

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

---

### 5 SUDBURY HILL, HARROW

1/01

P/142/05/CFU/RJS

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REDEVELOPMENT: THREE STOREY BLOCK TO PROVIDE 10 FLATS WITH PARKING AT REAR

LITMAN & ROBESON for COUNTRY & METROPOLITAN

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: LR1, Project No.24294 Drg.No.P01 Rev.B, P02 Rev.B, P03 Rev.B, P04 Rev.B, P05 Rev.B, P06 Rev.B, P07 Rev.A, P10 Rev.A

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of excessive size, bulk and unsatisfactory design, would be visually obtrusive and overbearing, would not respect the scale, massing and form of the adjacent properties to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers thereof, the appearance of the streetscene and the character of the locality.
- 2 The proposal represents an unacceptable form of piecemeal development detrimental to the character and proper planning of the area.
- 3 The proposed windows/balconies in the rear elevation would allow overlooking of the adjoining properties and result in an unreasonable loss of privacy to the occupiers.
- 4 Refusal - Parking in Rear Garden
- 5 Due to the sites close proximity to the traffic light controlled junction the number of units proposed and the associated car parking arrangement would generate additional vehicle movements that would be to the detriment of the safety and free flow of traffic on the neighbouring highway.
- 6 The proposed development by reason of unsatisfactory design and layout would have poor physical and visual links between the flats and the rear garden thus providing an inadequate standard of amenity for future occupants thereof.

### INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
EP25 Noise  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D6 Design in Employment Areas  
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-usable Materials in New Developments  
T13 Parking Standards  
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

continued/

---

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

- 1) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D6)
  - 2) Site Layout (D4, D5, D8, C16)
  - 3) Amenity of Neighbours (EP25)
  - 4) Parking/Highway Safety (T13, D8)
  - 5) Housing Provision and Need (SH1, SH2)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	13
	Justified:	
	Provided:	11

**b) Site Description**

- the site is located on the north eastern side of Sudbury Hill at the lower end adjacent St Georges School and opposite the junction with Greenford Road
- the site is currently occupied by a double storey attached dwelling
- the subject property is the end dwelling is a row of five large two storey detached properties that extends north west along Sudbury Hill away from the intersection of Greenford Road / Sudbury Court Drive
- the immediately adjacent property to the north west is St Georges School
- immediately to the south west is Buchanan Court, a large modern design, pitched roof, three storey residential care home
- to the south of the site on the opposite side of the main intersection are two storey semi-detached dwellings/ flats
- the property has a overall width of 23 metres and depth of 76 metres

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on site
- construction of a 3 storey building in the approximate location of the existing dwellings on site. the building would accommodate 10 residential flats (6 x 2 bedroom & 4 x 1 bedroom)
- the dwelling would accommodate an 'archway' design to allow vehicles to access 9 vehicle spaces to the rear of the building. The area beyond the parking area would be allocated for 120 square metres of rear garden area. Two additional parking spaces would be provided to the forecourt of the site

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

W/973/99/OUT	Outline: 3 blocks of 10, 3 bed flats with access and forecourt parking	REFUSED 13-APR-00 APPEAL DISMISSED 15-JAN-01
W/1139/02/FUL	Demolition of properties, construct 55 flats in 3 blocks part 3/part 4 storeys, 1 house, access and parking	WITHDRAWN 01-JUL-03

**e) Consultations**

EA:	Unable to respond
TWU:	No comments received
L.B. Brent:	

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 25-FEB-05
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 54	Replies 11 + Petition (24 signatures)	Expiry 18-FEB-05
----------------------	------------	---	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Astounded that the application has been made, as a recent application for 1-5 Sudbury Hill applied to redevelopment with a block of flats was turned down; it seems if this application is approved that it will amount to a back door way of beating the original lost application; the whole character of the neighbourhood of Sudbury Hill will be changed for the worst; some apartments will overlook neighbouring property; intrusion of between 20-30 people and rear parking area will create detrimental noise; inadequate amount of parking proposed; traffic safety issues due to additional traffic; 1-5 are attractive properties and a piecemeal development should not be allowed; application is ridiculous as the owners of 2-5 Sudbury Hill are currently in negotiations with the applicant to sell their properties for redevelopment. Overdevelopment - 1 house to 10 flats, existing parking problems associated with the school, light and noise pollution, would affect water pressure, safety issue for children attending the school.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

Although there are different forms and scales of buildings within the locality the character of area is clearly residential. However it is highlighted the subject site has its clearest link and relationship with the five large two storey detached properties that extend north west along Sudbury Hill away from the intersection of Greenford Road / Sudbury Court Drive. It is considered that this is the character that any proposed redevelopment of the individual site should be responding to.

continued/

Overall it is deemed that the proposed development constitutes an overly large and overbearing design that does not respect the character of the locality nor reflects the scale and form of the nearby residential dwellings. The front elevation proposes a façade width and overall height that clearly out masses neighbouring buildings. This is considered to constitute an unacceptable design in light of its visual prominence at the end of the row of five dwellings. As such it is deemed that the proposed building by reason of overly large design would present a building with a height and general bulk that would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with adjacent neighbouring buildings, and would not respect the scale, massing and form of those properties to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

Likewise by proposing to develop the site with a stand alone proposal that does not respect the form, design and layout of adjoining properties, it is considered that the proposal represents an unacceptable form of piecemeal development detrimental to the character and proper planning of the area.

The large parking area to the rear of the site is an additional elements that is not in keeping with the prevailing character of the neighbouring properties to the south east. This would appear to be proposed in an attempt to maximise on site parking, however it results in a proposal where a large part of the rear garden, adjacent to neighbouring gardens, is given over to parking. This is not considered to be a design solution that constitutes positive design and layout.

**2) Site Layout**

The site layout of the property has attempted to retain the common building lines of adjoining properties, however the proposal for a large portion of the rear of the site to be given over to parking is not an existing theme of adjoining properties. This design solution had a two fold negative impact in that it firstly intensifies vehicle activity and movement adjacent to the rear garden of the adjoining property, whilst secondly it separates the remaining rear garden area from the proposed flats. Apart from the amenity impacts caused for adjoining neighbours this would constitute a reduced level of amenity for future occupants and simply amounts to poor design and layout.

**3) Amenity of Neighbours**

The proposed layout would mean that balconies on the rear elevation would have general views out towards the neighbouring residential property to the south east and the caretaker's dwelling to the north, with the main rear garden areas of these properties being within 10 metres of upper floor balconies. Such balconies would clearly cause detrimental overlooking impacts for the adjoining property, which is considered to be unacceptable.

continued/

It is noted that the development proposes a blank three storey boundary wall to face the adjoining dwelling to the south east. This wall would pose an unacceptable level of visual bulk over the adjoining dwelling & associated rear garden area. Likewise as raised earlier, the size and bulk of the facades of the proposed building area design elements that would create a development that is overbearing and that does not respect the character of the locality, nor reflects the scale and form of the nearby residential dwellings. Such impacts over residential amenity are unreasonable and considered to highlight an unacceptable design solution.

**4) Parking/ Highway Safety**

Although on site parking is proposed, the layout and design of the parking spaces to the rear of the site is considered to be inappropriate. As already raised, it is not the character of adjacent residential properties to accommodate large parking areas to the rear of their sites. Likewise it is highlighted that the rear parking area would utilise a large portion of the rear of the site for parking spaces, adjacent to both the rear garden of the adjoining dwelling to the south east and the caretaker's dwelling to the north west. It is considered that such a parking area by general activity associated with vehicle movements would cause disturbance to the adjoining properties that would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties.

Furthermore, the additional level of traffic that would be likely to be generated by the proposal is considered to be to a level that would give rise to conditions prejudicial to safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway. Specifically there are no current traffic island measures located to the frontage of the subject site to prevent cars turning right into the property. This would be likely to have detrimental impact on the flow of traffic from the nearby intersection, and likely to cause safety issues.

**5) Housing Provision and Need**

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

**6) Consultation Responses**

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

*Astounded that the application has been made, as a recent application for 1-5 Sudbury Hill applied to redevelop with a block of flats was turned down;*  
Technically the application was not refused, rather it was withdrawn prior to a determination being issued.

*It seems if this application is approved that it will amount to a back door way of beating the original lost application;*  
Each application is required to be considered on the basis of individual merit.

continued/

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**LAND R/O 25-28 BELMONT CIRCLE AND 13-25  
BELLAMY DRIVE, HARROW**

**1/02  
P/3347/04/COU/TEM  
Ward: BELMONT**

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT IN FORM OF DETACHED  
PART 2/3 STOREY BUILDING FOR 2 HOUSES AND 12  
FLATS WITH CAR PARKING

TRIAD PLANNING & DESIGN LTD for MR E RYAN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/366/01B, 02C, 03C

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of excessive number of units, size of building and hardsurfaced parking areas, would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and give rise to an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:

- SEP5 Structural Features
  - SD1 Quality of Design
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - EP28 Conserving and Enhancing Biodiversity
  - EP46 Green Chains
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - T15 Servicing of New Developments
  - T16 (Schedule 6 - Map 3) Servicing of New Developments
  - EM15 Land and Business in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas
- 

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

- 1) Employment Policy (EM15)
  - 2) Appearance and character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Impact on Green Chain/Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SEP5, EP28, EP46)
  - 4) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
  - 5) Parking and Access (T15, T16 Schedule 6 – Map 3, T13)
  - 6) Enforcement Considerations
  - 7) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	18
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	15
Site Area:	1790m <sup>2</sup>	
No. of Residential Units:	14	
Habitable Rooms:	34	
Density - hrph:	78 dph 190 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- adjacent to north-east boundary of Belmont Local Centre
- triangular shaped piece of land occupied by 39 lock-up garages in 3 rows along boundaries of site
- nearly all in use for car related activities such as mechanics, tyres/exhausts, others in storage use
- access provided via L-shaped single carriageway private service road between Kenton Lane (to south of site) and Weston Drive (to north)
- arm to Kenton Lane proposed for improvement as Service Road Proposal 6
- houses in Bellamy Drive to north-east of site
- rear of commercial premises in Belmont Circle to south-west on opposite side of Weston Drive service road
- Belmont Line green chain/Site of Nature Conservation Importance adjacent to north-west boundary, with houses in Felbridge Avenue beyond
- public car park at southern end of green chain next to Kenton Lane arm of service road

### **c) Proposal Details**

- outline application – siting and means of access to be determined at outline stage
- demolition of all lock-up garages
- development of 12 flats and 2 houses in L-shaped building sited some 6m from north-west boundary with Belmont Line, wrapping around corner and abutting part of Weston Drive service road
- mainly 2 storeys with third storey element where building turns the corner
- 8 x 1 bed x 2 habitable room units and 6 x 2 bed x 3 habitable room units
- 11 parking spaces in hardsurfaced area on south-east side of site
- 2 spaces beyond the car park adjacent to service road
- 2 spaces in north-east corner of site accessed via driveway located between Belmont Line and proposed building
- communal amenity space of some 300m<sup>2</sup> in centre of site
- alterations to access from Weston Drive by provision of 2 traffic calming narrowing strips, improved radius curves at junction with Weston Drive, and 3 x lighting columns

continued/



**d) Relevant History**

LBH/33053                      Redevelopment of garage site & erection of 6                      REFUSED  
light industrial/storage units & alterations to                      29-OCT-87  
existing access

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal would result in excessive traffic generation along the service road and onto Kenton Lane and would result in traffic difficulties along these roads and at this junction.
2. The proposal represents an inappropriate use in this residential area and would be prejudicial to the amenities of adjoining and nearby residential properties.”

Appeal allowed 23-JUN-88

EAST/588/93/FUL              Redevelopment to provide single storey                      REFUSED  
building for community centre with parking                      17-FEB-94  
and widening of access road

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council’s minimum requirements in respect of the development, leading to parking on the neighbouring highways to the detriment of the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways and the amenity of residents.
2. The proposal, by virtue of the resultant heavy use of the public car park, would prejudice future development of the car park and adjacent land which is a Proposal Site in the Deposit Unitary Development Plan.”

EAST/626/94/FUL              Change of use from garaging to builders yard                      REFUSED  
with ancillary buildings and bays                                      28-NOV-94

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed means of access is inadequate, contrary to the development plan and would cause conditions likely to prejudice the highway safety and the free flow of traffic.
2. The proposed use would be detrimental to the residential amenities of adjoining properties.”

EAST/50/96/OUT              Outline: Eight two storey flats in one linked                      REFUSED  
block with parking and access from Weston                      24-MAR-98  
Drive

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed development, by reason of excessive number of units, size of building and hardsurfaced parking areas, with associated general disturbance and activity, would result in an over-intensive use and amount to overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
2. The proposals, by the provision of inadequate access and vehicular turning arrangements, would be detrimental to vehicular and pedestrian safety, contrary to the policies of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

continued/

- 3. The character of the Belmont Line Green Corridor would be excessively harmed by the siting of the proposed building and the provision of inappropriate landscaping, contrary to the requirements of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.”

P/2047/04/COU                      Outline: Redevelopment in form of detached      WITHDRAWN  
 part 2 part 3 storey building to provide 2      30-SEP-04  
 houses and 14 flats with forecourt parking

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

- revisions to previous application:
  - reduction in number of units from 16 to 14
  - redesign of units closest to Bellamy Drive to ensure no loss of privacy or inter-visibility between new and existing development
  - access drive altered on land within control of applicant or local authority to provide improved entrance features and separation between pedestrians and vehicles, still retaining a passing facility
  - landscaping buffer to Belmont Line, to be of native species and environmentally friendly
  - access road to be made up to adoptable standards, while not being adopted by local authority
- Traffic Flow Assessment report accompanies application, conclusions:
  - existing traffic counts of about 150 movements between 07.00 – 19.00 hours far higher than predicted movements of about 29 in same period for proposed development
  - would not have detrimental affect on highway network given that existing traffic flow on Weston Drive exceeds 1,2000 vehicles in same period

**f) Consultations**

EA:	Unable to respond
TWU:	No objections

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry
		10-FEB-05

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	64	3 + petition of	03-FEB-05
		27 signatures	

**Summary of Responses:** Support as would enhance neighbourhood, harm to wildlife, overdevelopment, limited amenity space, highway danger, inadequate on-site parking, overlooking, loss of light, increase in noise, loss of privacy.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Employment Policy**

This site is effectively in employment use by virtue of the extent of small businesses which operate on the land. However, they are almost all B2 uses which are detrimental to neighbouring residential amenity. In addition, access to the site from Weston Drive is sub-standard for employment purposes. For these reasons continued employment use is not supported in terms of criteria (E) and (G) of Policy EM15.

### **2) Appearance and Character**

The existing appearance of the site is poor, both by virtue of its use for industrial purposes and the presence of a palisade fence for security reasons.

Redevelopment for housing would provide the opportunity to significantly tidy up the land and improve its appearance to the benefit of the character of the area.

However, whereas a 2-storey form of development is supported in principle, the proposed 3-storey element would be overbearing and out of place on this restricted site.

In addition, the main car park would provide an excessive area of hardsurfacing and activity close to the residential boundary, although this has to be weighed against existing appearance and activity levels.

Overall it is considered that an overdevelopment of the site is proposed.

### **3) Impact on Green Chain/Site of Nature Conservation Interest**

The proposed building would be at least 6m from the edge of the Belmont Line compared with the existing garages which directly abut the land. A planted strip is shown next to the open space to soften the impact of the building. While an acceptable relationship would be provided in relation to the 2-storey component, the 3-storey element would be overbearing and detrimental to the amenity of the adjacent land.

In terms of nature conservation, no works are proposed to the Site of Nature Conservation Interest and its integrity should therefore be retained.

### **4) Residential Amenity**

This scheme shows the majority of habitable room windows facing towards the rear garden boundaries of houses in Felbridge Avenue on the opposite side of the Belmont Line. These boundaries are some 25m away with the rear walls of the houses a further 20m distant. These separation distances are considered sufficient to preserve privacy.

continued/

2 clear windows facing Bellamy Drive would be at least 20m from neighbouring rear gardens, so that the impact overall in terms of privacy is considered to be acceptable.

The northern wall of the block would be between 2.5 – 7m from the adjacent garden boundary, and over 23m from the nearest house in Bellamy Drive. The impact therefore in terms of outlook is also considered to be acceptable. The traffic report demonstrates that vehicular activity would be less than that generated by the existing uses, so that this would not result in detriment to neighbouring activity.

**5) Parking and Access**

It is considered that a satisfactory form of access for both vehicles and pedestrians is shown from West Drive to serve the scale of proposed development.

An acceptable level of parking is proposed given that public car parks are provided in Belmont local centre.

**6) Enforcement Considerations**

A report on enforcement considerations, to include whether the current commercial uses may qualify as lawful uses, will be submitted in due course.

**7) Consultation Responses**

- |                                  |   |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| Limited amenity space            | - | this is indicated by the overdevelopment of the site which is proposed         |
| Increase in noise                | - | it is not considered that this would result given the existing use of the site |
| Other issues discussed in report |   |  |

**CONCLUSION**

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

REDEVELOPMENT: PART TWO, PART THREE  
STOREY DETACHED BLOCK TO PROVIDE 14  
FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for W E BLACK

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/2312/1, 2, 3, 4, Site Plan

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

- 1 The proposal, by reason of its excessive width and depth, would be out of scale and character and out of keeping with neighbouring residential development and have a prejudicial impact on the character of the area.

### INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	max. 18
	Justified:	17
	Provided:	17
No. of Residential Units:	14	

### **b) Site Description**

- the site is located at the western side of the junction of Manor Road with Bonnersfield Lane and Crofts Road
- the site currently accommodates a pair of semi-detached houses (nos. 13 and 15) and a detached house (no.17)
- the site measures approximately 50m in depth and varies in width from 25 to 35m

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/2889/04/CFU continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- redevelopment to provide a part 2 storey/part 3 storey block containing 14 flats
- a rear car parking area is proposed with access from Crofts Road
- the car park would accommodate 15 cars, two disabled spaces are proposed within the Manor Road frontage
- the proposed block would measure a maximum of 28m in width and a maximum depth of 18m
- the height of the proposed block would vary from two storeys adjacent to No. 11 Manor Road to three storeys within the middle of the proposed block

**d) Relevant History**

For 9-17 Manor Road

P/1957/04/CFU	Two 2/3 storey blocks to provide 22 flats	REFUSED 30-JUL-04 APPEAL PENDING
---------------	---	---

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site and one which would, as a matter of consequence, be out of character with the area.”

