

# REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL OF MISCELLANEOUS COUNCIL OWNED SITES

The following tables list sites currently identified as suggested sites for development. These have been categorised based on an initial assessment of their development potential i.e. whether they are potentially suitable, possibly suitable or not suitable for development.

- Of the sites identified, six have been initially assessed as being potentially suitable for development (Table 1):  
Holsworth Close  
Hawkins Close  
Charles Crescent adjoining no. 18  
Garages and parking off Farmborough Close adjacent to Honeybun Community/Women's Centre  
Apsley Close  
Anthoneys Close

These six sites are assessed by Planning/Building Control as being potentially suitable for development and capable of delivering up to 6 flats and 7 houses. However, this is dependant on whether the loss of any parking or garage provision can be justified in terms of Planning Policy (see below).

- Eight sites have been initially assessed as being possibly suitable for development (Table 2):  
Masefield Avenue garage site 1-14 and playground  
Chichester Court parking area  
Moelyn Mews  
Martin Drive car park  
Pinewood Close garage court  
Stuart Avenue garages  
The Middle Way  
Buckingham Road

These six sites, whilst not discounted for development, have been assessed as more problematical in terms of acceptable setting of units, general access / access to existing sub stations and loss of parking, garages and play areas (which would require justification).

- The remaining sites have been assessed as being not suitable for development (Table 3) and are listed for future reference purposes.

The following comments have been made by Planning and Development Control in relation to many of the identified sites:

## **Parking issue:**

Any loss of parking provision will need to be justified, or existing parking provision will need to be re-provided in the vicinity. Justifying the loss of designated parking is more of a problem than justifying the loss of informal parking use. Evidence is needed to justify loss e.g. is it in current use, is there local congestion on the street or any local parking restrictions? – therefore would the loss lead to further congestion or access problems for emergency services? Parking policy can be checked with Richard Michalski (Senior Development Engineer in Planning).

## **Garage sites:**

Any loss of garages will need to be justified, as above. With all garage sites much will depend on the existing level of use, and /or lease arrangements between the local authority and tenants, whether the surrounding area has capacity to accommodate the displaced parking space, whether that space can be re-provided as part of a new development etc.

## **Plus:**

A check should be carried out to establish whether there are any covenants or other restrictions on any of the estates in relation to garages and/or car parking before any decisions can be made. Phil Greenwood, Senior professional, Major Projects and Design feels that in the past the estates probably had no real parking policies at the time of build so there is little likelihood of any restrictions in that regard.

With regard to loss of parking and garages, whilst there is a presumption against loss, it seems that each case has to be considered on its individual merits within the context of usage and the circumstances of the site and surrounding area.

Housing's priority need is for large family houses (3 bed + ) for social rent.

**Development Control advise the following actions to take the assessment of the sites forward:**

- 1) Investigate loss of parking / garage issues**
- 2) Go back to Planning / Development Control etc. with a suggested (more detailed) design solution for suitable sites (particularly those in Table 2) for further comment**

Note that all council owned sites must go to Planning Committee rather than being dealt with under Delegated powers.

Elaine Slowe  
Housing Enabling  
7 August 2008

**TABLE 1 - SITES POTENTIALLY SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	<b>Constraints on suggested design</b> M Lane	<b>Development Control Comments</b> Les Simpson Roger Pidgeon
<b>Holsworth Close</b>	May need to remove storage area (refuse & household) to front of site Some concern re loss of car parking and refuse facility	Remove bin stores to rear/side on suggested design.  <b>6 flats may be possible</b>
<b>Hawkins Close Between Nos. 30 and 31</b>	Some concern re loss of parking  Thought that parking area is used so might be difficult to argue for its release	Loss of existing parking.  <b>2 units OK in principle, subject to parking issue</b>
<b>Charles Crescent Adjoining No. 18</b>	Planners concerned about loss of car parking and mature tree	Parking loss issue – 9 garages plus informal parking – hard to justify loss for 1 new unit.  <b>1 unit OK in principle subject to parking issue</b>
<b>Garages and parking off Farmborough Close (adj to Honeybun Community Centre site)</b>	Redistribution of car parking spaces Removal of 8 x garages	Relationship with community centre site (now a women's centre). Possibly limited development potential as have to retain space and setting of women's centre. Also parking loss issue.  <b>Reasonable chance of 1 house to west of site subject to parking issue</b>
<b>Apsley Close</b>		Possibly one unit on the end of existing properties next to no 11
<b>Antoneys Close</b>		Maybe 2 small units – next to no 42 and next to no 49
<b>Total potential units</b>		<b>6 flats</b> <b>7 houses</b>

