ROAD,
SOUTH HARROW**

**2/05
P/2442/03/CFU/JH
Ward: ROXETH**

CHANGE OF USE: SHOP TO RESTAURANT
(CLASS A1 TO A3) ON GROUND FLOOR

G M SIMISTER for ANIL MAVADIA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ale - 6, OS Site Map

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 Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
- 6 Restrict Storage to Buildings
- 7 Shop Window Display
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
 - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
 - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 21 – Bottle Recycling
 - 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 3 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E51, S5, S16, T13, A4), (EP25, T13, EM20, EM26, C20)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

continued/

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E51, S5, S16, T13, A4
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EP25, T13, EM20, EM26, C20
Car Parking	Standard: (6) (1) Justified: No additional Provided: (0) (0)
Floorspace:	107m ²
Site Area:	107m ²

b) Site Description

- A1 retail unit situated on the north side of Alexandra Parade adjoining Station Parade at the junction of Alexandra Avenue and Northolt Road
- immediately above the site are two floors of residential accommodation
- there are service roads to the front and rear of the premises
- parking spaces are located to either side of the front service road
- property lies in an undesignated parade of 6 units consisting of the following uses: Tattooist (A1), Take away (A3), Restaurant (A3), Supermarket (A1), Butchers (A1), Car Accessories (A1 – subject site)
- immediately adjoining Alexandra Parade is an equally small group of shops (496-504 Northolt Road) consisting of one A1 use, one sui generis use, and three A3 uses
- the shop units opposite the site on Northolt Road comprise a variety of uses

c) Proposal Details

- change of use from car accessories retailer to restaurant (A1 to A3)
- the application does not propose hours of operation, staff numbers or proposed signage
- the drawings submitted show internal alterations to provide a restaurant floor area of 42m² together with WC facilities and the conversion of the integral garage to a kitchen
- the existing roller door would be removed and the wall replaced together with a window and single door

d) Relevant History

LBH/29914	Single storey building at rear for storage/fitting purposes	GRANTED 04-APR-86
WEST/550/96/FUL	Single storey rear extension	REFUSED 06-DEC-96
WEST/341/97/FUL	Single storey rear extension incorporating double garage	GRANTED 28-JUL-97

continued/

e)	Notifications	Sent 21	Replies 3	Expiry 25-NOV-03
-----------	----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: The number of restaurants and take-aways in Alexandra and Station Parade is excessive; vermin problem exists to rear service lane due to poor refuse disposal and hygiene; increased fire hazard; ventilation system would detract from the visual amenity of the area; increased odour problems would arise; devalues property prices.

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy

Retail policy within the adopted UDP (S16) permits change of use from A1 outside of designated centres providing the use would not result in the loss of necessary local retail provision and is in the interest of the appearance and vitality of the area. The Draft UDP (EM20) provides a further revision of this policy and permits such changes of use where the use is appropriate to the town centre; parking is provided in accordance with the Council's standards and the premises can be adequately serviced without causing harm to highway safety and convenience.

The proposal is in accordance with policy (EM20) where the parade is clearly divorced from the main retail area and as such is considered to contribute little to shopping or related activities. Notwithstanding the fact there may be a concentration of non-retail uses in the area, policy dictates that any town centre use such as that proposed (A3) is appropriate. The proposal is unlikely to have any more of an impact than the existing A1 use in terms of parking (discussed below) and servicing requirements.

2) Neighbouring Amenity

Conditions are suggested relating to noise, fume emissions and hours of use and subject to their imposition the amenities of neighbouring residents would be protected.

3) Accessibility

Internal alterations are proposed to provide access and WC facilities for disabled use. An informative relating to access considerations is also included.

4) Parking

In the revised Deposit Draft UDP the parking requirement for an A3 use is the same as for a retail unit. Given the previous parking deficiency and presence of the service road at the front with parking to either side, it would be inappropriate to refuse permission on parking grounds.

5) Consultation Responses

Property values are not a planning consideration. All other matters have been addressed in the report.

CHANGE OF USE: MOTOR VEHICLE WORKSHOP(CLASS B2) TO OFFICES (CLASS B1) WITH NEW HIPPED ROOF, WINDOWS AND ELEVATIONAL CLADDING.

GEOFF BEARDSLEY & PARTNERS LTD for ROSE HILL PENSION SCHEME

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2334/03, 04, 06B, 07, 7.

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 buildings
 - (b) the entrance doorsThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Restrict Storage to Buildings

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, E35, E38, E46, EM7, T13, A4); (SD1, D4, D13, D15, D16, EM4, EM23, T13, C19)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Employment Policy
- 2) Integrity of Locally Listed Building
- 3) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area
- 4) Residential Amenity
- 5) Parking and Traffic
- 6) Accessibility
- 7) Consultation Responses

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E35, E38, E46, EM7, T13, A4
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D13, D15, D16, EM4, EM23, T13, C19
Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Listed Building:	Locally Listed
Conservation Area:	Stanmore Hill
Car Parking	Standard: 6 (1) Justified: 0 (0) Provided: 0
Site Area:	144m ²
Floorspace:	160m ²
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- west side of Stanmore Hill within Stanmore Hill Conservation Area
- occupied by 2-storey locally listed building with single storey front projection, attached to 95 Stanmore Hill to south with passageway between properties, yard at rear
- previously used for car repairs/servicing with associated floorspace on 1st floor
- site within local parade 83 – 101 Stanmore Hill. Starting at no. 83 existing uses as follows:- surveyors (A2), hairdressers (A1), estate agent (A2), clothes shop (A1), bakers (A1), vacant – last use jeweller (A1), electrical goods (A1), hearing aids (A1), hairdressers (A1), application site, vacant – last use car repairs/servicing (B2), veterinary practice (D1)

c) Proposal Details

- change of use of ground-floor and first floor from vehicle workshop with ancillary offices (Class B2) to offices (Class B1)
- main entrance from front with new ramp
- secondary entrance from rear yard
- removal of front garage door, replacement with single entrance door and matching door screen
- provision of pitched, hipped roof over 2 storey element behind single storey front projection, plus shiplap boarding to front, rear and part south east elevation of 2 storey element

Continued/.....

d) Relevant History

P/141/03/CFU	Use Of Ground Floor For A2 Purposes With Alterations, Creation Of Front Roof Terrace With Railings At First Floor	REFUSED 15-APR-03
--------------	---	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:-

"1. The proposed building operations to this locally listed building, by reason of inappropriate design and appearance, would be detrimental to the integrity of the building and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Stanmore Hill Conservation Area.

P/1107/03/CFU	Use of Part Ground Floor for A3 Purposes and Conversion to Provide Flat with New Hipped Roof and Provision of Roof, Windows and Elevational Cladding	WITHDRAWN 26-NOV-03
---------------	--	------------------------

e) Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 08-JAN-04	
Notifications	Sent 118	Replies 0	Expiry 30-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1) Employment Policy

Adopted UDP policy EM7 and Deposit Replacement Policy EM23 set down a list of criteria against which proposals for B1 use should be assessed. The proposed B1 use would not be harmful in terms of criterion (b) relating to the emission of noise, smoke and other pollutants, and would not involve the loss of land from a use which other policies seek to protect (D).

Criteria (A), impact on neighbouring amenity and the character of the area and (C), traffic and accessibility are discussed individually.

2) Integrity of Locally Listed Building

The appearance of this building makes an important contribution to the conservation area by adding variety and also historic interest as a former forge reflecting past uses and activities within the area.

However, it would not be desirable on amenity and highway grounds for the extant car repairs/servicing area use to be reactivated even though this may enable the existing external appearance to be retained.

Continued/.....

The proposed use, which is more appropriate to this location, although giving rise to the loss of the garage door, would result in relatively minor changes to the look of the garage part of the building. The hipped roof would be retained and re-clad with replacement slates, and the front window would be retained.

The new front entrance doors would be in sympathy with the design of the retained window, and would represent an acceptable replacement for the previous garage doors.

The 2-storey rear section of the building would be greatly improved with the new roof and general refurbishment.

Overall, it is considered that the proposals would respect the integrity of the building.

3) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area

The proposed change of use would remove a use which generate unacceptable levels of noise, fumes and smells to the detriment of the character of the area. The proposed alterations to the building, particularly the improvements to the appearance of the 2 storey element, would result in the character and appearance of the conservation area being enhanced.

4) Residential Amenity

The replacement of the previous car repairs/servicing use with the proposed B1 use would be beneficial in residential amenity terms by reason of the removal of a use which could result in noxious noise and fumes. In addition, the previous use was uncontrolled in terms of hours and days of use.

No changes are proposed to the first floor area such as the insertion of new windows which might have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity. The new pitched roof would be opposite a secondary window in the flank wall of No. 95 which serves a room with a main front window. It is not therefore a 'protected' window in terms of the Council's guidelines. In view also of the benefits to the appearance of the locally listed building and the conservation area which the new roof would bring about it is suggested that it can be accepted.

5) Parking and Traffic

The previous use would have generated a minimum parking requirement of 6 on-site spaces on the basis of 1 repair bay, whereas no on-site parking was provided.

In the light of this, Government policy, and the fact that Replacement UDP standard would require 1 space only for the proposals, no objection is raised on parking or traffic grounds.

Continued/.....

6) Accessibility

The proposed ramp makes use of a fall in levels across the site and would enable satisfactory wheelchair access into the building. A stepped entrance also would be provided.

7) Consultation Responses

Awaited.

COUSINS GARAGE, 10 GREENHILL RD, HARROW

2/07

P/2242/03/CVA/RJS

Ward: GREENHILL

CONTINUED USE AS CAR REPAIR WORKSHOP AND M.O.T. TESTING STATION WITHOUT COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITION 6 OF PLANNING PERMISSION WEST/547/93/FUL.

MR MELLERS

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordinance Survey: Serial Number: 00000468

GRANT variation(s) in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans as follows:

- 1 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 2 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 3 The on site parking spaces shall be only used for the parking of private motor vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted and for not other purpose.
REASON: To ensure that the parking provision is available for use by the occupants and customers of the site and in accordance with the Council's parking standards.
- 4 The use hereby permitted shall not operate outside of the following times:-
 - a. 08:00 hours - 18:00 hours Monday to Friday;
 - b. 08:00 hours - 13:00 hours Saturday
 - c. And at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the local planning authorityREASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E51, S5, T13); (EP25, T13, EM12, EM23)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Existing Use and Residential Amenity
 - 2) Parking
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E51, S5, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	EP25, T13, EM12, EM23
Town Centre	Yes
Site Area:	149m ²
Floorspace:	149m ²
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- The subject site is located on the northern side of Greenhill Way at the point where the roadway makes a curved, 90 degree turn;
- The site accommodates a single storey workshop building utilised for the purpose of a motor vehicle repair workshop;
- An eight space carpark under separate ownership and tenancy is sited on the land adjacent to the east;
- The subject site abuts the rear gardens of residential properties sited to the north and west;

c) Proposal Details

- Continued use of the premises for the purpose of a car repair workshop and MOT testing station;
- Removal of Condition 6 of Planning Permit (WEST/547/93/FUL) that required the use to cease 10 years from the date of approval;

d) Relevant History

LBH/9790	erection of garage/ workshop for repair and servicing of motor vehicles	GRANTED 18-FEB-1974
LBH/9790/1	erection of garage/ workshop	GRANTED 13-MAR-1975
LBH/22904	re-siting and continued use of garage and workshop	GRANTED 13-APR-1983
WEST/547/93/FUL	single storey front extension, continued use for car Repair workshop and use as MOT testing station	GRANTED 01-DEC-1993

Continued/.....

e) Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	6	0	17-NOV-03

APPRAISAL

1) Existing Use and Residential Amenity

The proposal represents the continued use of the established business. It is highlighted that the business has been in operation in its current location for just over 20 years. The use was re-approved in 1993, with this current application again seeking the continuation of the use. The application also seeks the removal of the condition 6 of the previous approval (WEST/547/93/FUL), which required the use to cease operation within 10 years of that approval (and hence the reason for this current application).

From a search of planning records it is noted that there is no history of planning enforcement complaints relating to the operation of the existing car repair workshop and MOT testing station. Furthermore no objections were received to the public notification of the application. However, despite there appearing to be no problems with the operation of the existing business, due to the proximity of residential properties it is considered reasonable to impose standard restrictions on the hours of operation, rather than to again include a 10 year limitation with no hours control.