For 1, 3, 5 and 7 Manor Road

P/182/04/CFU	Part 2, part 3 storey building with accommodation in the roof to provide 22 flats with access and parking	REFUSED 17-MAR-04 APPEAL DISMISSED 07-JAN-05
--------------	---	--

**f) Consultations**

EA:  
TWU:

**f) Advertisement**

Major development

Expiry  
04-DEC-04

**Notifications**

Sent  
52

Replies  
9 + petition of  
15 signatures

Expiry  
25-NOV-04

**Summary of Responses:** Out of character, lack of parking, loss of view

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The Inspector from the appeal relating to Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 7 stated

“Manor Road is predominantly characterised by two storey houses of various designs. There are also some examples of 3 storey flats, in particular Manor Road House and Blackthorn Court... The site is close to the junction with Northwick Park Road where there are numerous examples of three storey flats.”

The Inspector went on to state:

“... the overall depth and width of the proposed block is substantially larger than the majority of developments on Manor Road. This is my main area of concern.”

The existing 2 storey buildings on the site are 13.6m in width and 7m in width. The proposed building would have a width of 28m. This would be well in excess of other buildings within Manor Road. The proposed width, combined with the depth of 18m, compared to 10m for the existing houses, would result in a building that would appear unduly dominant and out of place and would have a detrimental impact on the character of Manor Road. Although the front elevation would be stepped, it is considered that none of this would result in the impression of a less bulky building.

### **2) Amenity of Neighbours**

In relation to the nearest neighbour, No. 11 Manor Road, the proposal would easily comply with the 45° Code and would be sited far enough from the common boundary in order to protect the amenity of those neighbours. Additionally it is considered that the proposed parking area would be sited and screened in such a manner as to not have a prejudicial impact on the amenity of neighbours.

### **3) Car Parking/Highway Considerations**

Taking into account its sustainable location is considered that the provision of 17 spaces would be acceptable for such a development.

### **4) Consultation Responses**

Addressed in report

## **CONCLUSION**

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

DETACHED 2 STOREY COMMUNITY CENTRE

MEPK ARCHITECTS for WARDEN HOUSING ASSOCIATION LTD

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: P-10, P-11, P12, P13

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

- 1 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.

### INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character of the Area
  - 2) Amenity of Neighbours
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Floorspace: 1500m<sup>2</sup>

### b) Site Description

- site lies on the north east side of Scott Crescent, within the Rayners Lane Estate
- to the south east of the site is an access and parking area for the recently completed 4 storey flats

continued/



Item 1/04 – P/2513/04/CFU continued.....

- to the north west of the site is an area proposed for public open space within the overall redevelopment of the estate
- the site was shown for development for a community centre within the outline approval

**c) Proposal Details**

- two storey community centre building containing a multi-purpose hall with ancillary stores, changing facilities, shop, estate administration office/multi-purpose space
- the elevations would contain a theme of materials, most prominently on the front elevation, full height glazing with louvers

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/112/02/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment of estate, community centre, public open space	GRANTED
		16-OCT-02

**f) Advertisement**

Major Development

Expiry

**1st Notification**

Sent  
122

Replies  
0

Expiry  
25-OCT-04

**2nd Notification**

122

Awaited

08-MAR-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of the Area**

Land to the south east contains the recently constructed 4 storey flats and land opposite contains original two storey semi-detached houses.

The outline consent envisaged a two storey community centre of similar proportions to the one now proposed.

The materials and design proposed would result in a modern building of a high standard of design, which would be an asset to the area.

**2) Amenity of Neighbours**

The general principle of a building of this type and footprint was considered to be appropriate at the outline stage. The appearance of the proposal would not give rise to any amenity issues.

**3) Consultation Responses**

Awaited

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**MAURVILLE HOUSE, 44-46 RADNOR ROAD, HARROW**

**1/05**

**P/2769/04/CFU/RJS**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CONVERSION TO PROVIDE 10 SELF CONTAINED  
FLATS 3 REAR DORMER WINDOWS AND ROOFLIGHT  
AT FRONT.

BURTON J HELLING for MR & MRS S WATSON

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 21.06/04: Existing Roof & Site Plan, Existing Ground & 1st Floor Plan, Site Plan, Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans, Proposed Roof Plan, Proposed Section & Elevations, Details of proposed sound proofing/insulation for conversion of existing residential care home

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

- 1 Refusal - Conversion - Over-intensive
- 2 The left hand side dormer proposed within the rear roofslope of 44 Radnor Road is sited too close to the adjacent roof verge, which is considered to be visually obtrusive, and would detract from the appearance and character of the building.
- 3 The proposal does not provide adequate rear garden amenity space for 10 residential flats thus providing an inadequate standard of amenity for future occupiers thereof.
- 4 The proposed bin storage located to the front of 44 Radnor Road would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining property.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
EP25 Noise  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery  
H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Loss of Residential Care Home
  - 2) Character of Area and Residential Amenity
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Conservation Area:	Rayners Lane	
Car Parking	Standard:	12.2
	Justified:	5
	Provided:	5
Site Area:	609m <sup>2</sup>	
Floorspace:	350m <sup>2</sup>	
No. of Residential Units:	10	
Habitable Rooms:	21	

### **b) Site Description**

- an elderly residential care home housed within two converted and extended dwellinghouses
- the property is located on a corner bend in the roadway where Radnor splits off into Radnor Road and Radnor Avenue
- the original dwellings consisted of a two storey detached dwelling, and a two storey semi-detached dwelling. Additions to connect and extend the two dwellings for use as a residential care home were approved in 1985 and 1993 respectively
- the existing building accommodated 19 rooms (excluding bathrooms, en suites and utility areas) across two levels and within the roofspace, of these 19 rooms 14 are habitable bedrooms, 4 are living areas and 1 is a large kitchen
- two separate on site vehicle parking spaces with associated crossovers are located along the eastern roadway frontage, whilst three on site parking spaces and associated crossover are located to along the northern frontage
- the remainder of the frontage is finished with a combination of brick fencing, ornamental paving and garden beds
- the rear garden of the property is open plan and accommodates a combination of paving, grass cover and garden beds

### **c) Proposal Details**

- construct three dormers within the rear roofslope of the building and convert the existing residential care home into 10 x 1 bedroom self contained flats
- 4 flats would be accommodated on the ground floor, 4 flats would be accommodated on the first floor and 2 flats would be accommodated within the roofslope
- the 5 on site parking spaces would be retained as part of the overall proposal

### **d) Relevant History**

LBH/16823	Change of use of dwellinghouse to old persons home	GRANTED 19-JUNE-1980
LBH/28055	Two storey side extension and roof alterations to nursing home	GRANTED 10-OCT-1985

continued/

Item 1/05 – P/2769/04/CFU continued.....

WEST/45748/92/FUL Change of use: Class C3 to C2 GRANTED  
(residential to care home) (C2) and 2 27-SEP-1993  
storey flank extension

**e) Applicants Statement**

The present residential care home is of course a 24 hour-a-day undertaking. Total numbers at present are some 16 full-time residents plus 10 staff who work shifts and the 2 owners who visit the premises at least three times per day. Add to this the average of two-to-three relative visits per day per resident, delivery and collection of incontinence pads, the daily collection and delivery of badly soiled laundry (ordinary laundry is dealt with in house), physiotherapists, occupational therapists, volunteers, chiropodists, hairdressers, vicars, priests, rabbis, as well as visits by social service personnel, the police, the fire brigade (quarterly test of fire alarm system), lift engineers, funeral directors, gardeners, plumbers, electricians and the many other maintenance and peripheral staff that simply have not been taken into account by the objectors and a greater sense of 'balance' is called for as the change of use proposed will in truth represent a major planning gain as far as all traffic related issues are concerned!

**f) Advertisement**

Major Development

Expiry  
13-JAN-05

**Notifications**

Sent  
75

Replies  
13

Expiry  
01-FEB-05

**Summary of Responses:** Existing parking difficulties in Radnor Road; property is located on a dangerous bend; insufficient parking spaces proposed on site and insufficient parking available within the street; proposal would create greater parking problems for residents; further disturbance from traffic; school and nursery in the road already creates disturbance; development would increase through traffic and the chance of traffic accidents; noise disturbance would be caused from additional traffic and additional residents; conversion will impact on the character & atmosphere of the area by families leaving the area due to the amount of residential conversions; conversion will impact on the drainage network; additional rubbish and recycling bins would be required; residential care home is a community asset and should not be closed; if care home closes residents would suffer trauma from being relocated; there is already an acute shortage of residential care homes; the owner should offer to sell the property as a well established residential care home and only if unable to secure a buyer should an application for flats be considered; ten flats is an overdevelopment; added traffic during building work and afterwards would create risks for pedestrians; by the inclusion of two dormers and rooflight to create a third level it would seem that this is an attempt to put too great a density of living accommodation on this site

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Loss of Residential Care Home**

If approved the proposal would result in the loss of the residential care home, however it is acknowledged that there are no specific policies within the recently adopted UDP that would specifically require or encourage the retention of such a care home facility. Accordingly there is no Planning Policy basis to resist the loss of the care home and its conversion to residential flats must be considered on individual merit.

### **2) Character of Area and Residential Amenity**

The character of the area is one of residential properties predominantly consisting of pairs of two storey semi-detached dwellings, of which a number have previously been converted into flats. A more recent development encompasses the large flat development known as St. Saviours Court, which is located to the west of the site and accommodates pedestrian access from Radnor Road.

Whilst in principle the conversion of the existing care home into residential flats would be in keeping with the character of the area, this however is a broad consideration that does not take into account issues relating to the intensity of the residential conversion that is proposed and the amenity impacts such a proposal could cause. Specifically it is considered that the overall activity associated with the use of the property for 10 residential flats would result in an over-intensive use of the property. The comings and going of residents, including visitors, along with the general noise and activity associated with 10 residential flats is considered to amount to a level that would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and therefore would be out of character within the locality. As such the proposal is considered to constitute an over intensive development.

With respect of the specific design of the proposed dormers, it is considered that Harrow's Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extensions: A householders Guide is relevant. At D.5 it states "In order to reduce its visual impact, such a rear dormer should be set in at least 1000mm from the edge (or verge) of the roof...". It is highlighted the left hand side dormer proposed within the rear roofslope of 44 Radnor Road does not achieve this minimum offset. Therefore this dormer is considered to be visually obtrusive and would be out of character and would detract from the appearance of the building.

With respect of amenity for future occupants the proposed conversion of the building to accommodate 10 residential flats is hampered by the limited amount of outdoor amenity space. Specifically only 150sq.m. (approx.) of private rear garden area is available, of which only 4 units have direct access to this garden area. The rear garden area is only accessible to the remaining 6 flats via a pedestrian gate to the side of 46 Radnor Road. It is considered that these issues are symptomatic of an over-intensive residential conversion of the property.

continued/

Lastly, on matters of general layout and aesthetics of the proposed conversion of the building for residential purposes, it is considered that the bin storage facility proposed adjacent to 42 Radnor Road could be better sited to avoid detrimental impacts for this adjoining neighbour, whilst a new landscaping scheme should be encouraged for the property as part of any conversion to improve amount of landscaping in garden areas, whilst reducing the current level of hardsurfacing.

**3) Parking/Highway Safety**

Whilst it is proposed to retain the existing 5 on site car spaces, in accordance with UDP parking policy the proposal generates a maximum allowable on site parking requirement of 12.2 spaces. Likewise it is noted that the site has good access to public transport facilities in the way of local bus networks and being in close proximity to the Harrow town centre transport interchange. Additionally, it is noted that the surrounding locality is subject of a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Therefore, if a scheme were to be considered reasonable for approval, a restriction on future residents being ineligible for parking permits could be used to control demands on available parking. For this reason it is considered that an objection to inadequate parking could not be justified with respect of the current scheme.

**4) Consultation Responses**

It is considered that all relevant matters raised have been addressed in the report above.

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

## SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

### 1 MARLBOROUGH HILL, HARROW

2/01

P/2009/03/COU/TW

Ward: GREENHILL

OUTLINE: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE 4 STOREY DETACHED OFFICE BUILDING WITH 2 FLATS ON 3RD FLOOR, AND PARKING ON GROUND FLOOR

DAVID HIGGINS

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 03/110/2

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Outline - Reserved Matters (Design, Appear., Landsc.)
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 4 Restrict Industrial Activities to Buildings
- 5 Restrict Storage to Buildings

#### INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| EM15 | Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas |
| SD1  | Quality of Design   |
| D4   | Standard of Design and Layout   |
| D5   | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy                                   |
| T13  | Parking Standards   |

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Principle of Use
- 2) Character of the Area
- 3) Parking/Highway Considerations
- 4) Consultation Responses

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	max.4
	Justified:	4
	Provided:	6
Site Area:	0.025ha.	
Floorspace:	759sq.m.	
Habitable Rooms:	6	
No. of Residential Units:	2	

### b) Site Description

- two storey engineering works and offices
- located adjacent to the junction of Marlborough Hill with Station Road

### c) Proposal Details

- outline application to construct a four storey block containing parking at ground floor, office use at first and second floor, third floor to accommodate 2 flats
- siting and access are to be determined at this stage

### d) Relevant History

None

### e) Consultations

EA:

TWU:

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	22	0	30-DEC-03

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Principle of the Use

The existing premises provides employment floorspace of approximately 250sq.m. The proposal would contain approximately 350sq.m. of floorspace. Therefore the employment generating potential of the site would be enhanced.

The site is within a commercial area and does not benefit from any amenity provision.

Many commercial premises within this area contain residential units on upper floors, the residential premises are restricted to the top floor. The site benefits from good accessibility to public transport modes and to services.

continued/



**2) Character of the Area**

There are examples of 3 and 4 storey buildings within the area and the site sits opposite to the Civic Centre complex which contains the main 6 storey building. Illustrative drawings indicate that the proposal would be lower than the adjacent Job Centre building at 12 to 14 Station Road. It is considered that the proposal would not be out of character with the area.

**3) Parking/Highway Considerations**

The proposal contains provision for 6 car parking spaces at ground floor level. Taking account of the excellent transport accessibility of the site, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

**4) Consultation Response**

None

**CONCLUSION**

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

REDEVELOPMENT: PART 3, PART 2 STOREY DETACHED BLOCK TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

DENNIS GRANSTON for P TOMLIN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/583/20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:  
(a) the extension/building(s)  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-  
(a) the frontage.  
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected to include an acoustic fence along the back garden boundary with no. 5 Anselm Road has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
The boundary treatment shall be completed:  
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 5 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 6 Highway - Approval of Access(es)

Cont...

Item 2/02 - P/3012/04/CFU Cont...

7 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking area(s) have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

8 Landscaping to be Approved

9 Landscaping to be Implemented

10 Levels to be Approved

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

(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste

(b) and vehicular access thereto

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

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

12 Water Storage Works

#### INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 27 - Access for All

3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

4 Standard Informative 35 - CDM Regulations 1994

5 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

H4 Residential Density

T13 Parking Standards

EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land

---

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

1. Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, EP20)

2. Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)

3. Parking and Traffic (T13)

4. Consultation Responses

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	11
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	8
Site Area:	915m <sup>2</sup>	
Habitable Rooms:	25	
No. of Residential Units:	8	
Density	87 dph	
	273 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- eastern side of Anselm Road on corner of junction with Uxbridge Road.
- occupied by detached 2 storey house on southern half of plot.
- northern half comprises open garden area.
- 2-storey detached houses to south in Anselm Road.
- 2-storey commercial parade opposite site within Hatch End Local Centre.
- gardens within Dove Park adjacent to rear boundary with 3-storey flat blocks beyond.
- 3-4 storey blocks of flats on opposite side of Uxbridge Road.

### c) Proposal Details

- demolition of existing house.
- erection of detached building to provide 8 flats.
- 1 x 1-bed x 2 habitable rooms, 6 x 2-bed x 3 habitable rooms, 1 x 3-bed x 5 habitable rooms.
- 2-storey eaves height, 2nd floor predominantly in roofspace lit by front and rear dormer windows plus 2 front gable features.
- hipped roof, subordinate roof height adjacent to no. 5.
- multi-red facing bricks and tile hanging, plain roof tiles proposed.
- 8 parking spaces shown in rear garden, accessed from Anselm Road via tunnel through building.
- remainder of front garden shown for planting.
- scheme revised by reduction in units from 9 to 8, and deletion of rear wing and 2 space front garden parking area, provision of one additional space in rear garden.

### d) Relevant History

P/1916/04/CFU	Redevelopment: linked 2 and 3 storey buildings to provide 11 flats with access and parking	WITHDRAWN 18-AUG-04
---------------	--	------------------------

Cont...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- underground parking not practical nor necessary as proposed garden car park would be surrounded by trees and shrubs and mainly in excess of 20m from nearest corner of no. 5.
- limited amount of noise and disturbance to no.5, main traffic noise from traffic along Uxbridge Road.
- at rear of site is Dove Park, 3 and 8 storey blocks of flats.
- on opposite side of Uxbridge Road are 3 and 4 storey blocks of flats.
- proposed block designed to reflect character of houses in Anselm Road.
- land at side of no.3 originally a plot for detached house.
- proposed block not overdevelopment and would compare favourably with recently completed development, eg. Imperial Drive/Village Way, College Avenue/High Road, Alma PH Harrow Weald.
- proposed block carefully designed to avoid overlooking and respect scale and character of surrounding area and Anselm Road.
- flank wall of flats in line with opposite parade of shops.
- materials proposed to reflect character and appearance of houses in Anselm Road.
- car parking in accordance with standard taking into account proximity to station, bus services and local facilities.
- limited area of amenity space in accordance with Governments' and Council's policies to encourage maximum use of land.
- similar development at Marsh Road/Rayners Lane allowed on appeal and Inspectors decision should be given due importance.