**TABLE 2 - SITES POSSIBLY SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	<b>POTENTIAL PROBLEMS</b>	<b>Development control comments</b>
<b>Masefield Avenue – garage site 1-14 and playground</b>	Emergency services access	Problem of how to set the unit and justification of loss of play area would be difficult. – development unlikely
<b>Chichester Court – parking area at far end</b>	Access to electricity sub station at rear of site  Overlooking issue	Difficult setting. ?maintaining sub station access. ? overlooking from flats and road. ?access to new unit. Possibly 1 unit but setting difficult so unlikely but not discounted. Suggested design is OK but may have to move unit back past sub station.
<b>Moelyn Mews</b>	Not enough space around new building. Adverse impact of front on buildings facing it Amenity of neighbours	1 unit would need integral parking – difficult. Not discounted but need a parking solution
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	<b>POTENTIAL PROBLEMS</b>	<b>Development control comments</b>
<b>Martin Drive – car park</b>	Negative planning implications - Leave area along railway for access to electricity sub station, residential amenity of 19 & 21 Martin Drive, overlooking issue	No – loss of parking and setting
<b>Pinewood Close Garage Court</b>	Negative planning implications – garages (use) and access to No. 5's garage Too difficult to obtain planning permission.	Parking issue with the loss of 16 garages. If can get over the parking loss, may possibly get 1 unit (single detached house) but this would have to repair the line of the houses  Access to No 5's garage?
<b>Stuart Avenue, South Harrow</b>		Need to check the floodplain area for Roxbourne brook. Loss of parking and restricted parking in surrounding area. Access issues. Not discounted by unlikely – possible block of flats but overall difficult.
<b>The Middle Way</b>	Need additional land	Maybe 1 unit if could acquire additional land next to garages adjoining number 9
<b>Buckingham Road</b>	Flood risk area from Edgware brook???	If not in flood risk area a small block of flats possibly towards William Allen House
<b>Total possible units</b>		<b>6 houses</b> <b>2 small blocks of flats</b>

## TABLE 3 - SITES UNSUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

SITE LOCATION	PROBLEM
<b>Dobbin Close</b> <b>Dobbin Close</b>	Development Control say No – sub station issue leaves insufficient space for development
<b>43-45 Binyon Crescent,</b> <b>Stanmore</b>	Area adjoining LA housing estate. <u>43-45 Binyon Crescent</u> – Green Belt boundary follows edge of existing buildings – Green Belt fringe policy EP43 applies. Any redevelopment would be restricted to the existing footprint and the site therefore offers limited potential. Development Control say no – Metropolitan Green Belt
<b>Charles Crescent</b> <b>– rear court / rear</b> <b>of garages</b>	Negative planning implications –reconfiguration of car parking, rear rights of way, overlooking, removal of 14 x garages  Development Control say no- back land development
<b>Wood Close</b>	Development Control say Unlikely – house in flat setting is not good. Parking issue and access to remaining parking spaces Need 6m on M Lane suggested design, not 4.5m.
<b>Canning Road/George Gange Way – car sales unit</b>  <b>(General Fund)</b>	Development Control say No – not for residential use
<b>Greenway</b>	Negative planning implications. Designated Open Space (re C O'Brien) No access to site via 36-38 - alley only 2.5m wide. (6m between flank walls of 36 & 38 so gardens or one of the properties would need to be acquired). Zoned open space
<b>Chicheley Road Community Centre</b>	Negative planning implications - Community facility on site. Policy C2 and SC1 (re C O'Brien)  <u>Claire O'Brien</u> - Currently vacant, but redevelopment would nonetheless be considered against Policy C2 (which encourages the retention of existing community facilities). Also edge of Green Belt, therefore Green Belt fringe policy EP43 applies.
SITE LOCATION	PROBLEM
<b>48 Ellement Close</b>	No 48 has purchased the two garages on this land already. No 48 obtained planning permission for 2 storey side to rear extension to form 2 self contained flats in June 06
<b>Claire Gardens</b>	No space to build
<b>Welch Place</b>	No space to build
<b>Overbrook Walk</b>	No space to build
<b>Stuart Avenue</b>	No space to build
<b>Osmond Close/Shafesbury Avenue</b>	<b>Overall housing scheme to be looked at in the future – wider regeneration</b>  There appears to be some kind of access through this site to Grange Farm Close. Also trees on Osmond Close boundary
<b>Westfield Lane</b>	No space to build

<b>Mill Farm Close – garage area</b>	Archaeological priority area <b>Options appraisal being undertaken for wider regeneration of the estate</b>
<b>Former play area – Whitchurch Avenue</b>	David Sklair: (nov 06)  In summary, although the development of the site could be seen to be acceptable from a planning policy viewpoint, the practical implementation of this through the development control process would mean that any proposal is unlikely to be given permission.  Further information on these two elements are given below:  (i) Policy Comments Although there are no specific policies to protect play ground space, any development of this space would have to demonstrate that the space is no longer required or not appropriate and that there is adequate provision within the vicinity. A commitment to providing alternative play space for toddlers within the estate would also be helpful.  (ii) Development Control The view of Development Control is that development of the site would be unacceptable due to the following: - as the area is already quite densely developed, any further development could be considered as over development of the site - due to the site being overlooked by adjoining blocks on three sides, the site would be impossible to develop without affecting the amenity of these blocks
<b>SITE LOCATION</b>	<b>PROBLEM</b>
<b>Eaton Close</b>	Orientation of building is problematical – no way to orientate a building in an acceptable way to Planning
<b>Stonegrove Gardens</b>	Ajoins area of green open space. Backland development so not acceptable to Planning
<b>Allerford Court</b>	Backland development so not acceptable to Planning
<b>Silverdale Close</b>	Backland development so not acceptable to Planning
<b>Augustine Road</b>	Close proximity to Railway so not acceptable to Planning