2) Parking

The adjacent 8 space carpark detailed on the site layout plan is under separate ownership and is not associated with the subject site. With respect of this current application, it is not proposing an expansion of the business, rather it is merely applying to continue the existing use. Accordingly it is noted that the use has previously been granted approval with respect of the parking available both within the building and to the forecourt of the site. It is considered that circumstances with parking in the locality have not altered since the previous approval, highlighted by the fact that Transport Engineering have not raised any objection to the continued use.

3) Consultation Responses

None.

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT/SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF EXTENDED DWELLING TO THREE SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; FORECOURT PARKING

MR R SODHA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: AP/RS/03/01, 02, 03A, 04A, Site Plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 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 19 – Flank Windows
 - 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
 - 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conversion Policy
 - 2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions
 - 3) Parking and access
 - 4) Consultation responses
-

INFORMATION

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

continued/

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, E51, H10, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached dwelling on south-west side of Elmsleigh Avenue
- original net floor area of 96m² and rear garden area of 256m²
- house has attached garage at side, original single storey rear projection of approximately 1m (common to all dwellings in this locality)
- forecourt has single width driveway but otherwise soft landscaped
- attached semi to north-west, no.83, unextended to adjacent part of rear and at first floor side
- neighbouring semi to south-east, no. 79, has single storey extension to side and rear but unextended at first floor side; facing first floor flank elevation contains windows to a bathroom and stairs/landing
- conversion rate in this road is 2.6%
- on-street parking not controlled

c) Proposal Details

- two storey side to rear extension, details as follows:-
 - flank wall adjacent to boundary with no.105, recessed eaves/gutter detail
 - flank wall continues beyond rear main wall to depth of 3m to form first floor rear projection of 3.5m width
 - first floor front wall set 1m back from front main wall of original dwelling
 - subordinate hipped roof over side and rear
 - no windows in flank wall
- single storey rear extension:-
 - 3m deep adjacent to boundary with no. 83; further rearward projection of 1m inset 2.2m from boundary with no.83
 - flank walls adjacent to side boundaries and 3m high
 - flat roof over
- single storey front extension:
 - 1m deep with pitched roof over
- extensions to be finished in brick to ground floor front and rear walls on both storeys of outer flank wall, first floor walls to be rendered
- conversion of extended dwelling to three self-contained flats
- two flats on ground floor; Flat A to comprise 57m² net floorspace including three habitable rooms (two bedrooms), Flat C to comprise 36m² net floorspace including two habitable rooms (one bedroom); both flats to have access to rear garden
- one flat (Flat B) to first floor comprising 65m² net floorspace including four habitable rooms (two bedrooms) but no access to rear garden
- all flats accessed via internal shared lobby; single point of access to external front elevation
- two forecourt parking spaces; remaining area to be soft-landscaped
- rear garden area of 230m² retained

continued/

d) **Relevant History**

103 Elmsleigh Avenue

P/2517/03/CFU Two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front **UNDETERMINED**

71 Alicia Gardens

P/2515/03/CFU Two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front **UNDETERMINED**

96 Elmsleigh Avenue

EAST/574/93/FUL Single storey extension and conversion to 4 self-contained flats **REFUSED**
19-APR-94

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposal would result in the loss of a dwelling of a size and type which is considered more suitable for single family occupation, represents an unneighbourly form of development in this small property and would thus be contrary to the adopted conversion policy of the Local Planning Authority.
2. The proposed conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of increased noise, disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and be out of character in the locality.

A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed. In reaching his conclusion, the Inspector found no detriment to the character or appearance of the property in the streetscene arising from the forecourt parking area, and that the valuable addition to the stock of small, affordable homes outweighed non-compliance with the floorspace threshold of adopted Policy H10. In terms of use intensity, the Inspector found no likely increase beyond that which might occur if the house was occupied by six persons sharing, bearing in mind that car ownership of occupants would be low in view of good public transport availability in the area.

e) 1st Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	10	11 + petition of 107 signatures	19-NOV-03

Response: 1st Notification: Parking, highway safety (vehicles and pedestrians), noise and disturbance, precedent, overcrowding, character of community and environment, health, four flats on opposite corner, residential character of area, character and appearance of street, excess sewage, conversion/business use contrary to deeds, loss of light, overshadowing, density, water pressure, drainage, litter, loss of privacy, loss of trees, pollution, power/gas/water supply, fire hazard, applicant is property developer, loss of value, maintenance, risk of subsidence.

continued/

2nd Notification

Sent
10

Replies
Awaited

Expiry
30-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and character of proposed conversion

The proposal would, on its own, increase the proportion of non-single family dwellinghouses in Elmsleigh Avenue from 2.6% to 3.4%. Combining the proposal with that for which permission is sought in respect of no.103, the proportion would increase further to 5.1%. Notwithstanding the age of Policy H10 of the adopted UDP and the Inquiry Inspector's comments relating to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP, it can be seen that such proportions would fall well within the relevant conversion criteria contained therein. It is considered that the number of conversions in the road is so low that the proposal, both on its own and cumulatively with that of application P/2517/03/CFU, would not so significantly change the single family dwellinghouse character and the pattern of use intensity of the road as to be detrimental to the character or amenity of the locality.

The original dwelling has a net floor area below the threshold of 110m² set down in Policy H10 of the adopted UDP. This criterion has not been carried forward to the emerging replacement UDP, however, in view of PPG3 advice and the need to adopt a more flexible approach to new housing provision within existing urban areas. In these circumstances it is not considered that a reason for refusal relating to the loss of small dwelling, more suitable for single family occupation, is therefore now justified.

Although conversions of inter-war semis to two, and not three, flats is more conventional, this should not preclude conversion to a greater number of units where circumstances allow. Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals, inter alia, against the suitability of the units created in terms of size, circulation and layout. Paragraph 6.54 of the reasoned justification to the policy provides further amplification, in advising that the size of the property will influence the number of units and the consequent impact of conversions on surrounding properties.

The proposed extensions would add some 62m² floorspace to the original building in a manner that might otherwise have taken the form of an acceptable extension to the property as a single family dwelling. As an enlarged property, it follows that an increased number of habitable rooms can be accommodated on the site and clearly the additional space could be used to form two much larger flats than those proposed. It is considered that the enlarged property provides sufficient space to allow, in principle, three flats to be provided. In terms of the intensity of the use of the site, there need not be any significantly greater effect on the character of the locality nor levels of noise/activity that would be detrimental to the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers than would otherwise occur as an extended single family dwelling house or as two flats each with an increased number of habitable rooms.

continued/

It now turns to consider whether the size, circulation space and layout of the individual flats, which have been amended at officers' request during the course of the application, are acceptable. Flat A on the ground floor and Flat B on the first floor would occupy the original dwelling together with some of the additional floorspace, resulting in units of conventional size and circulation space and which are considered to be acceptable. Flat C would occupy the ground floor part of the side extension and a corresponding width of the rear extension. Its lounge would be 2.3m wide and 5m deep and an open-plan kitchen area would be partly inset into the understairs area resulting in a footprint of 3.5m x 2m. Beyond an internal bathroom and within the area of the rear extension would be a bedroom of 3m x 3.8m. It is considered that this innovative use of space would form a flat of reasonable size, having regard to its likely occupation by an individual or childless couple, and is acceptable.

The general vertical arrangement of the rooms within the building, which has also been amended at officer's request, would help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict between the flats. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the 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 both between the flats and between the building and the adjoining dwelling.

After the extension, the property would have a rear garden area of 200m². The area would serve the needs of the occupiers of the proposed ground floor flats and, as proposed to be subdivided, would exceed the levels of provision required for each of the units in respect of the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for residential development. However there would be no direct access to the garden from the proposed first floor flat.

The proposed arrangement therefore means that the first floor flat would have no access to any private usable amenity space. Paragraph 6.56 of the reasoned justification to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP recognises the problem of garden access from upper flats in conversion schemes and accepts that it is inappropriate to insist that all units have their own private rear garden. Kenton Recreation Ground is, however, with a 15-20 minute walk of the site. In these circumstances and in view of central Government advice in PPG3, it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of inadequate amenity space is justified or could be sustained.

In view of the configuration of the amenity space provision, in line with the local pattern and character of development, neither is it considered that use of the outdoor space by occupiers of the flats would so significantly increase levels of externally generated noise/activity as to be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

continued/

In the absence of external amenity space provision for the first floor flat a condition controlling use of the roof over the proposed rear extension is suggested, in the interests of the privacy amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Similarly details of refuse storage and the hard/soft landscaping of the forecourt can be satisfactorily controlled by the application of appropriate conditions, in the interest of visual amenity and character.

2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions

In accordance with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments, the proposed side extension would have a 1m set-back to the front of the first floor and a subordinate hipped roof over. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal would not appear unduly bulky or obtrusive in the streetscene, and that an adequate spatial setting for this and the neighbouring building would be maintained.

As the windows in the facing flank elevation of no. 79 Elmsleigh Avenue are not protected, for the purposes of the Council's guidelines, neither is it considered that the effect of the side extension on light to, or outlook from, these warrants refusal of the development proposed.

The proposed two storey rear extension, which has been amended at officer's request during the course of this application, would sit within 45° lines drawn, on plan, from the first floor corners of the attached semi, no. 83, and the neighbouring semi no. 79. The slight staggering of property in this part of the road is such that no. 79 is sited approximately 1m back in its plot relative to the application dwelling and, together with the siting of that property to the south-east and its single storey side/rear extension, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of no.79.

The 'inner' first floor flank wall would be sited 4.8m from the boundary with no. 83 and would not, it is considered, give rise to overshadowing or undue loss of light/outlook to the rear of that property. Neither is it considered that the first floor rear projection would appear unduly bulky or obtrusive when viewed from surrounding gardens.

The height and depth of the single storey rear extension adjacent to the boundary with no. 83, also amended at officer's request, would comply with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments. The additional rearward projection would be sited at a sufficient distance from the boundary with no.83 and would not project beyond the rear elevation of the existing extension to no.79. It is not considered, in these circumstances, that there would be any effect on the visual or residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers beyond that normally deemed acceptable.

A rear garden depth of some 29m would remain. Such a distance would be consistent with that of extended residential property in this area and would not, therefore, be detrimental to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of development in this locality.

continued/

The proposed front extension would be detached from, and not project beyond, the original front bay. Together with its modest bulk/height and satisfactory design, it is not considered that this element would appear unduly obtrusive in the streetscene or detract from the appearance of this and neighbouring buildings. Neither would it be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

Details of the external finish of the development can be controlled by condition. As flats the property would have no permitted development rights, consequently future outbuildings and window openings would automatically be the subject of planning controls.

In all other respects and subject to the conditions suggested, the proposal would safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.

3) Parking and access

It remains to consider the parking and highway safety implications of the proposed conversion.

The adopted UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals against local highway conditions, subject to one space per additional unit and one for any retained units where it is determined that some provision is required. The emerging replacement UDP makes no specific provision in respect of conversion schemes. Two forecourt spaces would fall one space short of the minimum requirement of the adopted UDP. The existing dwelling has only two spaces (one on the forecourt and one garaged) which represents a shortfall of one space below the minimum requirement for a house of its size as set out in the adopted UDP, but would be consistent with the maximum standard of the emerging replacement UDP.

The locational advantages of the locality were recognised by the Planning Inspector in the determination of the conversion of no. 71 Alicia Avenue and, taken together with the very modest level of shortfall below the adopted standard, it is not considered that any effect of additional on-street parking would be so significant as to be detrimental to highway conditions or the amenity and convenience of neighbouring residential occupiers. In view of the distance between the application property and nos. 103 Elmsleigh Avenue/71 Alicia Gardens, neither is it considered that there would be any unacceptable cumulative impact.

In all of these circumstances and in view of central Government advice, it is not considered that a parking related reason for refusal is justified nor could be sustained in this instance.

continued/

4) Consultation Responses

- Precedent - future applications to be judged on their own merits
 - Overcrowding - it is not considered that the proposal would cause overcrowding
 - Character of community and environment/pollution - it is not considered that the number of conversions in the road would be so significant as to cause undue change in these regards
 - Health - not material to the planning decision
 - Four flats on opposite corner - noted and taken into consideration
 - Character and appearance of street - the proposed extensions comply with guidelines and the house would retain a single door to the front elevation
 - Sewage, water pressure, drainage, fire hazard and risk of subsidence - building control matters
 - Conversion/business use contrary to deeds - proposed use is residential and not material to the planning decision
 - Trees - all now removed from site (none protected)
 - Power/gas/water supply - matter for suppliers
 - Applicant is property developer - not material to the planning decision
 - Loss of value - not material to the planning decision
- All other matters as set out in the appraisal.