<b>f) Notifications</b> (original 9 flat scheme)	Sent 54	Replies 34	Expiry 09-DEC-2004
---	------------	---------------	-----------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Support traffic congestion, pressure on local parking facilities, would make junction dangerous, overdevelopment, loss of privacy, flats out of keeping, insufficient on-site parking, noise and pollution, precedent, loss of light, aesthetically unappealing, harm to trees on boundary with Dove Park, danger to pedestrians, out of character, insufficient amenity space, front parking spaces detrimental to neighbouring amenity and streetscene, overlooking, excessive density, unneighbourly, excessive height, overshadowing.

Hatch End Association: loss of character, visually obtrusive, rear garden parking unneighbourly due to noise and fumes, insufficient amenity space, adverse impact on junction of Anselm Road/Uxbridge Road, would exacerbate traffic congestion.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Appearance and Character of Area**

The openness of this site between the existing house and Uxbridge Road provides the culmination of a swathe of green, open land projecting from Dove Park to the east up to Anselm Road. It provides a pleasant contrast with the more intensive forms of development on the opposite side of Uxbridge Road and in the local centre to the west.

The proposed development would result in the loss of the open land, but is supported on balance because i) the proposed 2½ storey building would be similar in height to the parade on the opposite side of Anselm Road and less high than flats on the other side of Uxbridge Road, ii) a 1m side buffer zone alongside the building and an adjacent planted highway verge would soften its impact on the streetscene, and iii) the proposal would make effective use of previously developed land in accordance with PPG3 and Policy EP20.

In terms of Anselm Road, the existing dwelling forms part of a group of distinctive and attractive suburban dwellings on each side of the road, which provide an orderly rhythm to this tree lined street.

The proposed building although overall of greater size and bulk than the neighbouring houses would be 2-storeys next to no.5 and would relate satisfactorily to the scale of this neighbouring property. The 2½ storey element can be supported given the corner location, the proximity to the town centre and the height of nearby buildings in Uxbridge Road as discussed above.

The provision of car parking in the rear garden would contrast with the verdant nature of neighbouring properties in Anselm Road. However, planting strips are shown around the edges of the car park and some 300m<sup>2</sup> of amenity space would serve 8 proposed flats.

The proposed area of front garden planting would benefit the streetscene and provide a good setting for the new building.

Overall, it is considered that the proposals would provide an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.

### **2. Residential Amenity**

The access and rear garden parking area would be sited away from the side boundary with no. 5, permitting the provision of planting plus an acoustic fence to minimise noise transmission and safeguard neighbouring amenity. In addition, vehicle noise generation from the 8 spaces which are proposed would be low in comparison with that generated by the adjacent Uxbridge Road. For this reason also the proposed car park would have a minimal impact on Dove Park to the east.

Cont...

No adverse impacts would be provided in terms of privacy, light or outlook.

### **3. Parking and Traffic**

The provision of parking on a 1-to-1 basis can be supported in this location which is close to Hatch End station, bus services and facilities within the local centre.

It is not considered that the position of the proposed access and the scale of development would give rise to traffic congestion.

### **4. Consultation Responses**

- loss of light, harm to trees on boundary with Dove Park - it is not considered that these would result from the proposals.
- precedent - not a material planning consideration.

### **CONCLUSION**

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

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT, DETACHED 3 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS WITH PARKING.

ROBIN BRETHERICK ASSOCIATES for COLIN COLLINS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 0320.S1; 0320.PN1; 0320.D1; 320.D2; 320.D3; 0320.ES1.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Outline - Reserved Matters (Design, Appear, Landsc.)  
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) design of the building(s)
  - (b) external appearance of the building(s)
  - (c) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (b) the boundary.  
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 4 Highway - Closing of Access(es)
- 5 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 6 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 7 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 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 development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

Cont...



- 9 The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until surface water attenuation/storage works have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding.
- 10 Details for drainage of the development must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure a co-ordination of the interests represented by various sewerage and drainage authorities.
- 11 No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of the proposed finished floor levels have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.  
REASON: To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding.(NB: Finished floor levels should be sited at a level of 73.27m above Ordnance Datum)
- 12 No raising of existing ground levels, deposition of spoil/materials, or additional building shall take place within the area of land liable to flood (contact Environment Agency for flood plain map).  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding due to impedance of flood flows and reduction of storage capacity.
- 13 Any walls or fencing constructed within or around the site shall be designed to be permeable to flood water.  
REASON: To prevent obstruction to the flow and storage of floodwater, with a consequent increased risk of flooding.
- 14 Disabled Access - 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 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SEP2 Water  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
EP11 Development within Flood Plains  
EP30 Tree Preservation Orders and New Planting  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D10 Trees and New Development  
T13 Parking Standards  
H4 Residential Density

Cont...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Residential Character & Visual Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  2. Housing Policy (SH1, H4)
  3. Parking & Highway Issues (T13)
  4. Flood Risk (SEP2, EP11)
  5. Trees (EP30, D10)
  6. Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	12
	Justified:	12
	Provided:	11
Site Area:	0.15ha	
Habitable Rooms:	24	
No. of Residential Units:	8	
Density:	160hrph	
	53.3dph	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- detached house with garage on eastern side of Gordon Avenue with 'in and out' gated access
- extensive planting on boundaries, including oak and yew trees at rear and dense laurel hedge at far rear
- 3 storey block of flats 'Oaklawn Court' to north, 2 storey houses to immediate rear (11 and 11a Gordon Avenue)
- access road to 5 properties to immediate south adjoining wooded area and Edgware Brook
- large oak tree in rear garden of Oaklawn Court with crown spread extending over site
- Character of area is residential with this end of Gordon Avenue comprising a mix of flatted development and individual residential properties

### c) Proposal Details

- revision of previous outline proposal of same description (P/584/04/CFU)
- outline application with only siting and means of access to be determined

Cont...

Item 2/03 - P/3300/04/CFU Cont...

- changes include revisions to drawings to show:
  - a changed roof line/ design which lowers the height on each side of the building from 9.6 – 8.4m
  - all patio's/ balconies reduced in size
  - rear window reduced in size at ground and upper floors
- redevelopment to provide 8 flats, illustrative floor plans indicate 2 bedroom units – these remain unchanged
- layout includes single vehicle entrance point, 3 parking spaces including 1 disabled persons parking bay at front, 4 parking spaces partly in under croft area with 4 spaces in the rear garden
- three storey building including front, side and rear balconies with integral bin store and cycle park beside under croft parking
- communal rear garden of some 626m<sup>2</sup>

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/11568/J	Erect Detached House and Garage	GRANTED 12-AUG-60
LBH/36795	Single-Storey Extension	GRANTED 01-NOV-88
P/1096/03/DFU	Installation of Electric Gates at Entrance	GRANTED 19-JUN-03
P/584/04/COU	Outline: Redevelopment, detached 3-storey building to provide 8 flats with parking	REFUSED 11-NOV-04 APPEAL (Suspended)

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character of the area which is characterised by single family dwellings both opposite, to the back and to the east.
2. The number of flats proposed will generate more traffic which will be detrimental to the free flow of traffic on the bend of this busy road. Vehicular access onto Gordon Avenue will be detrimental to traffic safety during peak periods.”

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Illustrative drawings have been revised, to include a changed roofline on the street elevation. This lowers the eaves height on each side of the building (from approximately 9.6m to 8.4m), and reduces its perceived scale. All balconies have also been further reduced in size, which provides a more compact overall building form, and one of the rear bedroom windows has been reduced in width.

Cont...

Item 2/03 - P/3300/04/CFU Cont...

- principle of 3 storey flats well-established along this stretch of Gordon Avenue with 2 similar developments immediately to north-east, Oaklawn Court and 7 Gordon Avenue
- Proposal continues scale and form of these adjoining buildings
- Water Gardens development to the south-west is a scheme of detached houses, the buildings are very closely spaced and built to a high density (for detached houses). They are separated from No.15 by the heavily treed Montrose Walk, its brook, and the access road to the rear properties providing a natural break between the 2 different types of development along this frontage.
- Proposal is in accordance with new UDP housing policies
- Net residential density of approx 160 hrpha, the proposal is only just above required minimum figure of 150hrpha (UDP policy H4) and the proposal cannot be reasonably considered an overdevelopment.
- Little difference between proposed access to those of adjoining flats. Numerous accesses along the road in accord with its function as an access road. 2 existing access points into property and 1 would be closed and current site lines improved.
- Flats nearby are of similar scale and site size. The building would provide a similar spacing, scale and site coverage to adjoining flats and there is a 9m gap between the 2.
- rear amenity space exceeds SPG guideline of 480m<sup>2</sup> (based on 60m<sup>2</sup> per flat)
- site well contained/ screened by established foliage, particularly along rear boundary where evergreen hedge is some 4m-5.5m in height (plus an 11m preserved yew tree).
- suggested reductions in the rear balconies and rear window will further assist the relationship with the houses to the rear.

**f) Consultations**

TWU	No objection
EA	No objection subject to conditions

<b>Notification</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	15	3	01-FEB-2005

**Response:** Proposal remains out of character with other flats and houses in vicinity; flats would significantly encroach on access driveway to the houses to the south of the site (Nos. 11, 11a, 13, 17, 19); overdevelopment of site and extends further back into garden than appropriate; inappropriate to extend car parking to side and rear of building particularly adjacent to other properties; too close to adjoining dwellings; overlooking; 2-storey may be more appropriate; other flats built on larger sites with more garden areas and well away from adjoining dwellings; TPO on site - would not like vegetation removed from site; increase existing traffic congestion/ hazard; increase traffic pollution, noise and access problems; destroy character, attraction and amenities of dwellings in vicinity; 8 homes would mean 16 cars and visitor cars so parking insufficient resulting in overspill into Gordon Avenue; loss of light, sunlight and privacy by 3-storey building with balconies.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Residential Character & Visual Amenity**

Whilst the application is submitted in outline, the front elevation has been provided and this demonstrates that in visual terms, a 3-storey development could be accommodated on the site without impacting harmfully on the streetscene. Both no. 7 Gordon Avenue (12 flats) and Oakham Court (8 flats) to the immediate north are 3-storey, and the proposal would therefore not appear out of character. The roof design and height have been reduced from 9.6 - 8.4m and slope away from adjoining properties with a height consistent with that of the adjoining Oaklawn Court. The proposed building would also be setback from the site frontage and have a similar building line to Oaklawn Court. Further revisions to the current scheme include the reduction of a rear facing window at ground and upper floor levels and the scaling back of balconies to the front, side and rear elevations in order to further mitigate any concerns relating to overlooking.

The tree and hedge screen at the rear of the site is substantial and would limit views to and from nos. 11 and 11a Gordon Avenue. There would be a minimum of 23m between the closest aspects of the rear of the new building and the front of no. 11 and 35m in respect of no. 11a. The front of no. 11 comprises an access drive which also serves no. 11a and it is considered that the relationship would be acceptable. Likewise the distance from the front elevation (including the roadway) to dwellings opposite would be 25m, which is considered to be acceptable.

There would be a usable rear amenity area of some 626m<sup>2</sup>, which exceeds the Council's previous Supplementary Planning Guidance requirement for the form of development proposed, as well as setting space at the front and on the southern flank. The level of amenity for future occupiers is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The access drive and parking spaces would be sited adjacent to the boundary with Oakham Court. The latter has a vehicular access adjacent to the boundary and a large oak tree to the rear which overhangs the boundary. Plans show a 1.8m lapboard fence and existing laurel screen to be retained along this boundary and in these circumstances it is not considered that there would be an unacceptable loss of amenity.

### **2. Housing Policy**

Whilst the density proposed would be just in excess of the PPG3 guideline, it would be similar to Oaklawn Court adjoining and no. 7 Gordon Avenue. As such it is not considered to be out of character. Effective use would be made of a previously developed site and, as noted above, it is considered that there would be no detrimental loss of amenity for adjoining occupiers. Consequently there is considered to be no conflict with the Council's housing policies.

Cont...

### **3. Parking and Highway Issues**

There would be a parking deficiency of 1 space for the proposal. Whilst at times there is heavy on-street parking on Gordon Avenue within the vicinity of the site, there is space capacity in the evenings and at weekends. In such circumstances it is considered that a parking reason for refusal could not reasonably be substantiated. The vehicular access arrangements are also considered to be acceptable and one of the existing accesses would be closed.

### **4. Flood Risk**

The Environment Agency is satisfied that the Flood Risk Assessment relating to the previous application would also apply to the current application and have no objection. Conditions are proposed to safeguard residents from the risk of flooding.

### **5. Trees**

An oak and yew tree to the rear of the site are the subject of a new TPO but are shown to be retained and should not be affected. The large oak tree on the adjoining site would be similarly unaffected. Scope for new planting would exist and landscaping would be covered by any subsequent detailed application.

### **6. Consultation Responses**

The house on the opposite side of the road would be 25m from the proposal and it is not considered that there would be any detrimental loss of light. The increase in traffic, parking and pollution would be negligible given existing traffic flows on Gordon Avenue. The new building would be setback from the road frontage and would not affect visibility for the adjoining access road. All other issues raised are dealt with in the report.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**496 - 504 NORTHOLT ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/04**  
**P/3067/04/CFU/TW**  
Ward: ROXETH

CONSTRUCTION OF SECOND FLOOR TO  
PROVIDE FIVE FLATS

G M SIMISTER for S SINGH, H PATEL, SHERWOOD SER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos:

**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

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| SD1 | Quality of Design                                       |
| D4  | Standard of Design and Layout                           |
| D5  | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| T13 | Parking Standards                                       |
- 

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	)
	Justified:	) See Report
	Provided:	)
Habitable Rooms:	5	

### **b) Site Description**

- the application site lies at the southern end of Northolt Road on its western side
- the ground floor premises are in retail/commercial uses and the first floor are flats
- there is a service road to the front and a delivery/service road to the rear, beyond which is Alexandra Park

continued/

Item 2/04 – P/3067/04/CFU continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a second floor of accommodation
- the proposal would be formed by means of a mansard roof, behind the existing parapet

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
50

Replies  
1

Expiry  
21-DEC-04

**Response:** Affect amenity

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of the Area**

The adjacent buildings are of a similar overall size as the proposed extension. It is considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the streetscene.

With regard to the rear, there are a variety of original buildings and extensions, which are typical of the rear of commercial premises. In this context the proposal would have no undue effect.

**2) Car Parking**

The proposal is located adjacent to a number of local services and close to South Harrow District Centre.

Public Transport links are in close proximity with both South Harrow and Northolt Park Stations within walking distance.

In these circumstances and taking account of the availability of car parking within the service road, it is considered that the proposal would not give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

**3) Amenity of Neighbours**

The proposal site is opposite other retail and commercial premises on Northolt Road, and to the rear is Alexandra Park and obliquely, the end of rear gardens of properties on Alexandra Avenue. It is considered that there would be no material impact on the amenity of neighbours.

**4) Consultation Responses**

Addressed in report.

**CONCLUSION**

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



---

**MICKLEFIELD, 1 PARK VIEW ROAD, PINNER**

**2/05**

**P/3221/04/CFU/RJS**

Ward: PINNER

RESURFACING OF FRONTAGE, PROVISION  
OF GATES, REBUILDING WALL,  
REPLACEMENT WOODEN FENCE

J R ORCHARD for MR & MRS A GOVANI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1000/SK1, SK2-A, SK3-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

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5 Structural Features

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

SD1 Quality of Design

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

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery

D14 Conservation Areas

---

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

1) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP33, D9)

2) Conservation Area Character and Appearance (SD1, SD2, D9, D14)

3) Residential Amenity (D4)

4) Consultation Responses

---

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Conservation Area: Pinner Hill

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- the site is located on the corner of Potter street Hill and Park View Road
- two driveway crossovers provide vehicular access from the Park View Road frontage
- a low brick wall is located between the two crossovers. This brick wall is in a partial state of disrepair
- the remainder of the Park View Road frontage accommodates mesh fencing and hedging
- a large area of the forecourt of the property is currently sealed with tarmac surfacing
- a close boarded fence is located along the Potter Street Hill frontage

**c) Proposal Details**

- repair and rebuild the front boundary brick wall
- removal of existing tarmac surface and replacement with resin bonded gravel surface and sections of York stone paving border
- installation of timber gates and posts to both of the driveway entrance. Gates and posts would measure 4.2m in width and 1.4m in height
- replacement of 1.8m fence along the Potter Street Hill frontage
- widening of the two existing crossover and reconstruction with tarmac

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Consultations**

CAAC:

Concern about the impact of brick wall on magnolia tree, which should be protected from the wall construction. Suggest leaving the tree where it is and having the wall stop either side. Otherwise no objections.

**Advertisement**

Character of Conservation Area

Expiry  
03-FEB-05

**1st Notification**

Sent  
4

Replies  
3

Expiry  
25-JAN-05

**Summary of Responses:** out of keeping and will spoil the rural residential neighbourhood; felling of two beautiful trees in order to rebuild a wall which could be re-built to accommodate them, would be detrimental to the conservation area of the estate; quite unnecessary to fell them; erection of gates is totally out of keeping with the rest of the road; on another property in the street Council insisted on the removal of their granite sets; granite sets are out of keeping with the conservation area; a replacement tree should not be accepted as a substitute or used to justify the destruction of the original tree; conservation area order allows replacement of what is already existing with the same; understands that Council prefers either tarmac or shingle for driveways to preserve the rural aspect of the hill; not one property in Park View Road has gates; where gates exist on the estate they existed before the conservation order came into being

continued/

**2nd Notification**

Sent  
10

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
24-FEB-04

## **APPRAISAL**

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

With respect of the boundary treatments, it is proposed to replace the existing side boundary fence to Potter Street Hill whilst installing driveway gates where there previously have been none. Green Belt policies aim to restrict the increase in size of buildings and structures within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard the openness of it. Notwithstanding, the proposal is considered to constitute a minor element of work that would not have a detrimental impact on the openness of the locality with respect of the Green Belt land classification. Accordingly it is deemed that the proposed additions would not be harmful to the Green Belt.

### **2) Conservation Area Character and Appearance**

The replacement wooded fence along the boundary with Potter Street Hill is considered to be acceptable, give it is of similar design and materials to the existing fence and to be treated with a natural wood preservative.

With respect of the Park View Road frontage the existing brick wall is unobtrusive, given its low height and colour. Therefore its replacement with like for like and the retention of the existing magnolia tree is considered to be acceptable.

With respect of the gates, it is acknowledged that gates are not a common feature throughout the conservation area. Whilst proposals for gates that utilise modern materials and designs that appear solid and defensive in appearance would be resisted, it is considered that the proposed gates do not fall into this category. It is felt that the proposed gates would be acceptable, as they attempt to achieve a semi-rural appearance by use of a traditional five-bar design and timber materials. The permeable nature of the design would allow views to be maintained through the gates, thereby not compromising the locality's openness. Likewise the treatment of the gates with a natural wood preservative is considered acceptable.

With regards to the resurfaced driveway, the existing tarmac surface is of little merit, therefore no objections are raised to its loss. It is considered that the proposed replacement with resin bonded gravel surface and sections of York stone paving border would preserve the character of the property and conservation area. No concerns are raised against the new and slightly enlarged crossovers as the tarmac would match the existing road, whilst no kerb edging would achieve a softer appearance.

Overall the proposed works to the frontage of the site are considered to constitute relatively minor cosmetic modification to the frontage of the site that would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

continued/

**3) Residential Amenity**

As the fencing, driveway gates and paving treatment would be located along the frontage of the site, there are no concerns that they would pose any detrimental impact for the adjoining neighbours.

**4) Consultation Responses**

All relevant issues raised have been addressed in the sections of the report above.

**CONCLUSION**

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

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT:  
REPLACE WINDOW WITH DOOR  
AT FIRST FLOOR

SQUARED LTD for MR SCOTT VINCENT

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos:

**GRANT** Listed Building Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Time Limit - Listed Bldg./Cons. Area Consent
- 2 Listed Building – Details ( a) new door )

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings

---

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

- 1) Character of Listed Building (D11, D13)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: Little Common Stanmore

Green Belt

### **b) Site Description**

- end of terrace of four cottages
- modern garage single storey extension

continued/

Item 2/06 – P/3255/04/CLB continued.....

**bb) Listed Building Description**

- circa 1860-70, complex built to house staff and to stable horses for Stanmore Hall
- red brick composition overlooking Spring Pond, with bargeboarded gables and elaborate chimney stacks
- bracketed eaves and single storey bays with gabled porches, some blue brick drapering and dressing, tile roofs

**c) Proposal Details**

- replace existing window at side with timber door leading out onto existing flat roof

**d) Relevant History**

None

**f) Advertisement**

Extension of Listed Building

Expiry  
25-JAN-05

**Notifications**

Sent  
5

Replies  
0

Expiry  
25-JAN-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Listed Building**

The proposed alterations are considered small scale, relating to the replacement of one window with a single leaf door. It is considered that the alteration would not affect the symmetry of the terrace as it is located on the side elevation. This elevation has already been altered by the addition of a single storey garage and it is not considered that the door would look out of place. It would also be partially obscured by the parapet to the garage roof so in views, the alteration would not be particularly apparent.

Overall it is considered that the proposals would preserve the character of the listed building.

There are no proposals to create a terrace on the flat roof and the application does not include an provision for railings etc. Such railings would be unlikely to be considered acceptable as they would look out of place and would be prominent in views across the pond.

**2) Consultation Responses**

None

**CONCLUSION**

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

ROYAL NATIONAL ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL, P/191/05/CFU/RJS  
BROCKLEY HILL, STANMORE

Ward: CANONS

TEMPORARY SINGLE STOREY OFFICE BUILDING

PKL HEALTHCARE for ROYAL NAT ORTHOPAEDIC HOSPITAL

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drg no. H5002-C1-001, Drg no. H5002-GA-001, Drg no. H5002-GA-002,  
Drg no. H5002-F1-001, Drg no. H5002-TA-001

**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 Completed Development - Buildings
- 3 The building(s) hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition within 3 year(s) of the date of this permission, in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
The additional footprint hereby approved will not be considered when calculating the aggregate ground floor area under the provision of paragraph C4 and C5 of Annex C to PPG2.
- 2 INFORMATIVE:  
SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
SD1 Quality of Design  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP32 Green Belt-Acceptable Land Uses  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt  
EP35 Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

Cont...

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

1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Listed Building:	Locally Listed
Conservation Area:	None
Green Belt:	Green Belt
Floorspace:	110m <sup>2</sup>

### **b) Site Description**

- The RNOH site is located in the north east of the borough and abuts Wood Lane and Brockley Hill;
- The application relates to an area of land to the south of the centre of the site and is bounded by other buildings on all sides;

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Temporary building measuring 12.2 metres by 9.0 metres and 3.4 metres in height;
- The building would accommodate offices;
- A five year temporary consent is applied for;

### **d) Relevant History**

The site as a whole has been the subject of numerous planning applications. None, however, relate to this part of the site.

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

The application is for planning permission for a time limited consent for a five-year period. The offices are to accommodate the staff of the booking unit; a department integral to the activities of RNOH, who currently have cramped office accommodation on the RNOH site. We confirm that the location of the proposed building is within the designated boundary for in-fill development on the RNOH site.

### **f) Consultations**

None

Cont...



## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character**

The site is identified in the UDP as a Major Development Site within the Green Belt and as such infilling within existing development areas can be considered appropriate development within the Green Belt. It is highlighted that the proposed siting of the building is within an existing development area given it would be surrounded by associated buildings. Additionally, taking into account the functional requirements of the hospital and its temporary nature pending redevelopment of the whole site, the proposal is in line with normal policy.

With respect of the requested 5 year time limitation, it is noted that a recent application for a similar development (P/1730/04/CFU) was determined by Committee and was given permission for a limited 3 year period. For the sake of consistency is deemed acceptable to likewise limit this current application to a 3 year temporary permission.

### **2. Consultation Responses**

N/A

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**WOODSIDE, 60 COMMON RD, STANMORE**

**2/08**

**P/3254/04/CFU/CM**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

ENTRANCE GATES AND METAL POSTS

JONATHAN SCHUMAN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: MPL/WCR/01, 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

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 INFORMATIVE:

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5 Structural Features

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

SD1 Quality of Design

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP32 Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D18 Historic Parks and Gardens

---

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

- 1) Green Belt Land, Area of Special Character and Historic Parks and Gardens (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP31, EP32, EP33, D4, D18)
  - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:

Green Belt

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- large detached property with tennis court adjacent to front and side boundaries with Common Road and The Cedar House
- existing brick piers to either side of entrance driveway with close boarded fencing and dense planting/trees forming front boundary with Common Road
- timber gate with rural appearance and name plate at entrance to the Cedar House
- close boarded fencing to opposite side of Common Road at rear of properties on Fairseat Close
- dense planting along highway to south with Harrow Weald Common to the west and Bentley Priory Open Space to the east
- cottages with small front gardens to north on Common Road
- large detached properties, many with front entrance gates similar to the proposed, on The Common nearby

**c) Proposal Details**

- the replacement of the existing brick piers to either side of the entrance with metal posts and the erection of black metal gates with silver finials and lettering, with solid back plates for privacy

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
4

Replies  
0

Expiry  
25-JAN-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Green Belt Land, Area of Special Character and Historic Parks and Gardens**

The proposal would have a minimal impact on the character and openness of the site, taking into account its location in an Area of Special Character, a Historic Park and Garden (Bentley Priory) and the Green Belt. The existing dense planting and trees, which run inside the fence fronting Common Road, would not be affected. While the metal posts, at 1.5m, would be higher than the existing piers (1.2m), they would nonetheless be lower than the fence at either side, and the height of 1.9m at the centre of the gates would not appear significantly higher. Due to the modest scale of the proposal and the variety of entrance gates in the surrounding area, including The Cedar House, Peterborough and St. Margaret's School and numerous dwellings on The Common, the proposal is not considered to affect the character, appearance, setting or openness of the area.

**2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

No impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers is foreseen due to the siting away from the neighbouring dwellings and the intervening dense planting at the boundaries. due to the modest scale of the proposal and the variety of entrance gates in the surrounding area, no impact on residential amenity is envisaged.

continued/

**3) Consultation Responses**

None

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**219 ALEXANDRA AVENUE, SOUTH HARROW  
(EX TITHE FARM P.H.)**

**2/09**  
**P/2661/04/CFU/JH**  
Ward: ROXBOURNE

USE OF PART OF CAR PARK FOR THE HAND  
WASHING AND VALETING OF CARS.

ARTIAN SHEHU

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered plan received 23-FEB-05, 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 The use hereby permitted shall be discontinued within 3 years of the date of this permission.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.
- 3 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:  
09:00 hours to 18:00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 The applicant is advised that advertising consent may be required for any signs to do with the proposed activity. Please contact the Council's Duty Planner Service should you require assistance or clarification of this matter.
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**  
**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
EP25 Noise  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, EP25, D4, T13)
  - 2) Parking (T13)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

The application was deferred at the Development Control Committee meeting of the 9th February 2005 in order to negotiate a more acceptable form of development

### **a) Summary**

Site Area: 2880m<sup>2</sup>  
Floorspace: 188m<sup>2</sup>

### **b) Site Description**

- existing car-parking area within the northern part of the site occupied by the Matrix Bar on the corner of Alexandra Avenue and Eastcote Lane
- piles of rubbish/fly tippings located to the rear of the car park
- small parade of shops located opposite
- adjoining properties to the north occupied by single storey garages together with a petrol filling station and to the west lie the rear gardens of residential properties fronting Rowe Walk

### **c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of 188m<sup>2</sup> of existing pub car parking for use as hand car wash and valet service. Use of storeroom at rear of pub for equipment storage
- hours of operation 09.00 Hrs – 18.00 Hrs, Monday – Saturday inclusive
- 3 staff to be employed.
- 15-20 vehicles expected per day.
- 1x jet washer for cleaning cars.

### **d) Relevant History**

None

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

- Drawings amended to show new position of car wash area and storage area
- In agreement with new position of car wash and hours of operation
- Prepared to arrange to have refuse removed with co-operation of leaseholder
- Concern with 12-month planning permission as we have invested a lot of money into the car wash. To reopen and apply again would not be cost effective and prolongs situation. It will take this amount of time to build a client base. If full planning permission is granted and problems arise, although not anticipated, an amicable solution could be found. You must also appreciate the cost incurred in reopening as will need to advertise to inform customers that we are operational again and to do this again in a 9 month period would not be an option for us and nor would it be good for our customers or our business.

### **f) 1st Notification**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
12	2	07-DEC-04

continued/

**Summary of Response:** Residents at rear of car park have already experienced the use of the car park as a car wash as this service was operational prior to the application and object for the following reasons: Noise - The service starts between 7.30 and 8.00 every day including weekends when residents are awoken by voices, cars and water jet machinery; Environmental impact – Rubbish accumulates at the rear of the car park. Rear wall of building used as toilet. These are visible from the rear windows of adjoining dwelling; Drainage – Surplus water runs elsewhere. Rear of residential garage parallel to car wash resulting in damp problems.

Matrix (pub/ bar) was previously granted a Public Entertainment Licence (PEL) on 19<sup>th</sup> Nov 2002. In considering application for a PEL the Panel took into account the availability of the car park for customers in order to minimise the effect of car parking in local streets. The current application would reduce parking spaces. Proposals have health and safety implications, which may hinder emergency evacuation of the premises, including the effect of any permanent or temporary structures, the effect of water on the ground and the use of machinery.

<b>2nd Notification</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	12	Awaited	14-MAR-05

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Neighbouring Amenity**

The site was previously used for a car wash and valet service without the benefit of planning permission. This use was subsequently discontinued and the current application submitted.

The immediate locality is characterised by a mix of residential and non-residential properties with access to the site via the busy Alexandra Avenue. Immediately to the rear of the site are a number of 2-storey residential properties fronting 15 – 25 Rowe Walk. The rear wall of the nearest dwellings would be approximately 37m from the proposed carwash area and the rear gardens of those properties would be approximately 25m away. The site boundary is defined by a tall close-boarded fence.

The proposed carwash area has been reduced in size and moved further away from the rear boundary with neighbouring residents. Conditions restricting hours and days of operation together with a condition for temporary permission are suggested in order to mitigate the impacts of the development on neighbouring residents.

### **2. Parking**

The site is currently used for parking associated with the bar/ pub. The area indicated for the use of the car wash has been reduced in size and the parking spaces would be available for the pub clientele outside of the hours of operation for the car wash.

continued/

**3) Consultation Responses**

The accumulation of rubbish and the use of the rear of the site as a toilet whilst undesirable are not material considerations for this application. Likewise health and safety issues whilst important are covered under other legislation. Other matters raised covered by the report above.

**CONCLUSION**

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



---

**256 EXETER ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/10**

**P/3118/04/DFU/PDB**

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

SINGLE AND TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR  
EXTENSION AND CONVERSION TO 3 FLATS;  
BIN STORE AT FRONT; PARKING AT REAR

STARR KILLOCH ADAMS ARCHITECTS for CROSSWAY DEVELOPMENTS LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 9430/010, 012 and 002A, 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
The boundary treatment shall be completed:  
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 5 The disabled persons access/egress arrangements shown on the approved drawings shall be implemented prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To make satisfactory arrangements for the occupation of the ground floor flats by disabled persons.
- 6 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the parking area shown on the approved drawing No. 9430/012 has been made available for use by future occupiers of the flats and shall thereafter be retained for parking, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking facilities for the development.
- 7 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a detailed scheme for the hard and soft landscaping of the forecourt has first been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the property in the streetscene.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

continued/

Item 2/10 - P/3118/04/DFU continued.....

3        **INFORMATIVE:**

**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1	Quality of Design
EP25	Noise
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D9	Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
D10	Trees and New Development
H9	Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
H18	Accessible Homes
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
T13	Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Character and Amenity of Proposed Extensions
  - 2) Conversion Policy
  - 3) Character of Area
  - 4) Residential Amenity
  - 5) Relationship with Appeal Decision at 103 Elmsleigh Avenue
  - 6) Effect on Street Tree
  - 7) Disabled Persons Access
  - 8) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to the Committee as a petition has been received and the recommendation is for grant.

**a) Summary**

None

**b) Site Description**

- two storey end of terrace dwelling on south east side of Exeter Road, on corner of junction with Capthorne Avenue; detached single garage at rear
- site approximately 0.5m lower than adjacent street level; street tree sited to outer edge of pavement and approximately 13.5m back from rear boundary
- attached mid-terrace dwelling to south west, no. 254, unextended
- nos. 241 Exeter Road and 43 Ovesdon Avenue (also on corner) have full depth two storey side extension; no. 80 Ovesdon Avenue unextended
- rear service road runs between property on this side of Exeter Road and those on Lynton Road – service road level falls away from Capthorne Avenue
- on-street parking not controlled

continued/

Item 2/10 - P/3118/04/DFU continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- single and two storey side and rear extension
  - side extension set 1m back on both storeys and 3m wide at ground floor level, 2m wide at first floor level
  - rear extension 2.4m deep and would span full width of the plot with lean-to roof over (3m high at mid-point of pitch) at ground floor level; first floor would be 4.3m wide and set in 3.5m from boundary with no. 254 and 1.5m from boundary with Capthorne Avenue
  - two storey elements would have subordinate hipped roofs over to match style of original building
- conversion of extended dwelling to three self-contained flats:
  - 1 x two habitable room flat on ground floor of original dwelling and part rear extension
  - 1 x two habitable room flat on ground floor of side to rear extension
  - 1 x four habitable room flat on first floor
- three off-street parking spaces to be provided at rear with access via the rear service road
- rear garden area to be subdivided into three self contained areas of amenity space
- forecourt to be retained as garden with refuse storage
- alterations to form parking area at rear of garden with access from service road and garage doors

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicants Statement**

The extensions have been designed to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area, generally in accordance with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines.

Crossway Developments apologise for the confusion and have served Notice No. 1 upon the trustees of 256 Exeter Road with Certificate B returned completed. It is understood that the fence is not in the correct position and the drawings show the property boundary as the centre line of the party wall which is believed to be correct.

Additional drawing numbered 9430/012 shows the parking layout in detail with levels and manoeuvring patterns. The parking area will be set on a slight slope to follow the line of the sloping access road which serves all other garages to the rear of properties in Exeter Road and Lynton Road. The existing garden to 256 Exeter Road will be enclosed with a new timber fence set back approx. 7m from the line of the existing fence, incorporating a gate for access to the rear garden area.

<b>f) 1st Notification</b>	Sent 13	Replies 3 + petition of 13 signatures	Expiry 24-DEC-04  continued/
----------------------------	------------	---	---------------------------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Overdevelopment, potential for ten occupants, loss of light/overshadowing, external and internal noise, use of garden for parking, congestion, opening line of sight into rear gardens, property is unsold/applicant not owner, excessive size, highway safety, should be no further accommodation in roofspace (rooflights shown on drawings), on-street parking stress, already a traffic problem (speed humps installed), loss of outlook, loss of trees will increase overlooking of garden, noise/disturbance/roof damage during construction, fire risk, inadequate manoeuvring/parking space and onto service road ramp, opens property up to vandalism/graffiti, lack of soak-away will increase garden flooding, will not permit access etc. for construction without consent under Party Wall Act, garage wall is on boundary (alignment of fence is not the boundary), Certificate A incorrect.

**2nd Notification**

Sent  
13

Replies  
0

Expiry  
04-FEB-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character and Amenity of Proposed Extensions**

The proposed two storey side to rear extension would comply fully with the Council's guidelines for such developments on corner sites and the effect of additional building bulk in the streetscene would be partly mitigated by the fall in site levels. Having regard to existing corner extensions within the vicinity and the modest nature of that proposed, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the visual amenity or character of the area.

The inner flank wall of the two storey rear extension would sit within a 45° line drawn, on plan, from the adjoining rear corner of no. 254 and would be to the north-east of that property. In these circumstances and consistent with the Council's guidelines it is not considered that the proposal would appear unduly bulky or overbearing when viewed from that property, nor would cause adverse effect by reason of lost light, outlook or overshadowing.

The single storey rear extension's depth and height are consistent with Council guidelines for such developments to terraced property. The effect on light to and outlook from the rear of no. 254 would therefore be no worse than that normally associated with such extensions and it can be noted the adjacent area to the rear of than neighbouring property has raised decking. It is not therefore considered that the single storey element would be of detriment to the visual or residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers

New windows in the rear elevation would overlook no. 254 at a conventional oblique angle, and other surrounding property at some distance, such as to be of no detriment to privacy amenity. Windows in the front elevation would be no closer to facing property than those of the existing dwelling and a first floor flank window to a bathroom is also considered to be acceptable.