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR, SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION AND CONVERSION TO THREE SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, PARKING AT FRONT

MR R SODHA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: AP/RS3/03/01, 02, 03A, 04A, Site Plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 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 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conversion Policy
 - 2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions
 - 3) Parking and access
 - 4) Consultation responses
-

INFORMATION

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

continued/

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, E51, H10, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached dwelling on north-east side of Alicia Gardens, original net floor area of 96m² and rear garden area of 170m²
- house has attached garage and lean-to at side, original single storey rear projection of approximately 1m (common to all dwellings in this locality)
- forecourt largely hardsurfaced, narrow planting beds to south side and front boundaries
- attached semi to south-east, no.69, unextended to adjacent part of rear and first floor side
- neighbouring semi to north-west, no. 71, unextended at rear but has two storey side/single storey front extension with first floor set back and subordinate hipped roof, no windows in facing flank elevation
- conversion rate in this road is 0.8%, on-street parking not controlled

c) Proposal Details

- two storey side extension, details comprise:
 - flank wall adjacent to boundary with no.73, recessed eaves/gutter detail
 - first floor front wall set 1m back from front main wall of original dwelling
 - subordinate hipped roof over
 - no windows in flank wall
- single storey rear extension:
 - 3m deep across full width of site
 - flank walls adjacent to side boundaries and 3m high
 - flat roof over
- single storey front extension:
 - 1m deep with pitched roof over
- extensions to be finished in brick to ground floor front and rear walls and on both storeys of outflank wall, first floor walls to be rendered
- conversion of extended dwelling to three self-contained flats
 - two flats on ground floor, Flat A to comprise 54m² net floorspace including three habitable rooms (two bedrooms), Flat C to comprise 33m² net floorspace including two habitable rooms (one bedroom), both flats to have access to rear garden
 - one flat (Flat B) to first floor comprising 57m² net floorspace including three habitable rooms (two bedrooms) but no access to rear garden
 - all flats accessed via internal shared lobby, single point of access to external front elevation
- two forecourt parking spaces, remaining area to be soft landscaped
- rear garden area of 146m² retained

continued/

d) Relevant History

103 Elmsleigh Avenue

P/2517/03/CFU Two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front UNDETERMINED

81 Elmsleigh Avenue

P/2468/03/CFU Two storey side to rear, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front UNDETERMINED

96 Elmsleigh Avenue

EAST/574/93/FUL Single storey extension and conversion to four self-contained flats REFUSED
19-APR-94

Reasons for refusal:

“1. The proposal would result in the loss of a dwelling of a size and type which is considered more suitable for single family occupation, represents an unneighbourly form of development in this small property, and would thus be contrary to the adopted conversion policy of the Local Planning Authority

2. The proposed conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of increased noise, disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and be out of character in the locality.

3. The proposed hardsurfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene.”

A subsequent Appeal against this decision was dismissed. In reaching his conclusion the Inspector found no detriment to the character or appearance of the property in the streetscene arising from the forecourt parking area, and that the valuable addition to the stock of small, affordable homes outweighed non-compliance with the floorspace threshold of adopted Policy H10. In terms of use intensity, the Inspector found no likely increase beyond that which might occur if the house was occupied by six persons sharing, bearing in mind that car ownership upon occupants would be low in view of good public transport availability in the area

e) 1st Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	6	18 + 2 petitions 91 & 107 names respectively	24-NOV-03

continued/

Response: 1st Notification

Parking, highway safety (vehicles and pedestrians), noise and disturbance, precedent, loss of family housing, should not be considered in isolation, overcrowding/ overdevelopment, character of community and environment, health, four flats on opposite corner, residential character of area, character and appearance of street, excess sewage, conversion/business use contrary to deeds, loss of light, overshadowing, density, water pressure, drainage, litter, loss of privacy, loss of trees, pollution, power/gas/water supply, fire hazard, applicant is property developer, loss of value, maintenance/gardens will be neglected, effect on foundations, will block side wall, measurements on plans incorrect, breach of 45 degree code, fence overbearing, loss of security, terracing

2nd Notification	Sent 10	Replies Awaited	Expiry 30-DEC-03
-------------------------	------------	--------------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and character of proposed conversion

The proposal would increase the proportion of non-single family dwellinghouses in Alicia Gardens from 0.8% to 1.5%. Notwithstanding the age of Policy H10 of the adopted UDP and the Inquiry Inspector's comments relating to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP, it can be noted that such proportions would fall well within the relevant conversion criteria contained therein. It is considered that the number of conversions in the road is so low that the proposal would not so significantly change the single family dwellinghouse character and the pattern of use intensity of the road as to be detrimental to the character or amenity of the locality.

The original dwelling has a net floor area below the threshold of 110m² set down in Policy H10 of the adopted UDP. This criterion has not been carried forward to the emerging replacement UDP, however, in view of PPG3 advice and the need to adopt a more flexible approach to new housing provision within existing urban areas. In these circumstances it is not considered that a reason for refusal relating to the loss of small dwelling, more suitable for single family occupation, is therefore now justified.

Although conversions of inter-war semis to two, and not three, flats is more conventional this should not preclude conversion to a greater number of units where circumstances allow. Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals, inter alia, against the suitability of the units created in terms of size, circulation and layout. Paragraph 6.54 of the reasoned justification to the policy provides further amplification, in advising that the size of the property will influence the number of units and the consequent impact of conversions on surrounding properties.

continued/

The proposed extensions would add some 48m² floorspace to the original building in a manner that might otherwise have taken the form of an acceptable extension to the property as a single family dwelling. As an enlarged property, it follows that an increased number of habitable rooms can be accommodated on the site and clearly the additional space could be used to form two much larger flats than those proposed. It is considered that the enlarged property forms sufficient space to allow, in principle, three flats to be provided. In terms of the intensity of the use of the site, there need not be any significantly greater effect on the character of the locality nor levels of noise/activity that would be detrimental to the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers than would otherwise occur as an extended single family dwelling house or as two flats each with an increased number of habitable rooms.

It now turns to consider whether the size, circulation and layout of the individual flats, which have been amended at officers' request during the course of the application, are acceptable. Flat A on the ground floor and Flat B on the first floor would occupy the original dwelling together with some of the additional floorspace, resulting in units of conventional size and circulation and which are considered to be acceptable. Flat C would occupy the ground floor part of the side extension and a corresponding width of the rear extension. Its lounge would be 2.3m wide and 5m deep and an open-plan kitchen area would be partly inset into the understairs area resulting in a footprint of 3.5m x 2m. Beyond and internal bathroom and within the area of the rear extension would be a bedroom of 3m x 2.8m. It is considered that this innovative use of space would form a flat of reasonable size and circulation, having regard to its likely occupation by an individual or childless couple, and is acceptable.

The general vertical arrangement of the rooms within the building, which has also been amended at officer's request, would help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict between the flats. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the 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 both between the flats and between the building and the adjoining dwelling.

After the extension, the property would have a rear garden of 146m². The area would serve the needs of the occupiers of the proposed ground floor flats and, cumulatively, would exceed the levels of provision required for each of the units in respect of the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for residential development. However there would be no direct access to the garden from the proposed first floor flat.

The proposed arrangement therefore means that the first floor flat would have no access to any private usable amenity space. Paragraph 6.56 of the reasoned justification to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP recognises the problem of garden access from upper flats in conversion schemes and accepts that it is inappropriate to insist that all units have their own private rear garden. Kenton Recreation Ground is, however, within a 15-20 minute walk of the site. In these circumstances and in view of central Government advice at PPG3, it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of inadequate amenity is justified or could be sustained.

continued/

In view of the configuration of the amenity space provision, in line with the local pattern and character of development, neither is it considered that use of the outdoor space by occupiers of the flats would so significantly increase levels of externally generated noise/activity as to be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

In the absence of external amenity space provision for the first floor flat a condition controlling use of the roof over the proposed rear extension is suggested, in the interests of the privacy amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Similarly details of refuse storage and the hard/soft landscaping of the forecourt can be satisfactorily controlled by the application of appropriate conditions, in the interests of visual amenity and character.

2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions

In accordance with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments, the proposed side extension would have a 1m set-back to the front of the first floor and a subordinate hipped roof over. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal would not appear unduly bulky or obtrusive in the streetscene, or give rise to an unreasonable terracing effect. An adequate spatial setting for this and the neighbouring building would be maintained.

The application originally proposed the continuation of the two storey extension beyond the rear main wall. In recognition of the siting of the application site to the south-east of no.73 and the potential, therefore, for undue loss of light/outlook and overshadowing of the rear of that neighbouring property, this element has been designed out of the proposal at officer's request. As amended it is not considered that the two storey proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

The height and depth of the single storey rear extension, also amended at officer's request, would comply with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments. It is not considered, in this circumstance, that there would be any effect on the visual or residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers beyond that normally deemed acceptable.

A rear garden depth of some 17m would remain. Such a distance would be consistent with that of extended residential property in Alicia Gardens and would not, therefore, be detrimental to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of development in this locality.

The proposed front extension would be detached from, and not project beyond, the original front bay. Together with its modest bulk/height and satisfactory design, it is not considered that this element would appear unduly obtrusive in the streetscene or detract from the appearance of this and neighbouring buildings. Neither would it be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

continued/

Details of the external finish of the development can be controlled by condition. As flats the property would have no permitted development rights, consequently future outbuildings and window openings would automatically be the subject of planning controls.

In all other respects and subject to the conditions suggested, the proposal would safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.

3) Parking and access

It remains to consider the parking and highway safety implications of the proposed conversion.

The adopted UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals against local highway conditions, subject to one space per additional unit and for any retained units where it is determined that some provision is required. The emerging replacement UDP makes no specific provision in respect of conversion schemes.

Alicia Gardens is a residential road of predominantly single family dwellings many of which have garaged and/or forecourt off-street parking provision. The proposed provision of two forecourt spaces would fall one space short of the minimum requirement of the adopted UDP. The existing dwelling has only two spaces (one on the forecourt and one garaged) which represents a shortfall of one space below the minimum requirement for a house of its size as set out in the adopted UDP, but would be consistent with the maximum standard of the emerging replacement UDP.

The locational advantages of the locality were recognised by the Planning Inspector in the determination of the conversion of 71 Alicia Avenue and, taken together with the very modest level of shortfall below the adopted standard, it is not considered that any effect of additional on-street parking would be so significant as to be detrimental to highway conditions or the amenity and convenience of neighbouring residential occupiers.

In all of these circumstances and in view of central Government advice, it is not considered that a parking related reason for refusal is justified nor could be sustained in this instance.

4) Consultation Responses

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Precedent | - | future applications to be judged on their own merits |
| overcrowding | - | it is not considered that the proposal would cause overcrowding |
| character of community and environment/pollution | - | it is not considered that the number of conversions in the road would be so significant as to cause undue change in these regards |

continued/

Item 2/09 – P/2515/03/CFU continued.....

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Health | - | not material to the planning decision |
| Four flats on opposite corner | - | noted and taken into consideration |
| Character and appearance of street | - | the proposed extensions comply with guidelines and the house would retain a single door to the front elevation |
| Sewage, water pressure, drainage, fire hazard and effect on foundations | - | building control matters |
| Conversion/business use contrary to deeds | - | proposed use is residential and not material to the planning decision |
| Trees | - | none protected |
| Power/gas/water supply | - | matter for suppliers |
| Applicant is property developer | - | not material to the planning decision |
| Loss of value | - | not material to the planning decision |
| Will block side wall | - | civil matter (Party Wall Act Informative suggested) |
| Measurements on plans incorrect | - | plans amended |
| Breach of 45° code | - | proposal amended to omit first floor rear |
| Fence overbearing | - | permitted development |
| Loss of security | - | security implications not considered to be significant |
- All other matters as set out in the appraisal.