Two rooflights are shown to be installed in the rear roofplane of the original dwelling and are considered to be of minimal visual consequence.

continued/

A distance of some 22m would be maintained between the rear elevation and the rear boundary. Such a distance is considered to be sufficient to preserve the spacious character and pattern of development in this locality.

## 2) **Conversion Policy**

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

In terms of floorspace, the extended dwelling would convert well and the sizes of the flats proposed are considered to be satisfactory. The ground floor flats would be accessed via a communal front door and lobby; the first floor flat would have its own door leading directly to the stairs. The existing front porch would be retained. The general circulation arrangement within the building would therefore be satisfactory.

The internal layout of the ground floor has been amended to increase the width of door openings, the hall and bathrooms to facilitate occupation of the larger unit by disabled persons.

The extension would be constructed with concrete infill between the ground and first floors and the layout of the flats within the original would secure appropriate vertical 'stacking' of room uses. Other than bedroom 3 of the first floor flat, which would be sited over the hallway, first floor bedroom 2 would be sited over the ground floor bedroom. Having regard to the living conditions of future occupiers and subject to the implementation of a scheme of sound insulation to the original building this is considered to be acceptable.

All habitable rooms would have windows to either the front or rear elevation. This would, it is considered, secure acceptable living conditions in terms of natural light to and outlook from the flats.

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

A condition controlling sound insulation between the units is suggested.

In addition to noise and disturbance between the flats, it is acknowledged that the formation of three independent households within the extended building will increase the intensity of domestic activity, with potential for transmission through the party wall to the adjoining property. It is therefore recommended that the condition also requires the implementation of a measures to insulate the party wall, in the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

continued/

- **The level of useable amenity space**

The submitted drawings show that, after the extensions and parking provision at the rear, a combined area of 120m<sup>2</sup> useable amenity space would be retained. The area would be formally subdivided and would provide an area of 30m<sup>2</sup> for ground floor flat 1, 35m<sup>2</sup> for ground floor flat 2 – both with direct access – and 55m<sup>2</sup> for the first floor flat accessed via the rear. This subdivision into two smaller areas for the ground floor flats and a larger area for the first floor flat is considered to be appropriately proportionate to the accommodation provided and would satisfactorily meet the likely needs of future occupiers.

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

Other than the provision of refuse storage, which would be contained within a new 1.3m high timber enclosure, the forecourt would be retained as a garden. This is considered to be acceptable. It is recommended that details of landscaping, to offset the visual impact in the streetscene of additional use of the forecourt for refuse storage, recycling etc, can be satisfactorily controlled by condition.

- **Traffic and highway safety**

Application of the replacement UDP maximum parking standard to the existing dwelling would give a figure of 1.8 – met by the existing rear garage. When applied to the proposed conversion this maximum figure increases to 4 spaces. The subject proposal would replace the rear garage with three parking spaces at the rear, accessed onto Capthorne Avenue via the rear service road.

Numerically, the provision of three spaces is considered to sit acceptably within the maximum standard and, equating to one space per flat, would make an appropriate level of provision in this suburban location. It was observed on site that the adjacent part of Capthorne Avenue was not heavily parked and could meet any additional demand by visitors, as well as parking for disabled persons.

The scheme has been amended to satisfactorily demonstrate that the parking spaces would be useable both in terms of levels and manoeuvring space. It can be noted that a double garage on the facing side of the rear service road demonstrates that a workable arrangement could be achieved.

### 3) **Character of area**

The area is predominantly characterised by inter-war semi detached dwellings, though some limited infill-development and extensions to form additional accommodation has taken place. In these circumstances it is not considered that the proposal would materially detract from the suburban, single family dwelling character of the locality. The converted property would retain a satisfactory appearance in the streetscene and from surrounding property.

The use of the area at the rear for parking with access to the service road would not be out of character: many other properties on this side of Exeter Road and Lynton Road use the service road for access to rear parking/garages.

continued/

**4) Residential amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the rear garden area and parking would increase as a result of the proposal. On this corner site however, flanked on one side by Capthorne Avenue and at the rear by the service road, it is considered that the additional externally generated noise and disturbance would be sufficiently absorbed into surrounding ambient levels as to be of no detriment to the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

Neighbouring residents have raised concern about loss of security associated with the 'opening up' of the rear garden to form a parking area. The applicant has shown the provision of a 1.8m high fence and gate between the parking area and the garden, with the existing garage to the rear of no. 254 forming enclosure on that side. It is not considered that the resulting arrangement would be any less secure than the existing situation or that of surrounding property in the locality. Taking into account the natural surveillance afforded by surrounding dwellings including those on the facing side of Capthorne Avenue, neither is it considered that the proposal would lead to any significantly increased risk of vandalism or graffiti.

**5) Relationship with Appeal Decision at 103 Elmsleigh Avenue**

The appeal decision referred to sought permission for extensions to an inter-war semi-detached dwelling and conversion to three flats. Permission had been refused by the Council on the ground, *inter alia*, that the conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the area. In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector agreed that there would be an over-intensive use of the site, leading to an unacceptable level of activity within the property and some disturbance outside the property – to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers' amenity and the character of the area.

Although the application site's size and the additional floorspace created by the extensions are similar to those of the appeal scheme, it is re-iterated that on a corner site the effects of increased use intensity are considered to be sufficiently ameliorated as to be of no demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

**6) Effect on Street Tree**

It is not considered that there would be any risk to the future health or survival of the adjacent street tree in Capthorne Avenue.

**7) Disabled Persons Access**

The proposal has been amended to provide disabled persons' access to the front door and from the rear of the larger ground floor flat to its garden. Internal door openings and the layout of the ground floor unit has also been revised to meet standards suitable to disabled occupiers.

continued/

In all of these circumstances it is considered that disabled person's access and occupation arrangements could be satisfactorily provided and therefore that the proposal complies with UDP Policy H18.

**8) Consultation Responses**

- loss of trees will increase overlooking of garden/opening line of sight into rear gardens: existing conifer trees not protected therefore their loss cannot be prevented
- highway safety: it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the free flow or safety of traffic, nor the safety/convenience of pedestrians
- should be no further accommodation in roofspace (rooflights shown on drawings): no planning control over internal alterations
- noise/disturbance/roof damage during construction/fire risk: not planning considerations
- lack of soak away will increase garden flooding: a building control matter
- will not permit access etc for construction without consent under Party Wall Act: a matter for the parties concerned
- garage wall is on boundary (alignment of fence is not the boundary)/Certificate A incorrect/property is unsold/applicant not owner: notice served and Certificate B supplied; neighbours renotified

All other matters as dealt with in the main report above

**CONCLUSION**

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



ALTERATIONS TO ROOF; RECONSTRUCTION TO INCLUDE FRONT DORMER

JAY PATANKAR & ASSOCIATES for MR BORIS BAIKOV

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Project Number no: 1273 Drawing no: AR/A4/SC/000  
Project Number no: 1273 Drawing no: AR/A3/SC/002  
Project Number no: 1273 Drawing no: AR/A3/SC/005  
Project Number no: 1273 Drawing no: AR/A3/SC/007  
Project Number no: 1273 Drawing no: AR/A3/SC/008

**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 proposed modifications to the roof, as detailed on approved plans: AR/A3/SC/005 & AR/A3/SC/007 must be undertaken and fully completed within six (6) months of the date of the decision notice.
- 3 Materials to Match

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

---

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

1. Planning History
2. Appearance or Character of Conservation Area
3. Residential Amenity
4. Consultation Responses

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character: Special Char & Adv  
Listed Building: Not Listed  
Conservation Area: Harrow: Roxeth Hill

### **b) Site Description**

- the site comprises a three storey 1960's terraced dwelling on the northern side of Roxeth Hill;
- The site slopes up Roxeth Hill (east-west) so that the terraced dwellings (81-97 Roxeth Hill) are stepped up at slightly higher elevations in accord with the slope of the hill;
- The site is situated within the Harrow: Roxeth Hill Conservation area and is also identified as an Area of Special Character;
- West Hill Hall is located directly behind the group of terraces, the residential properties Glasfryn House and Glasfryn House are located to the side of the subject site and the Harrow Hospital redevelopment site is situated directly across the road;
- A dormer/roof extension and single storey side extension were constructed in 2003, however were undertaken without planning approval being given. Planning Application P/304/03/CFU attempted to retrospectively approve both building elements, however was refused on the basis of the roof extension being deemed unacceptable. No specific objections were raised to the single storey side extension, however it was likewise refused due to being part of the application for the roof extension;
- The unauthorised works were the subject of enforcement notice pursued through legal and enforcement channels of Harrow Council, which resulted in an appeal being lodged with the Planning Inspectorate against the refusal notice. In their determination of the appeal the Planning Inspectorate approved the single storey side extension, however supported Council's refusal of the dormer/ roof extension;
- Subsequent to this determination of the Planning Inspectorate the enforcement notice was again pursued by Harrow Council, which resulted in this current application being lodged for consideration.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- The application proposes alterations to the existing roof and reconstruction to include front dormer;
- The design of the reconstructed roof and front dormer would exactly match the scale, design and proportions of the existing dormers at 83 & 85 Roxeth Hill, including reinstating the staggered roofline of the terrace row;

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

P/304/03/CFU	Retention of single storey side extension and roof extension	REFUSED 05-JUN-03
--------------	--	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The roof extension, by reason of its excessive height, width and resulting bulk, would be unduly prominent and obtrusive in the streetscene, to the detriment of the character of the area and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

P/1936/03/DFU	1 <sup>st</sup> floor side extension to provide conservatory	REFUSED 18-NOV-03
---------------	--	----------------------

**e) Advertisement**                      Character of Conservation Area                      Expiry  
17-JAN-05

**CAAC:**                      Objections: dormers too large, side elevation is 'too ugly'.  
Needs to be reduced further.

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	20	1	08-FEB-05

**Summary of Response:** previously built extension caused overshadowing, loss of light and sunshine, blocked view and out of character with the surrounding considerations area; particularly it is out of character with West Hill Hall - a Grade II Listed Victorian Building; has caused loss of property value.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Planning History**

The proposed development is the result of a prior application, planning appeal and enforcement notice. The single storey side extension and dormer/ roof extension were constructed without planning approval. The retrospective planning application (P/304/03/CFU), attempted to authorise the works, however after due consideration was refused. In the determination of a subsequent Planning Appeal the Planning Inspectorate approved the single storey side extension however disallowed the dormer/ roof extension. In response to this determination Council issued an Enforcement Notice requiring the dormer/ roof extension to be removed and the roof reinstated to its former condition. This current application seeks approval for further modifications to dormer/ roof extension to allow for its retention.

Cont...

## **2. Appearance or Character of Conservation Area**

Throughout the recent planning history of the subject site, the view has been taken that the subject site could accommodate an appropriately designed dormer/roof extension. However, up until the lodgement of the current application the size & design of both what has been constructed on site, and what has been subsequently proposed have been unacceptable. Notwithstanding, the current application differs in that it clearly addresses the form and design of the neighbouring dormers. It is highlighted that the plans detail a design involving the reconstruction roof and front dormer would exactly match the scale, design and proportions of the existing dormers at 83 & 85 Roxeth Hill, including reinstating the staggered roofline of the terrace row. This is considered to be an entirely acceptable design that would not constitute an obtrusive element within the context of the streetscape. Although Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance generally discourages front dormers, in this circumstance it is considered acceptable due to the existence of dormers at 83 & 85 Roxeth Hill and that the proposed dormer exactly matches their scale, design and proportions. Accordingly the reconstructed roof/ dormer is deemed to be an appropriate design solution that would not be unduly obtrusive in the street scene, nor would be detrimental to the visual amenities of surrounding properties, and would not detract from the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and Area of Special Character.

## **3. Neighbouring Amenity**

There are no significant impacts such as loss of light or privacy that would be caused for neighbouring properties. There is ample separation distance adjoining proposed and the subject building, likewise including boundary screening vegetation. Accordingly there are no concerns that the reconstructed roof would pose any detrimental impact for the adjoining neighbours.

## **4. Consultation Responses**

Apart from the matters already raised in the report above, the following comments are made with respect of the grounds of objection:

- the size of the roof extension would not cause any significant issue of overshadowing, loss of light etc.
- the design of the dormer is in-keeping with the existing building and the terrace row that it is part of. Therefore it would not impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Building.
- loss of property value is not a valid planning consideration.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

OUTLINE: REAR EXTENSION AT GROUND TO 3RD FLOOR LEVEL AND ADDITIONAL FLOOR AT FOURTH FLOOR LEVEL

MR H PATEL for HALEY PROPERTY HOLDINGS LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Ground Floor Plan (1:200), Drawing No. PA/461 P.01, Drawing No. PA/461 P.02

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Outline - Reserved Matters (Design, Appearance, Access, Landsc.)  
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) design of the building(s)
  - (b) external appearance of the building(s)
  - (c) means of accessREASON: 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 27 - Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 **INFORMATIVE:**

### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D7 Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
- 

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

1. Character & Appearance of Locality (SD1, D4, D7)
2. Neighbouring Amenity (D4, D7)
3. Parking (T13)
4. Accessibility (C16)

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Town Centre	Harrow	
Car Parking	Standard:	0
	Justified:	0
	Provided:	No additional

### b) Site Description

- application site is located on the east side of Peterborough Road;
- the subject property accommodates a four storey, flat roofed office building sited towards the frontage;
- a 'no through road' access way abuts the southern side of the site and provides access to the rear car park. The parking area accommodates 20 vehicle parking spaces;
- To the north: the adjoining property accommodates a four storey office building;
- To the south: to the opposite side of the access roadway is a four to five storey office building;
- To the east; beyond the car parking area are residential properties that front Kenton Avenue. Large trees along the common boundary provides partial screening;
- To the west: to the opposite side of Peterborough Road is a row of three storey terraces with a pitched roof design. The ground floor of the terraces are in commercial use, while the upper floor appear to accommodate residential flats.

### c) Proposal Details

- The outline application proposes the construction of an extension to the rear of the building to provide for additional floor spaces at ground floor, 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level. The application likewise proposes an additional floor level to be accommodated by a mansard roof extension;
- The rear extension would measure 3.6 metres in depth at ground floor and 8.4 metres at upper floor, with the additions spanning the 11.4 metre width of the building;
- The upper floors would be cantilevered over the existing 5 parking spaces to the rear of the building;
- The additions would provide for and additional;
  - 43 square metres of floor space at ground floor;
  - 88 square metres of floorspace each at 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor level, and;
  - 290 square metres of floorspace at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level;

### d) Relevant History

None

Cont...

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 34	Replies 0	Expiry 08-FEB-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Character & Appearance of Locality & Amenity**

Firstly it is highlighted that the subject site is appropriately located within the boundaries of the Harrow Metropolitan Centre. Therefore it has excellent access to the Harrow's transport interchange and a range of other associated commercial and business uses.

More specifically, the proposed development represents an extension to the rear of the existing four storey flat roofed commercial building and the creation of additional level within a mansard roof extension. The outline proposal details a four storey extension to the rear of the building that would match the form and design and the commercial nature of the existing building. Furthermore the scale and site is in keeping with this general character and appearance of the surrounding buildings. Therefore it is considered that the proposal represents additions to an existing building that are in keeping with the character and appearance of both the building and locality.

The building would not significantly impact upon on any adjoining properties, given the additions would abut adjoining commercial buildings, adjacent laneway and associated parking area. Although new windows would be provided along the north and south elevations (within close proximity of the adjoining properties), these are not considered to be unreasonable given the neighbouring buildings are commercial offices. Windows are likewise proposed in the east facing rear elevation at 1<sup>st</sup> through 4<sup>th</sup> level that have views towards the adjoining residential properties. Such windows are not considered to be unreasonable given there is a horizontal separation distance of 30 metres (approx) between these windows and the rear gardens of the adjoining residential properties. Furthermore partial screening would be provided by large trees located on the common boundary line. Lastly there would be a 20 metre separation distance between the west facing windows of the additional 4<sup>th</sup> level floor and the terraces opposite.

Overall the outline proposal is deemed to be an appropriate design solution that would not be unduly obtrusive, nor would be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding properties, and would not detract from the character and appearance of the locality.

### **2. Parking**

Although the commercial floorspace of the property would be increased, the parking capacity of the site would however not be reduced. The existing 20 on site car spaces would be retained as part of the proposal which is noted to being well in excess of the requirements of current parking restraint policies of the 2004 adopted UDP.

Cont...

**3. Accessibility**

The current application provides for lift access to all levels of the building which achieves disabled access to the upper floor of the building. Nevertheless the agent will be formally advised of the obligations contained within the Disability Discrimination Act, 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises), implemented on 1<sup>st</sup> October, 2004

**4. Consultation Responses**

None.

**CONCLUSION**

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



FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSIONS

LEE BUTLER for MR & MRS S R KAYE

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Existing Elevations, Drawing no. 91104 Revised 02/02/05, Site Plan Revised, Location 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), other than those shown on the approved plan no 91104 Revised 02/02/05 shall be installed in the rear 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 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 31 - No Future Extensions
- 3 Notwithstanding the approval of Drawing No. 91104 Revised 2/2/05, the permission hereby granted does not relate to the construction of an extension to the existing detached garage.
- 4 **INFORMATIVE:**  
**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SEP5 Structural Features  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

Cont...

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

UDP Key Policies:

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Listed Building:	Not Listed
Conservation Area:	None
Green Belt:	Green Belt

### b) Site Description

- two-storey detached property on corner of The Common and Priory Drive.
- within the Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character.
- large detached houses nearby with Stanmore Common to north.
- existing detached garage and extensions to house.

### c) Proposal Details

- flat-roofed first floor side extensions over ground floor bay windows at either end of house.
- proposed new element to north-eastern end wrapping around over single storey rear and higher pitched roof over side extension.

### d) Relevant History

EAST/497/95/FUL	Alterations, front bay window, single storey front and side extension with terrace over, detached double garage at side	GRANTED 19-OCT-1995
EAST/753/95/FUL	Alterations, front bay, single storey front and side extension with terrace over, single and 2 storey side extension and detached double garage at side	GRANTED 20-DEC-1995
EAST/783/97/CON	Retention of double garage	GRANTED 17-DEC-1997
EAST/784/97/CON	Retention of single storey rear extension	GRANTED 17-DEC-1997 Cont...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Letter received 8<sup>th</sup> February 2005 confirming that garage is to be omitted from application.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 03-MAR-2005
-------------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Green Belt & Area of Special Character**

Policies within the adopted UDP seek to restrict extensions to houses within the Green Belt in order that they should not represent disproportionate additions.

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing (%inc.)</b>	<b>Proposed (%inc.)</b>
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	186.3	218.81 (17.45)	218.81 (17.45)
Floorspace (m <sup>2</sup> )	320.15	380.03 (18.7)	397.78 (24.25)
Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	1003	1201.4 (19.78)	1246.4 (24.27)

The proposed extensions would be constructed over the existing single storey bay windows to either end, with the north-eastern element wrapping around to the rear of the existing two-storey extension and a higher and deeper pitch roof over the whole side extension. It is evident from the calculations above that while the proposed extensions to the house would add to the volume and floorspace of the property, no increase in site coverage would result. The proposed extensions are not considered to be disproportionate to the property (comprising of the house and outbuildings) as originally constructed. The dwelling itself is sited a substantial distance from the boundaries with The Common and Priory Drive, with generous mature planting to the side and hedging to the front. The modest scale of the proposal would not prejudice the character or openness which currently exists. The proposal to double the size of the detached garage, which would have been harmful in this respect, has been deleted from the application.

Given the above considerations, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would be harmful to the openness or character of this part of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

**2. Visual and Residential Amenity**

The proposal would involve the raising of the roof over the existing two-storey side extension, to accommodate the additional depth to the rear. This would result in a more symmetrical and balanced appearance than the existing, with matching bay features at either end, and the design and materials would match the existing house.

Cont...

The proposed extensions would be sited adequately and of modest scale so as to prevent any loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbouring property 'Rustington'. The largest part of the proposal to the north-east, where the additional roof height and depth would be of most visual bulk, would be adjacent to the flank wall at 'Rustington'. However, there are no protected windows in this flank elevation, only a door serving the utility room off the kitchen. The proposed bay windows would not lead to any additional overlooking than the existing original rear-facing windows, in particular as they would be sited away from either the front or rear elevations and usable private amenity space at 'Rustington' and the flank-facing sections of the openings would be secondary.

### **3. Consultation Responses**

No responses received.

### **CONCLUSION**

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

LAND R/O 158 CAMROSE AVE, EDGWARE, (CHANDOS RECREATION GROUND) P/3250/04/DFU/AMH

Ward: EDGWARE

INSTALLATION OF PUMPING STATION CONTROL PANEL CABINET

THAMES WATER PROPERTY for THAMES WATER

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 9H3F/A3/02105/EX Rev XI, 9H3F-A1-02104B-EX 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

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 INFORMATIVE:

### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- C13 Statutory Bodies and Utility Companies

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Impact on Adjacent Occupiers
  2. Impact on Recreation Ground (Open Space)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

None

### b) Site Description

- Site adjacent to southern boundary of Chandos Recreation Ground to rear of 158 Camrose Avenue.

Cont...

- 158 Camrose Avenue has single storey out building to rear of garden, virtually filling the plot width.
- Wire mesh fence along boundary between 158 Camrose Avenue and Recreation Ground.

**c) Proposal Details**

- Application proposes erection of pumping station control panel cabinet measuring 1.9m high , 5.9m wide, and 750mm deep.
- Cabinet would be sited c1m from rear boundary of number 158, within Chandos Recreation Ground, behind an existing single storey outbuilding that is sited within the curtilage of number 158 Camrose Avenue.
- The cabinet would be constructed of green Glass Reinforced Plastic.

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Comprehensive Planning and Design Statement dated December 2004, providing site description, details of proposed development and relevant planning policy.

It is stated that submersible pumping stations (with which the proposed cabinet is associated) are almost silent in operation, and are automatic requiring only infrequent visits for maintenance.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	5	2 (incl 1 petition)	10-JAN-05

**Summary of Response:** Would present security risk, as views of what is going on behind cabinet would be obscured; risk of dumping rubbish behind unit; noise from the cabinet; loss of existing trees.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Impact on Adjacent Occupiers**

Given the siting of the cabinet, behind an existing outbuilding, the modest size of the unit which would be lower and narrower than the existing out building in the rear garden of number 158 Camrose Avenue, and the separation distance of c21m between the rear elevation of this dwelling and the proposed cabinet, it is not considered that the proposed cabinet would appear unduly obtrusive or have any adverse impact on the visual amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

Cont...

The applicant has stated that the pumping station (with which the cabinet is associated) would be virtually silent in operation.

It is not considered that the proposed cabinet would significantly prejudice security at any of the adjacent dwellings. It is considered that the potential impact of reduced surveillance of the rear boundary of 158 Camrose Avenue and the adjacent dwellings by the general public walking within the park would have negligible consequence on the security of 158 Camrose Avenue or the adjacent dwellings. It is considered that at present the greatest level of surveillance stems from the rear elevations of the dwellings fronting Camrose Avenue, this would be unaffected by the proposal.

## **2. Impact on Recreation Ground (Open Space)**

The applicant has stated that no trees would be felled in connection with the proposed development.

Given the modest size and green colour of the proposed unit, it is not considered that the cabinet would appear unduly obtrusive or detract from the open character of the recreation ground.

It is not considered that the installation of the cabinet would encourage the dumping of rubbish in the recreation ground.

## **3. Consultation Responses**

Addressed in above report.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**WOOLMER HOUSE, 3 PRIORY CLOSE, STANMORE**

**2/15**

**P/167/05/CRE/CM**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

RENEWAL OF PERMISSION EAST/354/00/FUL:  
DETACHED GARAGE BLOCK WITH ACCOMMODATION  
AT FIRST FLOOR ROOF LEVEL.

DLA TOWN & PLANNING LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 000403/01 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 The proposed ground floor garage of the development hereby permitted shall be used only for the parking of private motor vehicles (and domestic storage if appropriate) in connection with the use of the premises as a single family dwellinghouse and for no other purpose.  
REASON: To ensure that adequate parking provision is available for use by the occupants of the site and to safeguard the character of the area and the Green Belt.

### INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 INFORMATIVE:

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SEP5 Structural Features
- SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- EP31 Areas of Special Character
- EP33 Development in the Green Belt
- EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
- SD1 Quality of Design
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout

continued/



---

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

- 1) Renewal of Permission in Green Belt and Area of Special Character (EP31, SEP5, SEP6)
  - 2) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character  
Green Belt

**b) Site Description**

- two storey detached property with extensions at end of cul-de-sac at Priory Close in substantial grounds
- within Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character, southern boundary abuts Site of Special Scientific Interest (Heriots Wood/The Summerhouse)
- large detached swimming pool building in rear garden adjacent to boundary with 'Turf Hills' as approved under EAST/862/00/FUL
- tennis court to east of house adjacent to boundary with 'Rima'
- mature foliage to all boundaries and to rear of proposed siting, fall in ground level from north to south
- hardsurfaced area with basketball net to east of house, from where existing garage is accessed

**c) Proposal Details**

- renewal of permission EAST/354/00/FUL for detached garage building with crown roof and three front dormers and accommodation in the roofspace
- the building would comprise a triple garage with utility area on the ground floor and staff accommodation on the first floor, accessed via an internal spiral staircase

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/821/98/CLP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: Single storey detached garage and rear gable to existing house	<b>GRANTED</b> 19-MAR-99
EAST/174/99/FUL	First floor extensions to both sides, rear gable, alterations and front vestibule (revised-alternative scheme)	REFUSED 21-APR-99 ALLOWED ON APPEAL 06-OCT-99
	Appeal permission not implemented	

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/167/05/CRE continued....

EAST/306/99/FUL	Detached garage block with accommodation at first floor/roof level	GRANTED 28-JUN-99
EAST/354/00/FUL	Detached garage block with accommodation at first floor roof level	GRANTED 12-MAY-2000
EAST/862/00/FUL	Detached swimming pool building at rear(revised)	GRANTED 03-OCT-2000 Implemented

Permission EAST/354/00/FUL related to a revised scheme following approval of EAST/306/99/FUL, with the block sited 2m closer to the main house and an increase in the footprint of 5.5m<sup>2</sup> (infilling a corner) and an increase in usable floorspace of 8m<sup>2</sup>.

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 23-FEB-05
----	----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Renewal of Permission in Green Belt and Area of Special Character**

Two previous applications for the detached garage block and one application for the swimming pool building were approved as separate developments. The swimming pool building has since been constructed and the current proposal is to renew the permission for the garage block, which is due to expire. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in Green Belt terms and no change in circumstances has occurred.

Given the above considerations, it is not considered that the proposed extensions would be harmful to the openness or character of this part of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

### **2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The proposal would be sited away from the neighbouring properties and would be well screened by the mature trees at the site boundaries. Due to the change in levels on site, the garage block would appear subservient to the main house and the use of a crown roof with front dormers would serve to minimise the height of the structure. Access to the upper level would be via an internal staircase. The relationship with the neighbouring properties was considered to be acceptable when the garage block was previously approved, and no change in site circumstances has occurred.

### **3) Consultation Responses**

None

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**16 BARROW POINT AVENUE, PINNER**

**2/16**

**P/3222/04/DFU/SG3**

Ward: PINNER

SINGLE AND FIRST FLOOR REAR  
EXTENSION/ REAR DORMER

E HANNIGAN for MR & MRS MCKENNA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 284 Rev.B, 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 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 3 Materials to Match
- 4 That floor levels within the proposed development be set no lower than existing property levels.  
REASON: To minimise the risk of flooding.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 20 - Encroachment
- 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 31 – No Future Extensions
- 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

### **INFORMATIVE:**

#### **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION - HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION:**

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- |      |   |
|------|---|
| SD1  | Quality of Design                                       |
| D4   | Standard of Design and Layout                           |
| D5   | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| EP11 | Development within Flood Plains                         |

---

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

- 1) Residential Character
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity
  - 3) Flood Risk
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

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

- a) **Summary**  
None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- site lies 40m east of the junction of Barrow Point Avenue and Avenue Road, on the northern side of Barrow Point Road
- site occupied by a two storey semi-detached dwelling with single storey rear projection (kitchen) and a detached outbuilding some 6m behind the dwelling
- the roof of the dwelling has been extended from a hip to a gable end and the loft converted with the inclusion of roof lights
- access to the rear is via a pathway along the west side of the dwelling.
- site is long and narrow – rear garden depth approximately 40m, and site approximately 8.5m wide
- neighbouring dwelling to the west (No. 18) has a single storey rear projection that projects approximately 1m past the rear wall of the single storey rear projection at No. 16 (subject site)
- the dwelling at No. 18 has a protected window (dining room) in the flank wall at ground floor level
- neighbouring dwelling to the east (No. 14) has a first floor rear extension over the single storey rear projection, the first floor rear extension has a flat roof.
- boundary treatment includes a 1.4m wooden fence along the boundary with No. 18 and a 1.2m wooden fence along the boundary with No. 14
- ground level relatively flat
- area is characterised by mostly semi-detached dwellings. Dwellings 6 to 24 Barrow Point Avenue all of similar character. Original character being two storey semi-detached with single storey rear projections. Nos. 6, 8, 10, 14 and 22 have first floor rear extensions above the single storey rear projection. First floor rear projections at Nos. 6, 8 and 22 have pitched roofs. First floor rear projections at Nos. 10 and 14 have flat roofs.

**c) Proposal Details**

- single storey rear extension to side of existing single storey rear projection
- first floor rear extension over existing single storey rear projection
- rear dormer
- the proposal has been amended as follows:-
  - reduction in width of the proposed rear dormer
  - reduction in depth of the proposed single storey rear extension
  - reduction in size of the two windows proposed in the flank wall of the existing dwelling
  - incorporation of obscure glazing for both windows and fixing shut these windows below 1.8m above floor level
  - confirmation that the floor level of the proposed single storey rear extension will be the same as the existing ground floor level

**d) Relevant History**

18 Barrow Point Avenue

WEST/568/01/FUL First floor rear extension

**REFUSED**  
21-JAN-02  
continued/

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed first floor rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, result in loss of light to the dining room of No.16 Barrow Point Avenue, protected side elevation window, not comply with the 45 degree code Supplementary Planning Guidance, overshadowing and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property, No. 16 Barrow Point Avenue.”

**e) Consultations**

EA: Recommended conditions relating to floor levels and flood proofing

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	2	2	06-JAN-05

**Summary of Responses:** First floor rear extension: excessive bulk, loss of light, overshadowing of protected dining room window, windows in flank wall: overlooking/loss of privacy, dormer window: out of character, excessive size, overlooking, ground floor extension: overshadowing, excessive size

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Character**

The proposal would create a first floor flat roof rear extension, a single storey rear extension adjacent to the boundary with No. 14 and a rear dormer.

In terms of the proposed first floor rear extension, Council’s guidelines normally require that first floor or two storey extensions have pitched roofs. The proposed first floor extension has been proposed with a flat roof. There are a number of first floor rear extensions in the row of semi-detached houses between Nos. 6 and 24 Barrow Point Avenue. The first floor rear extensions at Nos. 6, 8 and 22 have pitched roofs whereas at Nos. 10 and 14 they have flat roofs. The site circumstances are similar. Therefore, it could be said that a precedent has been set for flat roofs over first floor rear extensions. It is considered that a flat roof is appropriate for the proposed first floor rear extension at No. 16 as this would reflect the first floor rear extension to the other half of the pair (No. 14).

The proposal has been amended with the reduction in width of the proposed rear dormer and the reduction in depth of the proposed single storey rear extension.

continued/

The width of the proposed rear dormer has been reduced in response to concerns about the overall level of development of this property and the impact of this dormer on the protected window at No. 18 Barrow Point Avenue. The proposal has been amended to reduce the width of the dormer window so that it is contained on the side of the roof closest to No. 14. It is considered that the reduction in width of the proposed rear dormer will help to reduce the overall bulk of the extensions when seen from the adjoining properties. It is also considered that by containing the dormer to one side of the dwelling, this will help to emphasise the vertical alignment of the dwelling and will balance out the projecting elements. The proposed rear dormer also complies with the minimum setback requirements from the roof eaves and party wall (i.e. 1000mm and 500mm respectively).

The depth of the proposed single storey rear extension has also been reduced to 3m. The reduced depth is in accordance with the Council's guidelines for single storey rear extensions where these are adjacent to a residential boundary.

## **2) Neighbouring Amenity**

### First Floor Rear Extension

The proposed first floor rear extension is to be constructed over the existing single storey rear projection, following the same building lines. The proposed extension is to measure 3.3 metres deep by 3 metres wide. The extension is to have a flat roof. The extension is to measure 5.75 metres above ground level.

The extension is to be set away from the boundary with No. 14 by 3.7 metres. As the extension is to project 3.3 metres from rear main wall, the extension will comply with the 45-degree line taken from nearest two storey rear corner of the dwelling at No. 14.

The neighbours at No. 18 have expressed concern about the bulk of the first floor rear extension and the impact that this would have on light to their property, especially light into a protected window in the flank wall of their dwelling. The protected window serves a dining room at ground floor level. The window is in the flank wall of the two storey portion of the dwelling towards the back of that wall. The dining room is next to the kitchen, which occupies the single storey rear projection at No. 18.

The proposed first floor rear extension will be to the east/ north east of No. 18. Therefore any loss of light arising as a result of this extension would occur in the morning with the sun rising in the east. The area to the east side of the dwelling at No. 18 is used primarily for access to the rear and is not used for outdoor living.

continued/

Item 2/16 - P/3222/04/DFU continued.....

The distance between the two dwellings is approximately 3.6 metres. The distance between the dwellings and the boundary is roughly equidistant (1.8 metres). There is no variation in the building lines between the dwellings at Nos. 16 and 18. As the extension is to project 3.3 metres from rear main wall of the subject dwelling and the distance between the dwellings is 3.6 metres, the extension will comply with the 45-degree line taken from nearest two storey rear corner of the dwelling at No. 18.

Given the separation between the dwellings, the orientation of the dwellings to one another, the use of the space to the side of the dwelling and that the extension will comply with the relevant 45-degree line, it is not considered that the extension would result in unreasonable loss of light or over shadowing to No. 18, or for that matter No. 14.

The only 45-degree line that would apply to the protected window at No. 18 is a vertical plane taken from sill level. The flank wall of the existing dwelling at No. 16 already breaches this 45-degree plane. The rear dormer, as originally proposed, would have slightly increased the extent of this existing infringement but as noted above, the dormer window has been reduced in width and therefore will not affect the existing level of infringement.

No windows are proposed in the flank walls of the proposed first floor rear extension thereby avoiding any loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties.

The proposal does however include the introduction of two windows in the flank wall of the existing dwelling. These are one at first floor level for a new bathroom and one at loft level to provide light to the stairs up to the loft. Both windows were originally proposed as two pane width with top and bottom lights. These were considered to be unnecessarily large for the rooms/ spaces that they would be serving. It was also considered that even if these were glazed with obscure glass there was the potential for perceived overlooking onto No. 18. The agent has since reduced the size of these windows down to single pane windows and has advised that these will be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut below 1.8 metres above floor level. Given the amendments to the windows and the use of the rooms, the concerns regarding loss of privacy and overlooking of No. 18 are considered to have been addressed.

Single Storey Rear extension

The proposed single storey rear extension is to be built in the space between the existing single storey rear projection and the boundary with No. 14. The extension has been reduced in depth to 3 metres, measured from the rear main wall of the adjoining dwelling. The extension is to measure 3 metres above ground level. No windows are proposed in the flank wall of the extension facing No. 14.

The neighbour at No. 14 has raised concerns about the size of the extension and the effect that it would have on light access to the rear of that dwelling.

continued/

The size of the proposed ground floor extension is within what would normally be allowed under the Council's guidelines for single storey rear extensions to semi-detached dwellings. There are no unusual site circumstances to warrant a smaller extension to that proposed. Given the depth and height of the extension, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have unreasonable effects on the adjoining property in terms of loss of outlook, overshadowing/ loss of light. The size of the extension is considered to be reasonable. A condition to prevent the construction of a balcony on the roof of the extension is recommended, should planning permission be granted.