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR, SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION, AND CONVERSION TO 3 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, PARKING AND WIDENED ACCESS

MR R SODHA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: AP/RS2/03/01, 02, 03A, 04A, Site Plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 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 41 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conversion Policy
 - 2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions
 - 3) Parking and access
 - 4) Consultation responses
-

continued/

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, E51, H10, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13

b) Site Description

- two storey semi-detached dwelling on south-west side of Elmsleigh Avenue, original net floor area of 96m² and rear garden area of 228m²
- house has attached garage and shed at side, original single storey rear projection of approximately 1m (common to all dwellings in this locality)
- forecourt has single width driveway but otherwise soft landscaped
- attached semi to south-east, no.101, unextended to adjacent part of rear and at first floor side
- neighbouring semi to north-west, no. 105, unextended at rear and first floor side, facing flank elevation contains windows to a bathroom and stairs/landing
- conversion rate in this road is 2.6%, on-street parking not controlled

c) Proposal Details

- two storey side extension, details comprise:
 - flank wall adjacent to boundary with no. 105, recessed eaves/gutter details
 - first floor front wall set 1m back from front main wall of original dwelling
 - subordinate hipped roof over
 - new windows in flank wall
- single storey rear extension:
 - 3m deep across full width of site
 - flank walls adjacent to side boundaries and 3m high
 - flat roof over
- single storey front extension:
 - 1m deep with pitched roof over
- extensions to be finished in brick to ground floor front and rear walls and on both storeys of outer flank wall, first floor walls to be rendered
- conversion of extended dwelling to three self-contained flats:
 - two flats on ground floor, Flat A to comprise 54m² net floorspace including three habitable rooms (two bedrooms), Flat C to comprise 33m² net floorspace including two habitable rooms (one bedroom); both flats to have access to rear garden
 - one flat (Flat B) to first floor comprising 62m² net floorspace including four habitable rooms (two bedrooms) but no access to rear garden
 - all flats accessed via internal shared lobby, single point of access to external front elevation
- two forecourt parking spaces, remaining area to be soft landscaped
- rear garden area of 204m² retained

continued/

d) Relevant History

81 Elmsleigh Avenue

P/2468/03/CFU Two storey side to rear, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front UNDETERMINED

71 Alicia Gardens

P/2515/03/CFU Two storey side, single storey front and rear extension and conversion to three self-contained flats, parking at front UNDETERMINED

96 Elmsleigh Avenue

EAST/574/93/FUL Single storey extension and conversion to four self-contained flats REFUSED
19-APR-94

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal would result in the loss of a dwelling of a size and type which is considered more suitable for single family occupation, represents an unneighbourly form of development in this small property, and would thus be contrary to the adopted conversion policy of the Local Planning Authority.
2. The proposed conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of increased noise, disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and be out of character in the locality.
3. The proposed hardsurfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene.”

A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed. In reaching his conclusion, the Inspector found no detriment to the character or appearance of the property in the streetscene arising from the forecourt parking area, and that the valuable addition to the stock of small, affordable homes outweighed non-compliance with the floorspace threshold of adopted Policy H10. In terms of use intensity, the Inspector found no likely increase beyond that which might occur if the house was occupied by six persons sharing, bearing in mind that car ownership upon occupants would be low in view of good public transport availability in the area.

e) 1st Notification Sent 10 Replies 11 + 2 petitions of 91 and 107 names respectively Expiry 19-NOV-03

Response: 1st Notification: Parking, highway safety (vehicles and pedestrians), noise and disturbance, precedent, overcrowding, character of community and environment, health, four flats on opposite corner, residential character of area, character and appearance of street, excessive sewage, business use contrary to deeds, loss of light, overshadowing.

continued/

2nd Notification

Sent
10

Replies
Awaited

Expiry
30-DEC-03

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity and character of proposed conversion

The proposal would, on its own, increase the proportion of non-single family dwellinghouses in Elmsleigh Avenue from 2.6% to 3.4%. Combining the proposal with that for which permission is sought in respect of no.81, the proportion would increase further to 5.1%. Notwithstanding the age of Policy H10 of the adopted UDP and the Inquiry Inspector's comments relating to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP, it can be noted that such proportions would fall well within the relevant conversion criteria contained therein. It is considered that the number of conversions in the road is so low that the proposal, both on its own and cumulatively with that of application P/2468/03/cfu, would not so significantly change the single family dwellinghouse character and the pattern of use intensity of the road as to be detrimental to the character or amenity of the locality.

The original dwelling has a net floor area below the threshold of 110m² set down in Policy H10 of the adopted UDP. This criterion has not been carried forward to the emerging replacement UDP, however, in view of PPG3 advice and the need to adopt a more flexible approach to new housing provision within existing urban areas. In these circumstances it is not considered that a reason for refusal relating to the loss of small dwelling, more suitable for single family occupation, is therefore now justified.

Although conversions of inter-war semis to two, and not three, flats is more conventional this should not preclude conversion to a greater number of units where circumstances allow. Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals, inter alia, against the suitability of the units created in terms of size, circulation and layout. Paragraph 6.54 of the reasoned justification to the policy provides further amplification, in advising that the size of the property will influence the number of units and the consequent impact of conversions on surrounding properties.

The proposed extensions would add some 53m² floorspace to the original building in a manner that might otherwise have taken the form of an acceptable extension to the property as a single family dwelling. As an enlarged property, it follows that an increased number of habitable rooms can be accommodated on the site and clearly the additional space could be used to form two much larger flats than those proposed. It is considered that the enlarged property forms sufficient space to allow, in principle, three flats to be provided. In terms of the intensity of the use of the site, there need not be any significantly greater effect on the character of the locality nor levels of noise/activity that would be detrimental to the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers than would otherwise occur as an extended single family dwelling house or as two flats each with an increased number of habitable rooms.

continued/

It now turns to consider whether the size, circulation and layout of the individual flats, which have been amended at officers request during the course of the application, are acceptable. Flat A on the ground floor and Flat B on the first floor would occupy the original dwelling together with some of the additional floorspace, resulting in units of conventional size and circulation and which are considered to be acceptable. Flat C would occupy the ground floor part of the side extension and a corresponding width of the rear extension. Its lounge would be 2.3m wide and 5m deep and an open-plan kitchen area would be partly inset into the understairs area resulting in a footprint of 3.5m x 2m. Beyond an internal bathroom and within the area of the rear extension would be a bedroom of 3m x 2.8m. It is considered that this innovative use of space would form a flat of reasonable size and circulation, having regard to its likely occupation by an individual or childless couple, and is acceptable.

The general vertical arrangement of the rooms within the building, which has also been amended at officer's request, would help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict between the flats. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the 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 both between the flats and between the building and the adjoining dwelling.

After the extension, the property would have a rear garden area of 204m². The area would serve the needs of the occupiers of the proposed ground floor flats and, as proposed to be subdivided, would exceed the levels of provision required for each of the units in respect of the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for residential development. However there would be no direct access to the garden from the proposed first floor flat.

The proposed arrangement therefore means that the first floor flat would have no access to any private useable amenity space. Paragraph 6.56 of the reasoned justification to Policy H10 of the emerging replacement UDP recognises the problem of garden access from upper flats in conversion schemes and accepts that it is inappropriate to insist that all units have their own private rear garden. Kenton Recreation Ground is, however, within a 15-20 minute walk of the site. In these circumstances and in view of central Government advice at PPG3, it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of inadequate amenity space is justified or could be sustained.

In view of the configuration of the amenity space provision, in line with the local pattern and character of development, neither is it considered that use of the outdoor space by occupiers of the flats would so significantly increase levels of externally generated noise/activity as to be detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

continued/

In the absence of external amenity space provision for the first floor flat a condition controlling use of the roof over the proposed rear extension is suggested, in the interests of the privacy amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Similarly details of refuse storage and the hard/soft landscaping of the forecourt can be satisfactorily controlled by the application of appropriate conditions, in the interests of visual amenity and character.

2) Amenity and character of proposed extensions

In accordance with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments, the proposed side extension would have a 1m set-back to the front of the first floor and a subordinate hipped roof over. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal would not appear unduly bulky or obtrusive in the streetscene, and that an adequate spatial setting for this and the neighbouring building would be maintained.

As the windows in the facing flank elevation of 105 Elmsleigh Avenue are not projected, for the purposes of the Council's guidelines, neither is it considered that the effect of the side extension or light to, or outlook from, these warrants refusal of the development proposed.

The application originally proposed the continuation of the two storey extension beyond the rear main wall. In recognition of the siting of the application site to the south-east of no.105 and the potential, therefore, for undue overshadowing of the rear of that neighbouring property, this element has been designed out of the proposal at officer's request. The slight staggering of property in this part of the road is such that no.105 is sited approximately 1m forward in its plot relative to the application dwelling and, consequently, the flank wall of the proposed side extension would project beyond the first floor rear main wall of that neighbouring dwelling by a corresponding amount. In view of the original single storey projection to the rear of no.105 and its siting of the common boundary, however, it is not considered that the effect of the resulting relationship would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

The height and depth of the single storey rear extension, also amended at officer's request, would comply with the Council's householder guidelines for such developments. It is not considered, in this circumstance, that there would be any effect on the visual or residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers beyond that normally deemed acceptable.

A rear garden depth of some 25.5m would remain. Such a distance would be consistent with that of extended residential property in Alicia Gardens and would not, therefore, be detrimental to the privacy amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of development in this locality.

continued/

The proposed front extension would be detached from, and not project beyond, the original front bay. Together with its modest bulk/height and satisfactory design, it is not considered that this element would appear unduly obtrusive in the streetscene or detract from the appearance of this and neighbouring buildings. Neither would it be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

Details of the external finish of the development can be controlled by condition. As flats the property would have no permitted development rights, consequently future outbuildings and window openings would automatically be the subject of planning controls.

In all other respects and subject to the conditions suggested, the proposal would safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality.

3) Parking and access

It remains to consider the parking and highway safety implications of the proposed conversion.

The adopted UDP undertakes to assess conversion proposals against local highway conditions, subject to one space per additional unit and for any retained units where it is determined that some provision is required. The emerging replacement UDP makes no specific provision in respect of conversion schemes.

Elmsleigh Avenue is a residential road of predominantly single family dwellings many of which have garaged and/or forecourt off-street parking provision. The proposed provision of two forecourt spaces would fall one space short of the minimum requirements of the adopted UDP. The existing dwelling has only two spaces (one on the forecourt and one garaged) which represents a shortfall of one space below the minimum requirement for a house of its size as set out in the adopted UDP, but would be consistent with the maximum standard of the emerging replacement UDP.

The locational advantages of the locality were recognised by the Planning Inspector in the determination of the conversion of 71 Alicia Avenue and, taken together with the very modest level of shortfall below the adopted standard, it is not considered that any effect of additional on-street parking would be so significant as to be detrimental to highway conditions or the amenity and convenience of neighbouring residential occupiers. In view of the distance between the application property and 83 Elmsleigh Avenue/71 Alicia Gardens, neither is it considered that there would be any actual cumulative impact.

In all of these circumstances and in view of central Government advice, it is not considered that a parking related reason for refusal is justified nor could be sustained in this instance.

continued/

4) Consultation Responses

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| Precedent | - | future applications to be judged on their own merits |
| Overcrowding | - | it is not considered that the proposal would cause overcrowding |
| character of community and environment/pollution | - | it is not considered that the number of conversions in the road would be so significant as to cause undue change in these regards |
| Health | - | not material to the planning decision |
| Four flats on opposite corner | - | noted and taken into consideration |
| Character and appearance of street | - | the proposed extensions comply with guidelines and the house would retain a single door to the front elevation |
| Excess sewage | - | a building control matter |
| Business use contrary to deeds | - | proposed use is residential and not material to the planning decision |
- All other matters as set out in the appraisal.

TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSIONS IN THE FORM OF THREE LINKED PAVILIONS

TONY WELCH ASSOCIATES for STANMORE COLLEGE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 843/0SP, 021 Rev 1, 023, 024, 031 Rev 3, 032 Rev 1, 033, 034, 035, 036

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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
- 6 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 7 Trees - Protective Fencing
- 8 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 9 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the cycle parking area have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development.
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory cycle facilities.
- 10 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the ramp into the adjacent teaching block have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The ramp shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development hereby permitted.
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory access by disabled persons.

Continued/.....