### Rear Dormer

As noted above, the proposed rear dormer has been reduced in scale from a full width dormer to approximately half width. This amendment has been made to overcome concerns about the impact on the protected window at No. 18, and the overall bulk and the appearance of the extensions. The dormer window has been pulled back so that it reads as a single width, smaller element to complement the single width of the proposed first floor rear extension. By doing so it also reads as a separate vertical element that emphasises the vertical lines of the building. It is considered that all the necessary reductions have been made to address the above concerns regarding protected windows, bulk and appearance of the extensions.

The neighbour at No. 14 is also concerned about overlooking from the dormer window, but the impact of these windows would be no greater than existing first floor windows in the rear elevation of the subject dwelling and no significant loss of privacy would result.

The windows in the rear dormer have been designed to tie in with the position and design of the windows at the lower levels. The window placement and design is considered appropriate.

#### **4) Flood Risk**

The subject site is located within the flood plain of the River Pinn. The Environment Agency has identified that the site is located within an area of high flood risk, although they view the proposal as low risk.

The only part of the proposal that might be affected by flooding is the single storey rear extension. The agent has shown in the plans that the floor level of the proposed single storey rear extension will be set at the same level as the existing ground floor level and it is therefore considered that the requirements of the EA have been addressed.

#### **3) Consultation Responses**

Addressed above.

continued/



Item 2/16 - P/3222/04/DFU continued.....

If the Committee are minded to grant this application, which complies with adopted policy and guidance, the occupiers of No. 18 will be informed that a further application for the development previously refused at that address could be favourably considered.

**CONCLUSION**

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

## SECTION 3 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

---

**THE GARDENS R/O PINNER ROAD, HARROW**

**3/01**

**P/2632/04/CFU/TW**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

TWO STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 8  
FLATS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING.

BARKER PARRY TOWN PLANNING for COUNTRY & METROPOLITAN PLC

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1209/A04 Rev.B, /A05 Rev.B, /A06 Rev.B

Had the applicant not appealed against non-determination the application would have been **REFUSED** for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposal would result in a loss of openness of the site to the detriment of its designation as part of a Green Corridor, the amenity of neighbours and the wildlife value of the site.
- 2 The proposal would result in the loss of protected trees of amenity and landscape value which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality.
- 3 The proposed development of the site would result in residential premises which would be subjected to unacceptable levels of noise from the adjacent railway.
- 4 The proposed development by reason of its siting, site levels and location of access and parking, would result in disturbance and an overbearing appearance, to the detriment of the amenity of those neighbours.

### INFORMATIVES

1 **INFORMATIVE:**

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SEP4, SEP5, SD1, EP25, EP26, EP27, EP28, EP29, EP50, D4, D5

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Nature Conservation/Open Space
  - 2) Trees
  - 3) Noise
  - 4) Amenity of Neighbours
  - 5) Consultations Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

**a) Summary**

TPO

Car Parking	Standard:	12 max
	Justified:	10
	Provided:	10
No. of Residential Units:	8	

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- site measures between 16m and 33m in width and approximately 260m in length
- site is largely overgrown and contains numerous trees
- the site rises considerably towards the south which abuts the railway track
- to the north are the rear gardens of properties on Pinner Road
- the site has a frontage onto The Gardens

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a 2 storey block of 8 flats sited approximately 65m from the frontage of the site
- a car park of 10 spaces is proposed with an access road running along the northern boundary of the site
- creation and management of part of the site as a nature reserve
- an appeal against non-determination has been lodged

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/103/98/FUL	Detached 2 storey building to provide 6 two-bed flats, 8 semi-detached & 3 terraced houses, access & parking	REFUSED 07-APR-98
WEST/67/99/FUL	Establishment of wildlife reserve	GRANTED 19-MAR-99
WEST/131/99/OUT	Outline: detached building to provide nine, 2 bed flats with access and parking and provision of public open space	WITHDRAWN
WEST/130/99/OUT	Outline: provision of 37 space car park for use by adjoining industrial estate	REFUSED 10-MAY-99

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 172	Replies 95	Expiry 25-OCT-04
-------------------------	-------------	---------------	---------------------

**Response:** Loss of wildlife, effect on trees, amenity of neighbours, overlooking, noise designated nature reserve

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Nature Conservation/Open Space**

The site is identified in the UDP as a Green Corridor and as a Proposal Site as a 'Nature Reserve' and states:

“The site forms part of a Green Corridor and has planning permission for use as a nature reserve. This will secure the sites nature conservation value, protect and enhance the various environments and species and promote its effective management.”

continued/

The UDP acknowledges that the value of Green Corridors is based on both their ecological significance and in terms of their visual amenity. In the case of this particular site, it forms part of largely unbroken wildlife route from onsite of the Borough to the other. It also provides an important visual screen between dwellings on Pinner Road and the railway land to the south.

It is considered that the proposal would have a damaging effect on the ecological value of the site by coverage of a significant area with buildings and hardsurfacing and by the introducing of vehicular activity and other activity which would compromise this aspect of the sites value. In addition the proposal would lose part of its value as a visual break.

**2) Trees**

The site is the subject of a TPO. The proposal would result in the removal of a number of trees of amenity value, covered by the TPO, to the detriment of the character of the area.

**3) Noise**

The applicant's assessment of noise and vibration places the site within Category C of Annex 1 of PPG24. Category C is defined thus (for dwellings):-

“Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.”

There is no justification to set aside the presumption against development of this site on noise grounds. The proposal would therefore not provide a satisfactory residential environment.

**4) Amenity of Neighbours**

The site forms an important visual break between properties on Pinner Road and the railway. The proposed development would reduce this value and therefore have a prejudicial effect on the amenity of neighbours.

The proposed access road and car parking area would be sited adjacent to the northern boundary of the site which abuts gardens of Pinner Road properties. The access road would rise to a level of approximately 1.2m higher than those adjacent gardens. The proposed car park would also be at this elevated level. It is considered that the introduction of activity generated by vehicles at this level, would have a prejudicial impact on the amenity of those neighbours.

The proposed block would be sited at a distance of approximately 15m from the boundary with gardens on Pinner Road. The proposed ground floor level of the block would be at a level approximately 1.5m above those rear gardens. The proposed block would be 46m in width and the facing elevation would contain windows to all the principle rooms within the development. It is considered that this would have a considerable impact on the amenity of those neighbours both in terms of overlooking and an overbearing presence.

continued/

Item 3/01 - P/2632/04/CFU continued.....

- 5)      **Consultations**  
          Addressed above.

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/02**  
**P/2680/04/CCA/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS ATTACHED TO AND WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF A LISTED BUILDING

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/03**  
**P/2683/04/CCA/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS ATTACHED TO AND WITHIN THE CURTILAGE OF A LISTED BUILDING (DUPLICATE)

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/04**  
**P/2679/04/CLB/AB**  
Ward: PINNER

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: DEMOLITION, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONVERSION TO 2 NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/05**  
**P/2682/04/CLB/AB**  
Ward: PINNER

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: DEMOLITION, INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS IN ASSOCIATION WITH CONVERSION TO 2 NO. RESIDENTIAL UNITS (DUPLICATE)

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/06**  
**P/2678/04/CFU/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

CONVERSION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS TO DWELLINGHOUSE AND GARAGE: ERECTION OF 2 NEW DWELLINGHOUSES, ONE WITH NEW GATEHOUSE, ONE USING STORAGE BUILDING AS GARAGE: EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

continued/

---

**EAST END FARM, MOSS LANE, PINNER**

**3/07**  
**P/2681/04/CFU/TEM**  
Ward: PINNER

CONVERSION OF STORAGE BUILDINGS TO DWELLINGHOUSE AND GARAGE: ERECTION OF 2 NEW DWELLINGHOUSES, ONE WITH NEW GATEHOUSE, ONE USING STORAGE BUILDING AS GARAGE: EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS (DUPLICATE APPLICATION)

TREVOR CLAPP for MR & MRS B LEAVER

---

P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA (Duplicate)

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12, 13E, WP001, 002A, A01, A02(1), A02(2), A02(3), A02(2A), WPC01, 02, WPA003A, WPH01A, 02A, 03A

**REFUSE** Conservation Area Consent for the works described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed new structure to replace the existing buildings would, in the context of the overall scheme for the site, fail to preserve or enhance the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area.

**INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings  
D13 The Use of the Statutorily Listed Buildings  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
D16 Conservation Area Priority

---

continued/

Items 3/02, 3/03, 3/04, 3/05, 3/06, 3/07 – P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA, P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB, P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CLB continued...

P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB (Duplicate)

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12, 13E, WP001, 002A, A01, A02(1), A02(2), A02(3), A02(2A), WPC01, 02, WPA003A, WPH01A, 02A, 03A

**REFUSE** Listed Building Consent for the works described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed physical interventions in the barns in the form of the introduction of a toilet in Barn C would have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings, to grant consent for which would be contrary to the statutory duty of the Local Planning Authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.

### INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings  
D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
D16 Conservation Area Priority
- 

P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CFU (Duplicate)

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: WP01E, 02E, 03E, 04E, 05E, 06E, 07E, 08E, 09E, 10E, 11E, 12, 13E, WP001, 002A, A01, A02(1), A02(2), A02(3), A02(2A), WPC01, 02, WPA003A, WPH01A, 02A, 03A

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

- 1 The orchard land, by virtue of its openness, contributes to the character of the East End Farm Conservation Area and to the setting of East End Farm Cottage and its loss would therefore be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Listed Building.

continued/



- 2 The proposed new house and its ancillary gatehouse on the Orchard would, by virtue of their design, size and siting be inappropriate within the East End Farm Conservation Area and detrimental to the setting of East End Farm Cottage, and give rise to harm to neighbouring residential amenity, and the potential loss of trees on the site.
- 3 The proposed new house and its ancillary gatehouse on the Orchard, would, by virtue of their size, design and siting give rise to harm to neighbouring residential amenity and the potential loss of trees on the site.
- 4 The proposed new house to the north of Barn B would by virtue of its siting, design and form fail to respect the existing character of the Conservation Area and would appear at odds to it. It would compete visually with nearby listed buildings, to the detriment of their setting and would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.
- 5 The proposed enabling development would not meet the tests as set out in the English Heritage guidance and would crucially damage the asset which it seeks to preserve.
- 6 It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the amount of development proposed is the minimum necessary to secure the repair of the barns, contrary to English Heritage's guidance in Enabling Development.
- 7 The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessive site coverage by buildings and hardsurfaced area and inadequate amenity space and space around the buildings to the detriment of neighbouring residents and the character and appearance of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area.
- 8 The proposal could result in the loss of protected trees of significant amenity and landscape value which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area and give rise to harm to neighbouring amenity.

INFORMATIVE:

1 INFORMATIVE:

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:

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

- H4 Residential Density
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D10 Trees and New Development
- D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- D21 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- D22 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- SD1 Quality of Design
- T13 Parking Standards
- T15 Servicing of New Developments

---

continued/

## RECOMMENDATION

The Committee, on current advice and recognising the Inspector's conclusions in the recent appeal, accept that a 2 house development, one located within Barn A and the other on the site of buildings D, E and F, would provide a viable future for the site sufficient to secure the long term future of the barns, requiring the minimum number of dwellings located in the least sensitive parts of the site.

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Impact on the Listed Buildings, their settings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D11, D13, D14, D15, E16)
  - 2) Enabling Development
  - 3) Employment and Housing Issues (EM15, SH1, H4)
  - 4) Archaeology and Underground Works (D20, D21, D22)
  - 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
  - 6) Access and Parking (T13, T15)
  - 7) Trees (SD1, D4, D10)
  - 8) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: East End Farm Pinner

Car Parking: Standard: 5  
Justified: 5  
Provided: 6+

Site Area: 0.32ha.

No. of Residential Units: 3

Habitable Rooms: 24

Density: 9 dph 75 hrph

Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- historic barns and ancillary structures off Moss Lane, Pinner, part of former East End Farm; referred to by applicant as barns A-F
- barns A & B and barns C, D & E listed Grade II as "East Barn" and "North Barn" respectively
- application site includes access to Moss Lane, barn yard, orchard to rear of properties in East End Way and land to 'rear' of barns A & B (adjacent to Moss Lane)
- site entirely within East End Farm Conservation Area; neighbouring buildings Tudor Cottage and East End House also listed Grade II; East End Farm Cottage listed Grade II\*
- site surrounded by low-density residential development in Moss Lane and East End Way

continued/

- premises understood to have been used for warehousing between 1960s and 1990s, varying in intensity; currently vacant

**bb) Listed Building Description**

- East Barn to East End Farm (applicant's Barn B): later 16th century, timber framed, 3-bay barn with sweeping old tile roof over out-shot on west side, central wide-gabled wagon entrance, later projecting wing to south and weatherboarded. Roof construction of staggered butt-purlin and queen strut trusses
- North Barn to East End Farm (applicant's Barn C): 18th century, timber framed, four bay barn with wagon entrance. High weatherboarded walls under steep pitched old tile roof. Roof construction of two collar and tie-beam trusses and one queen-post truss
- Barn A: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn B, an early twentieth century structure, extended to the east, of robust, agricultural style, with a long, plain tiled roof, and with quirky but considered detailing, including Crittal windows and glazed gablets
- Barn D: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn C is a courtyard infill between structures C and E. It is of little architectural merit, but is of a robust, functional, agricultural idiom which complements its setting
- Barn E: listed by virtue of being attached to Barn C & D, is a nineteenth century, brick built cattle shed. Interior fittings have been removed, but the remaining exterior brickwork is good. It forms the northern extent of what would have been a small secondary yard, or "fold enclosure"
- Barn F: unlisted but within Conservation Area – a three bay, Dutch Barn with corrugated sheet metal roofing, weather-boarded, timber framed walls to rear and sides, and brick piers to front – front now enclosed
- the Listed Buildings are set in the East End Farm Conservation Area, a rare surviving collection of agricultural buildings set around the farmyard, and adjoining the former farm residential buildings of East End House and East End Farm Cottage listed as Grade II and Grade II\* respectively. The farmyard is enclosed by the assemblage, and is both the focal point of the Conservation Area and a key element in the setting of all the Listed Buildings

**c) Proposal Details**

P/2680/04/CCA and P/2683/04/CCA (Duplicate)

- demolition of barns D, E and F (details as described above)

P/2679/04/CLB and P/2682/04/CLB (Duplicate)

- repair of Barns B and C including timber frame, roof repairs, new doors
- new toilet in Barn C
- demolition of lean-to to Barn B
- new windows and doors to Barn B in 1950s extension in connection with the change of use from storage to house
- alterations to Barn A in connection with the change of use from storage to residential

continued/

Items 3/02, 3/03, 3/04, 3/05, 3/06, 3/07 – P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA, P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB, P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CLB continued...

P/2678/04/CFU and P/2681/04/CFU (Duplicate)

- change of use of Barns A and B from storage to house of 7 habitable rooms – details as described above
- change of use of Barn C from storage to residential garage in connection with new adjacent house of 7 habitable rooms – details as described above
- development of 2-storey detached house with 2-storey gatehouse on orchard
- house sited about 8m from western boundary of orchard with Woodpeckers and some 6m from northern boundary with houses in East End Lane
- single/1½ storeys eaves height, gable-ended roof
- lounge/study/kitchen/dining room on ground floor with 4 bedrooms on first floor within roofspace, lit by dormer and velux windows, plus windows in end walls
- 2-storey gatehouse to east of proposed house containing arched driveway
- double garage and store on ground floor, study and storage/studio area at first floor level
- timber elevations, tiled roof

**d) Relevant History**

This site has been the subject of many planning applications over the years. Relevant decisions to these current applications are as follows:-

The Orchard

LBH/37212	One 2-storey detached house with double garage, two parking spaces and access	REFUSED 22-FEB-90
-----------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The application site, by virtue of its openness, contributes to the character of this part of the East End Farm Conservation Area and its loss would therefore be detrimental to the character of the area.
2. The proposed house by virtue of its size siting and detailed design would be inappropriate within East End Farm Conservation Area, and furthermore would be detrimental to the setting of the adjoining listed building, East End Farm Cottage.
3. The proposed house by reason of its relationship to adjoining properties would be subject to unacceptable overlooking and would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers in Dormer Cottage and East End Farm Cottage by virtue of overlooking and additionally would have an overbearing impact on adjoining rear gardens to the north of the site.”

Barns A-F

WEST/666/02/FUL	Change of Use: Storage to residential (Class B8 to C3) and external alterations in association with conversion to 3 residential units	REFUSED 21-JAN-03
-----------------	---	----------------------

continued/

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed change of use of the barns, which would involve interventions of harm to the special character of the listed buildings, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to Policy E34 of the HUDP.
2. The proposed alterations to the external envelope of the listed buildings, including the creation of new rooflights would detrimentally affect the appearance of the buildings thereby detracting from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
3. The proposed glazed wall to Barns A and B has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/667/02/CAC	Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of agricultural building attached to and in the curtilage of listed building	REFUSED 21-JAN-03
-----------------	--	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed works of demolition, in the absence of an acceptable proposal for replacement extensions/buildings and works to make good the affected parts of the listed barns, would be inappropriate and detrimental to the character and appearance of the East End Farm Conservation Area.”

WEST/668/02/LBC	Listed Building Consent: Demolition and internal and external alterations in association with conversion to 3 residential units	REFUSED 21-JAN-03
-----------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed physical interventions in the barns in the form of introduction of the gallery platform in Barn C and bathroom block beneath it, and introduction of new openings and lights into the external envelope of the buildings would have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings, to grant consent for which would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.
2. The proposed physical interventions to the fabric of the barns in the form of timber frame repairs; introduction of residential grade insulation; and treatment of internal finishes have not been satisfactorily demonstrated not to have a likely harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings: to grant consent for them would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.

continued/

3. The effect of the proposed introduction of the louvered wall to the east elevations of Barns A and B has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to not be likely to have a harmful impact on the special character of the listed buildings: to grant consent for it would be contrary to the statutory duty of the local planning authority to preserve the buildings, their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess; and contrary to advice set out in PPG15.
4. The proposed change of use of the barns, which will involve interventions of harm to their special character, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to advice set out in PPG15, paras 3.7 – 3.19

Appeals against refusals dismissed 20-OCT-03

- **Principle of Residential Conversion**

Development Control Committee on 29th April 2003 considered a report on the principle of a conversion of the barns to residential use. The Committee Resolved:

that (1) the Committee accept that, on current advice, the only viable use for the site is one which involves an element of residential use but that any residential use should be the minimum possible and located in the least sensitive part of the site; and

(2) it be agreed to amend reason for refusal (1) of WEST/666/02/FUL and reason for refusal (4) of WEST/668/02/LBC to read “The proposed change of use of the two principally listed barns, which will involve interventions of harm to their special character, has not been satisfactorily demonstrated to be the only viable use for the buildings, and is contrary to advice set out in PPG15, paras. 3.7 – 3.19.”