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
 - 3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
 - 4 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(E6, E29, E46, C5, A4, T13); (SD1, D4, D11, C6, C20, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E29, E46, C5, A4, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D11, C6, C20, T13
Archaeological Priority Area	
Car Parking	Standard: Justified: See Report Provided:
Site Area:	1.3 ha
Floorspace:	780m ² additional
Council Interest:	Freehold owner of site

b) Site Description

- Large site flanked by Elm Park to east, The Ridgeway to the south, Old Church Lane on the west side, and residential accommodation to the north
- Occupied by 2 and 3 storey buildings, plus single and 2 storey mobile classrooms
- Car parking within site accessed from Elm Park
- Service access from Old Church Lane
- Extensive tree cover around boundaries of site

Continued/.....

c) Proposal Details

- Removal of 3 single-storey mobile classrooms fronting onto Elm Park
- Development of 2 storey extension in form of 3 linked modules to provide additional teaching accommodation and ancillary facilities
- Brick, cladding and glazed elevations, slate pitched and hipped roof with lantern feature above each module
- Angled siting shown in relation to Elm Park, proposals between 4.6 and 8.6m from boundary
- 2 outer modules linked at 1st floor levels to adjacent 3 storey main classroom block
- provision of bicycle parking area near site entrance

d) Relevant History

Various permissions have been given since 1981 for the provision of extensions and mobile classrooms within the site.

e) Applicant's Statement

- Extension essential to replace existing dilapidated teaching accommodation
- Will provide better facilities including interview facilities and meetings room
- Will not involve any increase in student numbers
- Proposed structure loaded to piled foundation at each corner of each module with floating ground floor construction to permit retention of all adjacent trees

f) Consultations

English Heritage (Archaeology): Awaited

Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	50	1	23-SEP-03

Response: Overlooking, loss of trees, loss of amenity, overdevelopment, on-street parking.

APPRAISAL

1) Education Policy

This proposal which seeks to replace outworn temporary teaching accommodation with improved permanent facilities meets the thrust of education policies in the adopted and deposit draft replacement HUDP's which require college provision to meet the needs of the population and wider community.

Continued/.....

2) Appearance of Area

The proposed extension is shown to be sited on part of a swathe of originally open land between the 2 and 3 storey teaching blocks and the boundary with Elm Park. However, the area is mostly occupied at the moment by 3 temporary mobile classrooms and the principle therefore of developing this part of the site has to some extent already been accepted, given the circumstances and requirements of the college personnel accommodation and is considered acceptable.

Although the proposed development would be higher and partly closer to the boundary than the existing mobiles, the angled siting would reduce its impact on the streetscene and retain sufficient space along the frontage. In addition, the buildings would be partly screened by major trees which are located adjacent to the boundary and the proposed development. A condition is suggested regarding suitable foundation treatment to safeguard these trees. The necessary removal of several smaller trees is not objected to as this would benefit management of the major trees, and not have a significant impact on the streetscene.

Existing trees between the proposed development and the adjacent main teaching blocks would not be adversely affected. The proposed design of the extension and scale of development are considered to be satisfactory and overall the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the area.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposed northern module would be sited over 13m from the side boundary of the rear garden of no. 86 Elm Park, with a large sycamore tree in between. It is considered that neighbouring amenity to the north would thereby be adequately preserved.

Houses on the opposite side of Elm Park would be over 20m from the proposal with adjacent tree screening, and undue loss of residential amenity would not result.

4) Accessibility

The proposed development would be fully accessible to persons with disabilities, and has the benefit of providing a new ramp to enable access into the adjacent teaching block. Details would be the subject of a suggested condition.

Continued/.....

5) Parking

Provision of the northern module would result in the loss of 8 parking spaces which are sited alongside the access road. While this is regrettable, it is suggested that the educational benefits which the new accommodation would provide would outweigh any harm in terms of on-street parking which the loss of 8 spaces would give rise to. Details of the proposed bicycle parking facilities are required by condition.

6) Consultation Responses

- Discussed in report.

2/12

HARROW SCHOOL POLE SHED, OFF 18 FOOTBALL
LANE, HARROW, WOODLAND R/O SPINNEY
COTTAGES

P/2079/03/CFU/TW

Ward: HARROW ON THE
HILL

PROVISION OF DETACHED SINGLE STOREY TEMPORARY CLASSROOM

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCIATES for KEEPERS & GOV'RS OF HARROW SCH

2/13

HARROW SCHOOL POLE SHED, OFF 18 FOOTBALL
LANE, HARROW, WOODLAND R/O SPINNEY
COTTAGES

P/2081/03/CCA/TW

Ward: HARROW ON THE
HILL

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY TIMBER POLE
SHED.

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCIATES for KEEPERS & GOV.RS OF HARROW SCH

P/2079/03/CFU

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1366/3A,/4A,/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 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) 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 The building hereby permitted shall be removed within 4 years of the date of this
permission and the land restored in accordance with an approved scheme of works
submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, and implemented within
the first planting season thereafter.
REASON: To safeguard the character of the area.

Continued/....

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 :
(E1, E2, E5, E6, E19, E38); (S1, EP43, EP44, SD1, SD2, D17)

P/2081/03/CCA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1366/3A,/4A,/5.

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

- 1 The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and planning permission has been granted for the development for which the contract provides.
REASON: To protect the appearance of the:-
(c) conservation area

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 39 - UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(E1, E2, E5, E6, E19, E38); (S1, EP43, EP44, SD1, SD2, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
- 2) Impact on Metropolitan Open Lane
- 3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E1, E2, E5, E6, E19, E38
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	S1, EP43, EP44, SD1, SD2, D17
Area of Special Character	
Conservation Area:	Harrow School
Floorspace:	54m ²
Council Interest:	None

Continued/.....

b) Site Description

- Single storey building measuring 18.5m by 4.5m, used by Harrow School to store rugby posts and other equipment
- The building is sited adjacent to the trackway that leads from Football Lane to the sports pitches
- The site is within the Harrow School Conservation Area and Metropolitan Open Lane (MOL)
- The site forms a relatively narrow level area with a backdrop of treed, rising ground

c) Proposal Details

- CAC application to demolish the existing building
- Replace the existing store with a single storey temporary classroom building
- The proposed building would measure 9.5m by 5.9m
- The building is required by the School to accommodate teaching which would be displaced during building works to the music schools building

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Consultations

CAAC: No objection

Advertisement	Demolition in Conservation Area	Expiry 24-OCT-03
----------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------

Notifications	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 16-OCT-03
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

The existing building, is of timber with a plastic corrugated roof, its long elevation facing the trackway and the falling ground to the east.

The proposed building would present a shorter elevation to the east. The building would also be seen against the backdrop of trees immediately to the west. It is considered that, with suitable control over the colour of the building, its impact on the conservation area would be neutral.

Continued/.....

2) Metropolitan Open Land

The proposed building would represent a reduction in footprint compared to the existing building and therefore represents an improvement to the openness of the MOL.

3) Consultation Responses

None.

10 COLLEGE AVENUE, HARROW

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR AND
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS
AND REAR DORMER.

MR K D'AUSTIN for MR ASHRAF ALI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 10CR/01a, Site Plan

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

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

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 20 - Encroachment
 - 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
 - 4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
 - 5 Standard Informative 40 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45), (D4, D5, SD1)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Appearance in the Streetscene
 - 2) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers
 - 3) Amenity Space
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

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

continued/

b) Site Description

- semi-detached residential dwelling on site located on the southern side of College Avenue
- existing single storey extension built up to western boundary
- 3 storey block of flats to west, sited 1m from boundary
- kitchen windows to 6 flats on facing flank wall
- rear garden depth of 11.5m and width of 7.5m
- adjoining neighbour to the east has no rear extension

c) Proposal Details

- it is proposed to extend from the western flank wall at ground and first floor level 2400mm to within 200mm of the boundary fence
- the extension would be level with the main front wall of the applicant's property at ground and first floor level
- the extension would run to 2700mm beyond the main rear wall, and at ground floor level the extension would span the width of the house and abut the boundary with no.12, and at first floor level the extension would terminate at 2600mm from the boundary with no.12
- the roof over the proposed extension would be hipped and continue the existing ridgeline
- the proposed single storey rear extension would measure 3000mm deep and span the entire width of the applicant's property
- the proposed rear dormer window would be sited 1m above the eaves, 0.5m from the roof boundary and 1.5m from the outer edge of the roof slope

d) Relevant History

P/183/03/DFU	Two storey side to rear and single storey rear extension, rear dormer window	REFUSED 24-MAR-03
--------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of excessive bulk and prominent siting, would be unduly obtrusive in the streetscene, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property, and the character of the locality.
2. 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.
3. The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality.

The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal. The sole reason for dismissing the appeal related to the potential impact on the adjacent dwelling no.12, as the original proposal did not fully comply with the Council's 45^o code.

continued/

The proposal was considered to be acceptable in all other respects.

In the light of the appeal decision the applicant has resubmitted the proposal, after reducing the depth of the first floor rear extension from 3m to 2.7m, and thus complying with the Council's 45° code.

e)	Notifications	Sent 16	Replies 1	Expiry 30-OCT-03
	Response: Loss of light			

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance in Streetscene

The previous application was refused partly by reason of the excessive bulk and prominent siting, making the proposal appear unduly obtrusive in the streetscene, to the detriment of the character of the locality.

The Inspector handling the appeal considered that there was no strong rhythm or uniformity in the built form along the southern side of College Avenue, that the proposal would not disrupt the rhythm or balance of the applicant's property and that the closing of the gap between the applicant's property and the adjacent flats would not prove unacceptable. It was concluded that the proposal would not cause material harm to the character or appearance of the streetscene. The appearance of this revised application in the streetscene would be identical to that refused.

Given the comments made by the Inspector, it is not considered this revised application could be reasonably refused for any reason relating to the appearance in the streetscene.

2) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

The previous application was refused partly by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection. It was considered that the proposal would have been unduly obtrusive, resulting in loss of light and overshadowing, detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property.

The Inspector handling the appeal against the original refusal of planning permission concurred that the excessive bulk and rearward projection would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers. The proposal has been amended to reduce the rearward projection, to comply with the 45° code.

The potential impact of the proposal on the secondary flank windows of the adjacent block of flats was not considered by the Inspector to be significant enough to justify the refusal of planning permission.

continued/

3) Amenity Space

The previous application was refused partly by reason of inadequate garden depth. Within the appeal decision letter the Inspector considered that the remaining garden space would be sufficient, would not unduly affect the character of the surrounding area, and would not conflict with Policy E45. Given these comments made by the Inspector, it is not considered the revised application could be reasonably refused for this reason.

4) Consultation Responses

Addressed in report

18 LATIMER GARDENS, PINNER

RETENTION OF ACCESS RAMP WITH HAND RAILS AT FRONT OF PROPERTY.

ROMAN PROFESSIONAL SERVICES for METHODIST MINISTER HOUSING SOC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: B01-1740 04 Rev B

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following informative:-

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E5, E6, E38, E45 & A6), (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17 & C20)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance
 - 2) Consultation Response
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45 & A6
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17 & C20
Conservation Area:	Pinnerwood Park Estate
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- A two storey end of terrace dwelling, located east of the junction with Pinner Hill;
- Site lies within Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area;

Continued/.....

c) Proposal Details

- The retention of a disabled access ramp to provide for wheelchair access to the front doorway entrance of the property;
- The ramp consists of a concrete base, with a gradient of 1:12 with a trowel smooth finish. The ramp face has been painted black to match the painted low level brick plinth of the dwelling;
- A 900 mm high pressed steel guard-railing is provided to the outer edges of the ramp. The metalwork has been coated in primer and black gloss paint to match the existing metalwork of the dwelling;

d) Relevant History

WEST/157/02/FUL	Single Storey Rear Extension	GRANTED 14-OCT-02
ENF/221/03/P	Erection Of Disabled Assess In Front Garden Within Article 4 Conservation Area	22-MAY-03 CASE CLOSED

e) Consultations

CAAC: This is unattractive – would prefer to avoid the use of separate stand alone handrails – these should be attached to the front elevation of the property.

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 25-SEP-03
Notification	Sent 2	Replies 0
		Expiry 19-SEP-03

APPRAISAL

1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance

The ramp in question has already been installed on site, therefore this application is retrospective. Although the ramp feature is technically not compatible with the architecture of the building, it is clearly necessary to provide wheelchair access to the building and given the circumstances of the applicant its retention can be justified. The details which include the painting of the edge facing the road to match the blank plinth on the main building gives the two elements some unity in design terms. If at a later date the ramp is no longer required, the railing could be removed at least giving some reversibility to the proposal.

2) Consultation Response

None.

18 LATIMER GARDENS, PINNER

RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH RAISED PATIO AND STEPS

ROMANS PROFESSIONAL SERVICES for METHODIST MINISTERS HOUSING AS

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: B01/1740/01 Rev A; BO1/1740/02 Rev H

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

- 1 The windows in the western facing elevation of the existing development must be permanently retained with obscure glazing or obscure treatment.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 39 – Reasons for Grant of Listed Building Consent or Conservation Area Consent:
(E5, E6, E38, E45, A6); (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17, C20)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45 & A6
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17 & C20
Conservation Area:	Pinnerwood Park Estate
	None

Continued/.....

b) Site Description

- A two storey end of terrace dwelling, located east of the junction with Pinner Hill;
- Site lies within Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area;
- a recently constructed single storey extension has been attached to the rear elevation of the subject building;
- 3m wide driveway is located between the subject dwelling and 16 Latimer Gardens;
- a conservatory has been built to the rear of the dwelling at No 20 Latimer Gardens of approximately 2.8 metre depth and 2.5 metre height;

c) Proposal Details

- The application involves the retrospective approval of the existing single storey rear extension. The rear extension was previously granted approval (W/157/02/FUL) with dimensions of: 3.0 metre depth, 6.5 metre width and 3.15 metre height (flat roof design). The approved plan included a small disabled ramp attached to the rear elevation of the extension. However, when the extension was constructed it was built with an overall height of 3.5 metres, including a raised brick patio measuring 1.6 metres by 6.5 metres. This application seeks to regularise the development as it currently exists.

d) Relevant History

WEST/157/02/FUL	single storey rear extension	GRANTED 14-OCT-02
ENF/221/03/P	erection of disabled assess in front garden Within article 4 conservation area	22-MAY-03 case closed

e) Consultations

CAAC: No objection as proposal is no worse than previous consent. Comments for front ramp as previous application for the works.

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 26-NOV-03
Notification	Sent 2	Replies 0
		Expiry 18-NOV-03

Continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance

This application represents the applicant's attempt to have the existing single storey rear extension retrospectively approved. The only issue is whether the raised patio and the increased height of the extension (over and above the height of the approved scheme), unduly impacts on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or has any detrimental impact on adjoining properties.

The extension as existing is 0.35 metres higher than the approved scheme and raised patio area is elevated approx. 0.45 metres above ground to correspond with the internal floor level of the single storey extension. Overall it is considered that the design of the extension and raised patio are in keeping with the style and character of the dwelling and do not detrimentally impact upon the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2) Neighbours Amenity

It is considered that the increased height of the extension would not be detrimental to the amenity of adjoining neighbours. Additionally the raised patio is deemed to be a standard design feature, which are common place in situations where the floor level of a dwelling is elevated above ground level. Likewise the raised patio does not give rise to any significant overlooking impacts for adjoining neighbours.

3) Consultation Response

None.

16 OLD SOUTH CLOSE, HATCH END

REPLACEMENT DETACHED GARAGE IN REAR GARDEN

MICHAEL SCAR for MISS MARILYN MILLER

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 504.1 & 504.2

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 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E5, E6, E38, E39, E45); (SD1, SD2, D4, D16, D17, D18)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

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

Continued/.....

b) Site Description

- Located on the north side of Old South Close within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area;
- Occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling on a generous sized plot;
- An existing single storey garage is located to the rear of the dwelling set back approximately 24m from the road frontage.

c) Proposal Details

- The application proposes the removal of the existing single car garage and its replacement with a new garage of similar appearance, materials and dimensions;
- The garage would have a height of 2.5m, length of 5.6m, and width of 3.7m respectively;
- It would be set back 2.3m from the rear of the dwelling with a flank wall running along the boundary with the adjoining neighbour in a position similar to that existing.

d) Relevant Planning History

WEST/502/93/FUL	Single storey rear extension	GRANTED 08-NOV-1993
-----------------	------------------------------	------------------------

e) Applicant's Statement

- The work is necessary because of subsidence of the existing garage. The new garage is to be of the same size, position and basic design as the existing garage.

f) Consultations

CAAC: It is suggested that side hanging timber doors would be more appropriate than the up and over doors currently proposed.

Advertisement		Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 13-NOV-03
Notification	Sent 2	Replies 0	Expiry 03-NOV-03

APPRAISAL

1) Neighbouring Amenity

The proposed garage is to be of a similar size, design and position as the existing garage. In relation to the dwelling at 17 Old South Close the garage would be sited on the side boundary between the two properties. The proposal is unlikely to give rise to any further impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours than exists at present.

Continued/.....

2) Appearance or Character of Conservation Area

The appearance and character of the Pinnerwood Park Estate conservation area would be preserved by the development due to the similarity of design, materials and appearance. The garage would be set back by approximately 2.3m from the rear of the dwelling and 24.0m from the road frontage. The distance from the frontage of the property means that the proposal would not be prominent in the streetscene. The use of matching materials and an existing stained timber (up and over) door would preserve the existing character of the site and this part of the conservation area.

3) Consultation Responses

None.

853 HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE

2/18

P/1482/03/CFU/TW

Ward: BELMONT

CHANGE OF USE: RETAIL TO OFFICE (CLASS A1 TO A2) AND REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE 2 FLOORS OF OFFICES/STORES

A OLOYEDE for RADIATION LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 85311PL03/A, 02/A, 01/A.

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

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E46, S16, T13); (SD1, D4, EM21, T13)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Loss of Retail
 - 2) Character of the Area
 - 3) Amenity of Residents
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E46, S16, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, EM21, T13
Car Parking	Standard: 2 (0)
	Justified: 0 (0)
	Provided: 2 (2)
Floor Area:	120m ²
Council Interest:	None

continued/.....

b) Site Description

- Ground floor commercial premises on the west side of Honeypot Lane
- Rear yard area with access from service road
- The property is vacant and was last used as a hairdressers
- The property is within a non-designated parade
- Uses in the parade are as follows: retail (4 units, A1), takeaway (A3), vacant (A1 – application site), café (A3), picture shop (A1), hardware (A1), supermarket (A1), retail (A1, 2 units), bar (A3), hire shop (A1), pharmacy (A1), restaurant (A3), newsagent (A1), launderette (sui generis). 13 x A1, 5 x A3.

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use of ground floor from hairdressers (Class A1) to an estate agents (A2)
- Extension at rear which would be partly set down within the site and would provide 2 levels of floorspace
- The proposed upper level would partly overhang the proposed two car parking spaces at the rear

d) Relevant History

None.

e) 1st Notification	Sent 22	Replies 0	Expiry 22-JUL-03
2nd Notification	Sent 22	Replies Awaited	Expiry 07-JAN-04

APPRAISAL

1) Loss of Retail Use

Policies contained within the Adopted and Draft UDP permit such changes subject to: no loss of necessary local provision, parking, servicing arrangements. In addition uses in this parade would remain predominantly retail. The application premises are vacant and it is considered that the proposal would not result in the loss of necessary local retail provision. Furthermore the proposal would provide a service not already present in this parade. A parking area of 2 spaces is proposed at the rear and servicing could take place from the rear or the front service road.

Continued/.....

2) Character of the Area

The rear areas of these commercial premises contain a variety of extensions and out-buildings. Whilst this extension would perhaps be the largest, in visual terms due to the fact that its height would be no greater than the parapet wall to the adjacent pedestrian walkway, its impact is judged to be acceptable.

3) Residential Amenity

The proposed height of the extension would be no greater than the parapet wall, adjacent to the walkway which gives access to the flats above. The proposal would therefore have little impact on the amenity of those residents.

4) Consultation Responses

None.

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND USE OF GARAGE AS HABITABLE ROOM

G E POTTLE & CO for MR & MRS CHOWDHARY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drg. No. 1802/01 Rev. A, Drg. No. 1802/02 Rev. B

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

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

INFORMATIVES

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

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1 Amendment to Application
 - 2 Conservation Area Character and Appearance
 - 3 Residential Amenity
 - 4 Parking
 - 5 Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E5, E6, E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1,SD2, D4, D16, D17
TPO	
Conservation Area:	Stanmore Hill
Car Parking	Standard: 2
	Justified: 2
	Provided: 8

Continued/.....

APPRAISAL

1) Amendment to Application

The application originally proposed a rear conservatory along with the single storey side extension/ garage conversion. However as a variety of concerns were raised with respect to the rear conservatory, it was later deleted from the proposed plans. The plans were further amended to clarify the relationship between the side elevation windows and the single storey extension.

2) Conservation area character and appearance

With regard to the loss of open space between buildings, a solid brick wall currently spans the width between the garage and dwelling. When viewed from the street this wall aligns flush with the front facades of both the dwelling and the garage, therefore already removing the 'gap' between the buildings. The roof form of the infill building is complimentary to the design and style of the both the dwelling and garage.

With respect to 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 would prevent it from being used a separate and self contained dwelling.

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

3) Residential Amenity

It is considered that the proposed building would have no impact on any adjoining property given that the proposed works involve the infilling of space between two existing buildings. Essentially the proposed works would not even be visible from the closest residential property, that adjoins the garage to the north.

4) Parking

Although the scheme would see the removal of the existing carport, there is ample on site parking available with regard to the large expanse of hard surfacing located to the forecourt of the property. This space more than adequately complies with the parking standards set out in the adopted UDP.

5) Consultation Responses

None.

PART SINGLE, PART TWO STOREY REAR, AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS

AITCHISON RAFFETY for DR OSAYI

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drawing No. 2254/1 rev. D;

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 The recommendations and tree protection measures contained within the report of John Cromar's Arboricultural Company (dated 16 October, 2002) must be implemented during all stages of the construction of the approved development.
REASON: To safeguard the trees on the adjoining land covered by Tree Preservation Orders.

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 : (E1; E2; E6; E10; E11; E45); (SEP6; SD1; EP34; D4)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character
 - 2) Residential Amenity
 - 3) Tree Preservation Order
 - 4) Parking
 - 5) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E1; E2; E6; E10; E11; E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SEP6; SD1; EP34; D4
Area of Special Character
Green Belt

Continued/

Site Area: 217m²
Habitable Rooms: 8
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- the subject site is located on the eastern side of Brookshill, north of the junction with Uxbridge Road;
- The building on the subject site is a double storey detached dwelling. The original dwelling has previously been extended;
- The subject property is within a row of only four residential properties. These four properties are surrounded by Harrow College along the north and eastern boundaries, whilst the subject site being the end property, abuts open playing fields along its southern boundary;
- Large mature trees (a mixture of ash, sycamore, elm, hawthorn & oak), are located along the southern boundary of the subject property, however are located on the playing field land. The trees are covered by Tree Preservation Order;
- the forecourt of the building is fully sealed with tarmac except for a few small landscaping beds. A vehicular crossover is located to either side of the properties frontage;

c) Proposal Details

- demolish the single storey garage sited to the side elevation of the dwelling;
- demolish the single storey rear conservatory;
- construct a part single and part double storey rear extension in the location of the demolished conservatory. The extension would have a larger footprint than the existing conservatory. Internally the extension would provide for a family room at ground floor and master bedroom with ensuite at upper level;
- construct a single storey side extension that would extend from the front elevation to the rear elevation. Internally the side extension would provide for a rebuilt single garage and an extension to the existing kitchen;
- infill the existing porch, including a pitched roof above that would wrap around the building to form part of the roof of the single storey side extension;

d) Relevant History

HAR/4016/F	erection of detached house (outline)	GRANTED 12-JUL-1961
HAR/4016/H	erection of detached house and garage	GRANTED 05-DEC-1961
LBH/37714	single-storey side and rear extensions with front boundary walls and gates	GRANTED 29-JUN-1989

Continued/.....

Item 2/20 - P/2294/03/CFU continued.....

LBH/42005	use of part of ground floor as day nursery	GRANTED 07-DEC-1990
P/823/03/DFU	part single, part two storey front, side and rear extensions	REFUSED 30-JUN-2003

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposed extension would result in a disproportionate and therefore inappropriate increase in the size of the building in this Green Belt location to the detriment of the Green Belt.”

e) Consultations

Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	5	0	07-NOV-03

APPRAISAL

1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character

With respect of the extension of dwellinghouses, Green Belt polices aim to restrict the increase in size of dwellings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard the openness of it. It is noted that the dwelling has been previously extended.

The area is characterised by large dwellinghouses set in ample plots, with generally abundant and mature boundary vegetation and space around the buildings. With regard to proposed additions it is highlighted that the majority of the works would not be visible from the streetscape. The only visible modification from the frontage is with respect of the infilled porch, and the proposed hipped roof that would extend from the infilled porch to wrap around to the proposed side extension. These are considered to be constitute minor elements of work that would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the locality with respect of the Green Belt land classification. The part double, part single storey rear extension would follow the general building pattern of the locality and would not reduce the openness of land surrounding the subject building.

	Original	Existing	% over original	proposed	% over original
Footprint (m2)	106.52	130.53	+22.5	147.17	+38.2
Floor Area (m2)	164.1	187.38	+14.2	217.74	+32.7
Volume (m3)	587.48	650.82	+10.78	770.12	+31.1

Continued/.....

It is considered that the proposed extensions are appropriate and are not disproportionate in size when compared to the original house. Accordingly it is deemed that the proposed additions would not be harmful to the Green Belt. The previous refused application envisaged percentage increases of: 46.22% in footprint, 53.93% in floor area and 49.43 in volume. The proposed revised addition would not be harmful to this part of the Green Belt.

2) Residential Amenity

At ground level the proposed rear additions have been designed to align with ground floor of the neighbouring property. Although the proposed upper floor rear addition would forward of the neighbour's upper floor (by 1.0 metre), it nonetheless does not infringe on a 45 degree angle when measured from the neighbouring building.

Additionally it is highlighted that the neighbouring dwelling does not accommodate any windows in its side elevation within close proximity to the proposed additions. Therefore there is no concern that the proposed dwelling additions would pose a detrimental impact for the adjoining neighbour.

3) Tree Preservation Order

Due to the existence of Tree Preservation Orders on the majority of the trees on the adjoining playing fields site, an arboricultural report was supplied with the application. This report specifies construction and protection methods that would be required to be undertaken during the construction process to ensure no damage to the trees would be caused. The recommendations of this arboricultural report has the endorsement of Development Control's Landscape Department.

4) Parking

With a single garage being proposed as part of the additions, along with the informal parking accommodated on the property's sealed forecourt, there would in actual fact be an oversupply of parking spaces when assessed against the adopted UDP and deposit UDP. Furthermore with two existing driveway entrances to the site and ample manoeuvring space, it would allow all vehicles to enter and exit the site in a forward direction. Accordingly there is no objection to the scheme on grounds of insufficient parking provision or highway safety.

5) Consultation Responses

None.

1 HALLAM GARDENS, PINNER

SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS

G M SIMISTER for MR AND MRS D REES

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: HAL-1 Rev B.

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

1. Time Limit – Full Permission
2. Materials to Match

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code
 - 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall Etc Act 1996
 - 3 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals: (E4, E6, E38, E45); (SD1, D4, D5, D17)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
 - 2) Amenity of Neighbours
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

This application was deferred at the meeting on 5th November 2003 in order to seek revisions to the detailing of the proposal.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E4, E6, E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, D4, D5, D17
Conservation Area:	Pinnerwood Park Estate
Site Area:	0.03ha
Council Interest:	None

Continued/

b) Site Description

- semi-detached, two storey house sited at the junction of Hallam Gardens and Grimsdyke Road
- the house is typical of the 'Artegan' style of housing within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension of 3m in depth and 6m in width of brickwork and half in the form a conservatory
- single storey side extension measuring 1.15m by 0.7m, sited behind the existing wall which encloses the rear garden from the front of the site

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Consultations

CAAC: Awaited

Advertisement	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 26-AUG-03
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

Notifications	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 19-AUG-03
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

The proposal would reflect the existing house in terms of window design and proportions. The rear extension would have a parapet at the edge of the roof which would have a brick on edge and tile creasing detail.

The side extension would partly fill in a recessed area on the side elevation and would be behind the existing garden wall.

It is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

Continued/

2) Amenity of Neighbours

The flank wall of the proposed rear extension would be adjacent to the boundary with the attached neighbour (No. 39 Grimsdyke Road) and would extend to a depth of 3m. This would comply with the Council's standards in this regard and would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbours.

3) Consultation Responses

None.

REAR DORMER

E B HARRISON for MR AMMOND

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Dwg AD 01; Dwg AD 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 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
 - (a) the extension/building(s)
 - (b) the ground surfacing
 - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 2 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E4, E5, E6, E38, E39, E45); (SD1, SD2, D4, D5, D16, D17)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E4, E5, E6, E38, E39, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, SD2, D4, D5, D16, D17
Conservation Area:	Pinnerwood Park Estate
Council Interest:	None

continued/

b) Site Description

- A semi-detached two storey house on northern side of Albury Drive, at the junction with Latimer Gardens;
- Site lies within Area 1 of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area;

c) Proposal Details

- The proposed development encompass the construction of a dormer within the rear roofslope;
- The proposed dormer accommodates a width of 2.0 metres, fascia height of 1.3 metres, with a hipped roof design. The ridge of the dormer's hipped roof sits 0.6 metres below the main ridge of the dwellinghouse;
- The proposed dormer is proposed to allow a bedroom and ensuite to be accommodated within the roofspace of dwellinghouse;

d) Relevant History

P/12/03/DFU	Roof extension and rear dormer	REFUSED 01-JUL-03
-------------	--------------------------------	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

“The proposed alterations, by reason of unsatisfactory design and/or appearance, would detract from the character and appearance of the property and this part of the conservation area.”

e) Consultations

CAAC: (Comments on prior application) This is a highly visible and prominent corner property. Proposal would result in loss of symmetry of the roof, this does not comply with conservation area guidance. Rear dormer too large, close to valley, should be 2 casements at most.

Advertisement		Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 18-DEC-03
Notification	Sent 6	Replies 0	Expiry 09-DEC-03

Continued/.....

APPRAISAL

1) Conservation Area Character and Appearance

With respect of the Roof Extension Policy of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area, the subject site is one of a number of properties where roof extensions are deemed inappropriate, unless an appropriate design solution can be achieved. This designation includes the subject site due its prominent siting and in light of the full side and rear elevations being visible from vantage points on Albury Drive;

The Roof Extension policy does however provide two examples of acceptable dormer designs. In this case the proposed dormer follows the examples of acceptable dormer design. Specifically the ridge of the dormer would sit below the main ridge of the dwelling to ensure that it would be a subservient feature within the rear roofslope. This design would not detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area nor the dwelling itself.

2) Residential Amenity

Due to there being a horizontal separation distance of approximately 20 metres between the proposed dormer and the side flank elevation of the adjoining dwelling to the north, there is no concern as to the impact on adjoining occupiers.

3) Consultation Response

None.

LAND ADJ. TO 128 SOMERVELL RD, HARROW

2/23

P/1900/03/CFU/AMH

Ward: ROXETH

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY DETACHED HOUSE WITH PAINTING AT FRONT
(REVISED)

MAHMUT HILMI ARCHITECT for MR S BUDHDEO

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: RPH 429: 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 be Approved
- 3 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E17, E45, T13); (D4, D5, SD1, EP42, T13)
 - 2 Standard Informative 20 - Encroachment
 - 3 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
 - 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc Act 1996
 - 5 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Amenity Space
 - 2) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers
 - 3) Appearance in Streetscene
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

Continued/.....

INFORMATION

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

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E17, E45, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: D4, D5, SD1, EP42, T13
Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- Site to northern side of Somervell Rd, formerly side garden to end of terrace building number 128 Somervell Rd.
- Purpose built block of flats to east, gable-facing east/west, with front and rear dormers.
- Residential area characterised primarily by short terraces and semi-detached buildings.

c) Proposal Details

- construction of a new detached house on land adjacent to number 128 Somervell Rd.
- dwelling would measure 5.3m wide, and a maximum of 11.5m deep (to end of single storey rear projection).
- dwelling would be sited 650mm from the adjacent number 128 Somervell Rd, and would almost abut the adjacent number 126a/b.

d) Relevant History

P/430/03/DFU	Single And Two Storey House With Parking At Front	REFUSED 10-JUL-03
--------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for Refusal:

- “1. The proposed house, by reason of its location, would result in a cramped form of development, obtrusive and overbearing in the street scene, exacerbating the incongruity of the present building that is known as 126a and 126b Somervell Road.
2. The principal difference between this application and the previous application is a reduction in height achieved through inclusion of a hipped roof as opposed to a gabled roof.

Continued/.....

Item 2/23 - P/1900/03 CFU continued.....

3. The original revised scheme was not considered acceptable. The applicant has submitted revised plans incorporating further minor changes, and this current application is considered in this context.”

e) Applicant’s Statement

- See letter dated 18th September outlining merits of application.

f) 1st Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	12	2	08-SEP-03

Response: Does not complement the character of adjoining buildings; prevents building maintenance; does not protect building structure; obliterates public realm and building environment; potential effect of off-street parking areas on traffic safety; Lack of respect for local residents, environment and Council's housing preferences; does not fulfil requirements of HUDP.

2nd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	12	2	18-SEP-03

Response: Does not complement the character of adjoining buildings; prevents building maintenance; does not protect building structure; obliterates public realm and building environment; potential effect of off-street parking areas on traffic safety; fails to comply with UDP; Lack of respect for local residents, environment and Council's housing preferences.

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity Space

At approximately 26m deep and 6m wide, the application site is considered large enough to accommodate the proposed development and to provide adequate amenity space for the proposed single family dwelling house.

2) Impact on Neighbouring Occupiers

The proposed development complies with the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance for siting of new development in relation to existing buildings. There are no protected windows on the facing flank wall of either adjacent dwellings, and the proposal would not impact on any protected windows to the front or rear of the neighbouring dwellings.

Continued/.....

In terms of the 45° code, the proposal is acceptable.

The single storey rear component reaches some 3m beyond the main rear wall of the adjacent 128, and as such would be consistent with the Council's guidelines.

It is not considered that the proposal would lead to any unreasonable overshadowing or loss of residential amenity for the neighbouring occupiers.

3) Appearance in Streetscene

The dwelling would be sited 650mm from the adjacent number 128 Somervell Rd, and would almost abut the adjacent number 126a/b.

The appearance of the proposed dwelling would be acceptable in the street scene. The design of the building would reflect the character of many of the neighbouring buildings and as such would not appear out of character.

It is not considered the proposal would be unduly bulky or obtrusive in the street scene or have any unreasonable impact on the character of the Applicant's property or surrounding area.

4) Consultation Responses

Where material planning considerations have been raised, they have been addressed in the above report.

The following issues are not considered to be material planning considerations: - prevents building maintenance; does not protect building structure; lack of respect for local residents.

SECTION 3 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

455 UXBRIDGE RD, HATCH END

3/01
P/1913/03/CFU/GM
Ward: HATCH END

CHANGE OF USE: A1 TO A3 (RETAIL TO FOOD & DRINK) ON PART OF GROUND FLOOR, WITH PARKING AT REAR.

ANTHONY J BLYTH AND CO for MS F SURACE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: PMB/03/152 and site plan.

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

- 1 Refusal - Loss of Retail Frontage - Centre

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 2 Standard Informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals : (E6, E51, S15, T13); (SD1, EP25, T13, EM19, EM26)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

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

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	E6, E51, S15, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SD1, EP25, T13, EM19, EM26
Town Centre	Hatch End
Car Parking	Standard: 2 (0 additional)
	Justified: 1 (0 additional)
	Provided: 0 additional
Customer Circulation Area:	24.5m ²
Council Interest:	None

Continued/....

b) Site Description

- Terraced unit on the southern side of Uxbridge Road within the designated retail frontage of Hatch End Local Centre
- Authorised use is A1 at front with A3 to rear, interlinked businesses
- Two floors of residential use above accessed from the rear
- Service road with parking at front, service road at rear
- Within parade of 20 units, 407 – 521 Uxbridge Road; the uses, starting at no. 407, are as follows: post office (A1), tile shop (A1), interior design (A1), electrical goods (A1), delicatessen (A1), dry cleaners (A1), video shop (A1), delicatessen (A1), optician (A1), off-licence (A1), interior design (A1), restaurant (A3), delicatessen/restaurant (the application premises, A1), restaurant (A3), flooring (A1), building society (A2), furniture shop (A1, sextuple frontage), furnishings (A1), clothes shop (A1), restaurant (A3); 16 x A1, 1 x A2, 3 x A3

c) Proposal Details

- Change of use of frontage from A1 to A3 on ground floor

d) Relevant History

LBH/35078	Change Of Use From Launderette To Retail Use	GRANTED 18-APR-88
LBH/42404	Single Storey Extension & Change Of Use Of Rear Of 455: Retail Use (Class A1) To Restaurant As Extension To No.451 And Retention Of Retail To The Front Of No.455	REFUSED 26-JUN-91
WEST/44462/92/FUL	Change of Use of Rear of No. 455: Retail Use (Class A1) to Restaurant as Extension to No. 451, Retention of Retail at Front	REFUSED 26-MAY-92

A subsequent appeal was dismissed.

EAST/682/94/FUL	Change Of Use Of Part Of Ground Floor From Retail To Food And Drink	GRANTED 07-MAR-97
-----------------	---	----------------------

Continued/....

increase to 33.33% if the proposal were to be allowed. For the revised deposit draft UDP the figures are 32.78% and 34.13% respectively. These figures exceed the 30% threshold set in Policy S15 of the adopted UDP and EM19 of the revised deposit draft. There is also a recent appeal decision for 294 Uxbridge Road (change of use A1 – A3) which was allowed but is the subject of a High Court challenge. If the challenge is not upheld the figures for non-retail frontage would be further increased from those quoted above. There would therefore be a clear conflict with UDP policy, with the change of use resulting in the loss of retail use and harming the vitality and viability of the Local Centre.

These are not considered to be in conflict with other aspects of the retail policies. A separate report will be made seeking authority for enforcement action to stop the unauthorised use occurring in breach of the legal agreement signed in 1996.

2) Residential Amenity

Given the high street location where A3 uses are to be expected it is not considered that there would be any loss of residential amenity from the proposal. Planning conditions relating to noise and hours of use would be appropriate if the application were recommended for approval.

3) Parking

Dependent upon whether the adopted or revised deposit draft UDP's parking standards are applied, either 1 additional or no additional parking spaces would be required. Given the location it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal could be justified.

4) Consultation Responses

These are addressed in the report.

51 ABERCORN CRESCENT, SOUTH HARROW

3/02

P/2400/03/CFU/OH

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

ARP ASSOCIATES for MISS PHILOMENA D'SOUZA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: ARP05/01-02 and Site Plan

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

- 1 The proposed depth of the rear extension would be unduly obtrusive and 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, E45); (SD1, D4, D5)
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Amenity Space
 - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity
 - 3) Special Circumstances of the Applicant
 - 4) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee in accordance with the Additional Householder Extension Guidance titled, "The Consideration of Personal Circumstances in Relation to Planning Applications for Householder Extensions for Disabled People".

a) Summary

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

Continued/.....

b) Site Description

- End of terrace dwelling located on Abercorn Crescent, South Harrow
- It is set back approximately 1m from adjacent house (number 53)
- There is an existing single storey rear extension to an approximate depth of 3.6m to line up with a single storey rear extension at adjoining house number 49, to the south
- There is an alleyway (approximately 5m wide) between number 51 and adjacent house number 53 (to the north) where there is also a single storey rear extension
- Rear garden depth of 40m with no trees with low wooden fences forming the boundaries with the adjoining property and the alleyway
- Rear garden boundary is formed with a garage/shed

c) Proposal Details

- It is proposed to extend to the rear of the existing single storey rear extension sited along the northern boundary
- The proposal would be to a depth of 3.48m, it would be 3.22m wide and 2.9m in height with a flat roof
- The plans indicate a door on the northern elevation facing the alleyway, a small window on the rear elevation and two windows and a door on the southern flank elevation

d) Relevant History

LBH/6866	Erection Of Single-Storey Rear Extension To Dwelling House To Replace Existing Extension	GRANTED 30-11-71
----------	--	---------------------

e) Applicant's Statement

- I am a pensioner and have never claimed any benefit from Social Security. I live on my own and suffer from hypertension. In 1995 I had a heart attack and a subsequent bypass operation. I also suffer from a degenerative spine condition which is getting progressively worse and I can hardly walk or climb stairs. I have included letters from my G.P. and relevant hospital specialists to substantiate this point.

I have not registered as a disabled person as I do not wish to claim benefits and be a burden to the Government. My brother is going to live with me and would occupy the upper floor whilst I would live on the ground floor, hence the need for the toilet, shower and utility room. Neighbours have no objection to the proposals, and finally all works will be funded by myself.

Continued/.....

Item 3/02 - P/2400/03/CFU continued.....

- This application has been made on the basis of the applicant's medical circumstances. The applicant's G.P. has submitted a letter (dated 03/05/2002) of support outlining the reasons why an extension would be beneficial:
 - The applicant suffers from low back pain and finds it difficult to climb stairs
 - The applicant suffers from Coronary Heart Disease and had a CABG at St Mary's Hospital in March 1997
 - The applicant would benefit from having an extension which will mainly contain a toilet and a separate shower unit, presently there is a combined toilet and bath on the 1st floor
 - It would give a better quality of life
 - The applicant will finance this extension and will require no assistance in this regard from the Council
- The applicant's Consultant Cardiothoracic Surgeon has also submitted a letter that states:
 - The applicant has shortness of breath with associated fatigue and would benefit from a downstairs extension to avoid her having to climb stairs

f)	Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
		2	0	11-NOV-03

APPRAISAL

1. Amenity Space

The application site is considered large enough to accommodate the proposed development without any adverse impact on rear amenity space.

2. Visual and Residential Amenity

The proposed single storey extension would be to a depth of 3.48m and would extend to a width of 3.22m, which is more than half the width of the house. The height of 2.9m is considered to be acceptable. The extra depth would mean that the depth of the extensions on the northern side would be a total of 7.08m from the original main rear wall of the dwelling. However, there is an alleyway to the side of the property separating this property and the adjacent terraced house at number 53. The distance between the proposed northern flank and the boundary fence at number 53 is approximately 5m, this distance is considered to be large enough to mitigate any adverse effects arising from any issues relating to an overbearing impact or effect visual amenity to the occupiers of the property at number 53 Abercorn Crescent.

It is considered that the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining dwelling, no. 49.

Continued/.....

There are a number of significant elements of the proposal that are considered to be unacceptable. The SPG states that where a greater depth is acceptable then it should be set away from the boundary with an attached dwelling by twice the amount of additional depth. The southern flank elevation is situated 2.5m from the flank boundary; this distance along with the proposed extra depth does not conform to the SPG in this respect and therefore would have an overbearing impact.

As well as this, the submitted drawings indicate two windows and a door on the southern flank elevation. It is considered that these are unacceptable, as they would be sited less than 3m from the flank boundary and would result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling.

It has been suggested to the applicant that setting the additional element away from the boundary with the attached dwelling by twice the amount of additional depth would make the proposal acceptable. It has also been suggested that the applicant considers incorporating further space to the side of the property, therefore positioning the extra depth away from the adjoining boundary. A further option would be to omit the utility area and create a W.C and shower in a 2.2m² extension; therefore it would have less depth and be sited further away from the adjoining boundary.

3. Special Circumstances of the Applicant

Notwithstanding the special needs of the applicant which warrant a sympathetic consideration of the application, regard must also be had for the occupiers of the adjoining property. In this case, were the proposal to be implemented, the impact on the neighbour would be unacceptable and could not be justified.

4. Consultation Responses

- Social Services were consulted with regards to this proposal and it appears that the applicant is not registered disabled under Section 29 of the National Assistance Act 1948. They were therefore unable to comment with regards to the applicant's personal circumstances in relation to this planning application.

SECTION 4 - CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

4/01

EDGWARE COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, BURNT OAK BROADWAY, EDGWARE, MIDDX, HA8 0AD

Ward: None

CONSULTATION: CONSTRUCTION OF NEW SITE ENTRANCE ONTO BURNT OAK BROADWAY.

BARNET LONDON BOROUGH

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: (11)-016 Rev C3, 0001622/011/C.

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

INFORMATIVES

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

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Highway Safety
 - 2) Residential Amenity
 - 3) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

Council Interest: None

b) Site Description

- East side of Burnt Oak Broadway, within London Borough of Barnet
- Northern part of former Edgware Hospital
- Residential and commercial premises within London Borough of Harrow opposite site
- Planning permission granted for replacement hospital and adjacent new residential development

Continued/

c) Proposal Details

- Construction of new vehicle site entrance opposite Nos.255-267 Burnt Oak Broadway
- Priority junction proposed with right-turn filter lane into site within Burnt Oak Broadway carriageway and out of site as part of new entrance
- Would serve hospital and residential site
- Existing vehicle entrance opposite 291-299 Burnt Oak Broadway would be closed to vehicles and become pedestrian access only
- Transport Assessment accompanies application

d) Relevant History

EAST/595/00/CNA	Consultation: demolition of existing buildings and erection of 3 storey community hospital with parking and landscape	NO OBJECTION 19-JUL-2000
-----------------	---	-----------------------------

e) Applicants Statement

- Level of traffic does not justify signal controlled junction
- Sufficient queuing capacity provided in junction to cater for traffic movements to and from community hospital at peak hours
- Existing parking restrictions on Burnt Oak Broadway would remain, but no other impact on on-street parking
- In technical and highway safety terms is most appropriate location

f) 1st Notification	Sent 61	Replies 7	Expiry 28-OCT-2003
---------------------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

Response: Obstruction to driveway, noise and disturbance, loss of on-street parking and unloading facilities, harm to highway safety, traffic congestion.

2nd Notification	Sent 61	Replies 3	Expiry 16-DEC-03
------------------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

Response: Traffic congestion, existing access should be retained, loss of on-street parking, harm to road safety.

Continued/

APPRAISAL

1) Highway Safety

The proposed new access would consist of a give way arrangement with a right turn lane into the site from Burnt Oak Broadway. This arrangement is considered acceptable in terms of accommodating traffic generation arising from the development.

It is envisaged that on-street parking on the 'Harrow' side of Burnt Oak Broadway, which is permissible during the off peak periods, would remain unaffected due to the adequate width of carriageway.

However it is considered that a sum of £10,000 is secured via a section 106 agreement to facilitate any alterations to the existing waiting restrictions if the proposals give rise to parking problems within 3 years occupation of the development.

2) Residential Amenity

Given that Burnt Oak Broadway is a classified road with existing high levels of traffic, it is not considered that the proposal would cause harm to residential amenity in terms of additional noise and disturbance

3) Consultation Responses

- obstruction to driveway – this would not result
- other issues discussed in report

**BACS, 3 DE HAVILLAND ROAD, EDWARE, MIDDX, P/2204/03/CNA/WM
HA8 5PA**

Ward: None

CONSULTATION: REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 125 X 2 BED AND 14 1 BED
FLATS, AND 44 TOWN HOUSES IN PART 3, PART 4 STOREY BLOCK WITH 172
PARKING SPACES

BRENT COUNCIL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 463-01D.

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

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 40 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals :
(H2, H9); (SH1, H4, H6, SEM1, EM16, T13)
 - 2 Standard Informative 34 – Consultation as a Neighbouring LPA
-

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

- 1) Housing Needs
 - 2) Consultation Responses
-

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:	H2, H9
Deposit UDP Key Policies:	SH1, H4, H6, SEM1, EM16, T13
Council Interest:	None

b) Site Description

- The site which is approximately 2 hectares in size is located on De Havilland Road
- The site is the remaining section of a much larger industrial site which has been redeveloped for residential use since the 1990s

Continued/.....

c) Proposal Details

- For the demolition of the existing commercial buildings and erection of 183 self contained dwellings comprising of 125 two bedroom flats, 14 one bedroom flats and 44 town houses in 3 and 4 storey block around a central and 172 car park spaces

d) Relevant History

None.

e) Notifications	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	1	0	18-OCT-03

APPRAISAL

1) Housing Needs

Although the proposed development could be regarded as a departure from policy, the surrounding industrial land has been developed for housing. The re-development of the remainder of the disused depot raise no major policy issues and in fact reinforces the current Government commitment to returning land from industrial to housing. The high proportion of affordable housing in this development provides an opportunity to address important housing needs. There may be a need to take adequate traffic management measures to minimise any adverse impact of additional traffic as a result of this development. Consideration may also need to be given to the cross Borough flow of school children and the implication of this for existing school facilities.

2) Consultation Responses

None.