The Inspector’s decision on the previous scheme also addressed this matter and it was his view that the existing storage use did not generate enough income to ensure the long term well being of the buildings. He stated that “I conclude an element of residential use is required, and would be acceptable in land use planning terms, subject to considerations of numbers and effect on the buildings and their surroundings”.

The critical point however was where that residential use was located. The Inspector took the firm view that residential was required on the *site* but that the listed barns, as the most important and historic parts of the site, should be kept free of conversion. Conversion should be restricted to the less sensitive or ancillary buildings in the group.

- e) **Applicants Statement**

- Proposal meets the criteria contained in the English Heritage Enabling Development guidance.
- The proposal meets the requirements of the Inspector.
- The proposals would restore the two historic structures in accordance with the specifications drawn up by the Council and using them as ancillary storage space.

continued/

- The new residential use in Barn B would be separated from the historic barn with a glass wall.
- The area of amenity land to the east would be used as garden space for Barns A and B.
- The new house to the north of Barn C is separate from it to preserve the foundations. The new house is single storey with a galleried living space and has an internal courtyard.
- The new house on the Orchard is located on disused land – the land slopes from a higher level at the southernmost boundary to the north by 2300mm. The site is bounded to the south by a 3m high beech hedge – the land is overgrown and there is no public access or right of way over the land
- The house is accessed through an entrance archway building which houses garage parking and study space above.
- The proposed house is set into the slope on the south west of the site reducing its height to below that of Dormer Cottage. By siting the house to the west of the plot there is no adverse effect on the view from Dormer Cottage.

f)

**Consultations**

P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA, P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB, P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CFU

TWU: No objections

EA: Unable to respond

CAAC: (17-JAN-05)

Draft comments were made at the meeting, however, due to the complexity of the case, Members decided to view the site and to defer their full views to next Committee (28th February 2005), to allow time to fully digest the plans and provide comprehensive views on both the principles and details of the applications.

EH: **The proposals:** The scheme is acceptable insofar as it relates to the repair and reuse of the barns, which would need to be secured by means of a Section 106 agreement in any future planning permission granted. Further consideration should however be given to the details of the elevations of the converted Barn A. There is no objection to the demolition of buildings D and E, and their replacement with a house, the principle of which I believe has been accepted.

I do however have major concerns about the impact that the development would have on the setting of the listed buildings and on the conservation area – the two issues are in this case inseparable.

The predominant roof form of the farm complex is steeply pitched and tiled, which lends cohesiveness to the group. We would not object to the principle of a contemporary building adjacent to Barn C which deploys traditional materials intelligently and which would not compete visually with the neighbouring buildings. However, the proposed house, which has a long shallow monopitch zinc roof and a strong horizontal emphasis, appears assertive and out of context. The building line has been brought forward, which may increase the impact on East End Farmhouse. cont'd/

The Orchard provides an important green buffer between the farm complex and the surrounding suburban development and helps preserve the rural character which defines the conservation area. Any buildings on the site would inevitably diminish that special character. The design of the proposed buildings unfortunately typifies the generic 'vernacular' pastiche which so often erodes the setting of historic villages in rural suburban fringes.

**Other considerations:** The application justifies the development in accordance with the criteria in English Heritage's policy guidance *Enabling Development and the Conservation of Heritage Assets*. Your Council is currently seeking independent expert advice on these matters. I do however stress that the criteria for enabling development need to be met in full. The first – and perhaps overriding – criterion is that the development should not detract from the heritage asset(s) which it is intended to help preserve. Moreover, the economic case as presented appears unconvincing. The prime objective of enabling development is to secure the preservation of heritage assets. If the proposed scheme would not, as it is claimed, stack up financially it is difficult to see how the preservation of the listed buildings could be assured by the granting of planning permission.

**Conclusion and recommendation:** The scheme, by virtue of its design and the overdevelopment of the land, would not preserve the setting of the listed buildings or the character and appearance of the conservation area, and would therefore be contrary to national and local policies. The criteria set out in *Enabling Development* do not appear to have been met. Our advice therefore is that planning permission and conservation area consent should be refused.

I must also reiterate our concern at the deteriorating condition of the listed barns, which are included suffering from serious water ingress, fungal attack and structural instability. I therefore recommend that urgent works notices be served as soon as possible. Unless a scheme for the full repair of the barns can be agreed and implemented within an acceptable timetable, I would also urge your Council to consider the service of a repairs notice as a preliminary to compulsory purchase. Advice on these matters is given in English Heritage's leaflet *Stopping the Rot*.

#### **Advertisements**

P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA

Demolition in Conservation Area

Expiry  
03-FEB-05

P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB

Extension of Listed Building

Expiry  
24-FEB-05

P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CFU

Character of Conservation Area

Expiry  
03-FEB-05

continued/



Items 3/02, 3/03, 3/04, 3/05, 3/06, 3/07 – P/2680/04/CCA & P/2683/04/CCA, P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB, P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CLB continued...

P/2680/04/CCA & P/2663/04/CCA, P/2679/04/CLB & P/2682/04/CLB, P/2678/04/CFU & P/2681/04/CFU

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 119	Replies 70	Expiry 26-JAN-05
----------------------	-------------	---------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** House on Orchard inappropriate, harm to Conservation Area, overlooking, loss of light, size of house of out keeping with area, restrictive covenant affects the site, overdevelopment, traffic increase, loss of employment use, change to character of listed buildings and adjoining properties, possible contamination from petrol chamber, harm to setting and condition of East End Farm Cottage, unsuitable design, appearance of yard would be compromised, precedent in Conservation Area, housing need would not be met, petrol station should be improved, use barns for storage

## APPRAISAL

A site plan is appended indicating what each building is referred to in this report and identifying the Orchard.

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

#### **New House on the Orchard**

The current proposals seek to create a residential unit, inter alia, on the strip of open space to the north of the site, known as the Orchard. The Orchard is considered to be a sensitive part of the conservation area and vital to the setting of East End Farm Cottage, a Grade II\* listed building. It is considered that there is an objection to the principle of building on this open space because of the harm it would cause to the character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building. There are also concerns with the detailed design of the proposals.

#### *Impact on character of the East End Farm Conservation Area*

The Orchard is identified as important open space in the conservation area study for the area; policy 3 states that applications for development on the existing areas of open land that have been defined as important open space will normally be refused. The study says that,  
“The orchard, a relatively narrow strip of open land running roughly east-west on the northern boundary of the conservation area is also a significant remnant of the farm hinterland.”

continued/

The statement makes clear that the open areas in the conservation area are critical to its character because if they are built upon and developed, this would erode the open nature and damage the “rural overtones” of the area. It is considered that the orchard is very important in the contributing to the character of the conservation area by virtue of its openness and natural informal landscape. It reinforces the semi rural, agricultural character of the area which is so unusual and which is it is desirable to preserve or enhance. Furthermore, the orchard acts as an important green buffer between the centre of the group of buildings around the farmyard, and the more modern buildings outside the conservation area to the north, again reinforcing its rare (in Pinner) rural character. Even though the site does not have a right of way and is not visible from the public highway, it makes an important contribution to the character of the conservation area as a whole. Furthermore, paragraph 4.55 of the HUDP states that other, private viewpoints are of importance to the character of conservation areas so that conservation areas can retain their character and integrity. The proposals would be contrary to Policy D15F of the HUDP which states that development should not adversely affect open spaces which contribute to the character of the conservation area.

#### *Setting of East End Farm Cottage*

The Orchard is also very important in the setting to East End Farm Cottage, a Grade II\* listed building. It would be possible to see the proposed Gatehouse from the Cottage and its garden, the two would be seen together in views up the Orchard and the Cottage would be visible from the new gatehouse. It is therefore considered to affect the setting of the Grade II\* building.

The Cottage was originally the former farmhouse and would have been surrounded (apart from its ancillary buildings, the barns) by fields. Remnants of the once extensive open land about the building, albeit under separate ownership, are nonetheless considered to provide an important semi rural setting. The building is small in scale: substantial new development in close proximity to it would overwhelm it. As the focus of the conservation area and farmstead, new buildings should not compete with it. If buildings were constructed behind the Cottage its setting would become increasingly cramped and overshadowed by development, with only its private garden as open space about it and this, it is considered would be detrimental to its special character. Whilst the proposed house would be set into the slope, to reduce its impact, this is not considered to outweigh the harm caused to the setting of East End Farm Cottage by it and its gatehouse. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policy D11C of the HUDP which states that development will only be permitted within the curtilage of listed buildings, or adjoining buildings, that does not detrimentally affect the setting of the listed building.

A previous application which sought to provide a new house on the orchard was refused in 1990 because of its detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building and on the character of the conservation area.

continued/

It is therefore considered that the principle of building on the orchard is unacceptable since it would cause harm to the setting of East End Farm Cottage and to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

There are also concerns in terms of the detailed design of the proposals. The Orchard is a thin strip of land. The proposal would result in significant built form or hardsurfacing on much of the land. The new house would be very close to the southern boundary, about 6m from the northern boundary and about 8m from the western boundary. It would look crammed onto the plot, with very little garden and setting space about it. Most houses in the conservation area have significant land and openness about them and this proposal would therefore be out of character. The proposed gatehouse would almost entirely fill the width of the plot. Even if the development of the Orchard were acceptable in principle, it is considered that the proposal would represent too much development crammed onto this tight plot.

The proposed buildings are too large and the combination of two buildings makes them sprawl across the site, leaving very little open space about them. In the appeal decision, the Inspector highlighted the problem of the intensive conversion of the buildings, effectively filling up all the built form with residential use. Although, outside the area of the barns themselves, a similar problem is considered to exist in these proposals in that, the open space would be filled up, almost to its limits, with built form and driveway, to the detriment of the semi rural, agricultural character of the area. The proposals would therefore fail to comply with policy D15 of the HUDP.

The proposed new house has quasi-agricultural features, but the dormers, chimney, half hips etc belie its nature. The west elevation is very domestic in appearance and does not appear to relate to the other elevations. The dormers are too large and top heavy and the rooflights are too large. The elevations are rather uninteresting, particularly the gable ends. It is neither a true agricultural type building- which would be more likely to be found in the setting of the farmhouse, nor is it a high quality architectural statement which would add to the character of the conservation area. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the area.

The proposed gatehouse would have a more of a barn type character on the east elevation. However, the dormers on the west elevation are oversized and would make the roof look top heavy and so whilst appearing more superficially agricultural, the proposed residential first floor accommodation would result in a domestic and more cluttered appearance, which would not preserve or enhance the character of the area.

The other properties in the conservation area have restricted rights in respect of hardsurfacing as the Council served an Article 4 direction in 2003. This was because large expanses of hardsurfacing were considered to cause harm to the informal, semi rural character of the area. The significant amounts of hardsurfacing which are proposed would suburbanise the character of the area, detract from the setting of East End Farm Cottage, and harm visual amenity and character of the site and the Conservation Area.

continued/

## **New House on the site of D, E and F**

### **The principle of residential use in this part of the site**

The Inspector's decision on the previous scheme stated that residential use was required but that it should be located in the least sensitive parts of the site or in less important ancillary buildings and not within the principally listed barns. D, E and F, where a former pig sty and some 1970s sheds exist, is considered on balance to be less sensitive to change. Building E is attractive and does comprise a former open fronted cow shed, dating from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, which represents a remnant of the former use of the farm, although it has been roofed over and altered. Buildings D and F are late 1940s and late 1970s respectively. They are of no architectural or historic merit and have at best, a neutral impact on the character of the area. Whilst the site itself is in a sensitive location, within the settings of both Barn C and East End Farm Cottage, on balance, the principle of a residential use here is considered acceptable.

### *Demolition of the existing buildings*

It is considered that buildings D and F do not make a positive contribution to the character of the area and that their demolition would not be objectionable in principle, subject to suitable proposals for the replacement building.

In terms of Building E, which is more attractive and has more historic merit but has been substantially altered, any replacement building would need to be of a high standard of design in order to outweigh the loss of the cow shed, if it is not to be retained and restored.

### **Design, form and location of proposals**

There are a number of concerns with the detailed design of the proposed building. The previous scheme sought to retain and alter the pig sty and the remainder of the proposal was very low key and subservient to the barn, both in form and in the simplicity of its materials and design. It was considered to remain 'neutral' in its impact.

The existing buildings are set well back from the gable end of Barn C and indeed from its small outshut. This helps retain some openness about East End Farm Cottage and allows the barn and its outshut to be prominent in the group. The proposed house, however, would be set forward of this existing building line, to line with the outshut, and would have a prominent, long fascia board running along the eaves line faced in bright zinc. The combination of its materials and the advance of the building line, would detrimentally effect the character of the area, reducing the sense of openness, and crucially reducing the prominence of Barn C and its outshut. It would therefore be detrimental to the character of the area and the settings of Barn C and East End Farm Cottage.

continued/

The conservation area is characterised by two storey, steeply pitched and tiled buildings, having a vertical emphasis. The proposed house is at odds with this established character. Whilst only single storey, the long horizontal emphasis of the building would give it dominance over Barn C and East End Farm Cottage. Although there is a step in the façade, this is masked by the continuous fascia board which would create a stark, horizontal impact. The mono pitch roof fails to respect the prevailing character and by virtue of its form, angle and because it would oversail Barn C's outshut, it would compete visually with Barn C, to the detriment of its setting and the character of the area. The current proposals do benefit from providing a narrow gap between the new house and Barn C but this is not considered to outweigh the harm caused by the proposals.

The proposed zinc roof would be very visible from within the conservation area and from other buildings within it including East End Farm Cottage, and is considered to be visually intrusive as it would be bright and reflective, unlike the traditional materials which characterise the area. The proposed building has a more alpine character, rather than reflecting the semi rural/agricultural traditions of the buildings around it. The proposals are not considered to comply with Policy D15 of the HUDP as the proposed house would not relate well to surrounding buildings, the materials and detailing are considered inappropriate in this context and the proposed development would not be in scale or harmony with the existing character of the area.

Whilst a modern architectural style could be appropriate in this location, acting as a foil to the listed buildings, it is considered that the proposed house is of poor design quality in its context and the house fails to be either low key and subservient or intrinsically outstanding. It would replace buildings with a neutral impact with one that would cause harm to the character of the area and settings of the barns and II\* farmhouse.

#### **New House within Barn A**

The appealed scheme was similar to that currently proposed in respect of Barn A. The inspector was broadly happy with the proposals. The current scheme differs in that there is no internal garaging, which would now be housed within Barn B. This is considered an improvement, both in terms of the external appearance of the dwelling and because it would allow the quaint petrol pump feature to be left in situ. Furthermore, the residential accommodation includes the 1950s extension to the east of Barn B and some alterations to the east elevation of Barn A. The more contentious items such as the glazed roof ventilators, scale and number of dormers and numbers and locations of rooflights appear to have altered little since the original decision. Even though these are not considered ideal, given the Inspector's acceptance of the proposals, it is not considered that objections can be sustained.

continued/

### **Works to the Listed Barns**

The barns are on the English Heritage register of Buildings at Risk and are in poor and worsening condition. The proposed repairs are welcomed and indeed follow the recommendations of the Council's consultants as part of the research for the public inquiry in 2003.

However, the provision of a toilet in Barn C is considered unnecessary. The Council argued successfully at the appeal that part of the special character of the barns was that they were unheated, unsealed structures and that conversion to residential use would change their intrinsic character to their detriment. The Inspector, in dismissing the appeal, (Report para 22) said,

“Both of the listed barns, B and C, are simple structures with exposed timbers and limited internal finishes. As such I find them of particular interest, having not been substantially tidied or upgraded in the past. The works required to fit them for full domestic, rather than ancillary use such as garaging or storage, would, in my judgement, compromise their character and appearance, and erode their historic place as simple unheated structures”.

Whilst only 1 room is proposed for conversion in the current proposals, this would still be an unfortunate erosion of the historic character of the barn. It would result in a fundamental change in the character of this part of the barn. There is a lack of information in relation to the detailed fitting out of the proposed toilet, which is also a concern. Given that the toilet would be further from the garden than the house itself and that other toilets are proposed on this level in the new house, the need for it is unclear. It is also a concern that if this “domestication” of barn C were allowed, it may be more difficult to refuse further internal changes to the barn in the future.

The Council has been placing pressure on the owners to undertake repairs and Members agreed at the Development Control Committee of 9<sup>th</sup> November that Officers should proceed with the preparation of an Urgent Works Notice. Since then English Heritage have visited the site and fully support the Council's efforts. The Council has engaged specialist surveyors who are reporting on the most cost effective means of making the barns weathertight and structurally sound. This report will be developed into a formal notice, to be agreed by Committee, prior to its service on the owners.

To summarise this part of the appraisal, it is considered that the proposals within the application would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and would detrimentally affect the setting and character of listed buildings within the conservation area. As such it would be contrary to policies D11, D14, D15 of the HUDP and those within the adopted conservation area study SPG for the area.

continued/

## 2) **Enabling Development**

Enabling Development is a planning tool which allows a balance to be drawn between the disbenefit of allowing development that would ordinarily be contrary to planning policy, and the public benefit of rescuing or enhancing a heritage asset. In these types of cases financial considerations are fundamental to the assessment and decision-making process. For instance, in the case of a dilapidated manor house in open green belt, a justification could be made that the repair of the manor house justified development of new housing in the Green Belt, which would ordinarily be against policy, because overall the public benefit of retaining and rescuing the house, would outweigh the disbenefit to the character of the Green Belt.

This application seeks to be judged in accordance with the criteria set out in English Heritage's policy guidance on Enabling Development, there is a presumption against development which does not meet their criteria, which are set out in Appendix A.

In summary, the applicants argue that the barns need a significant financial investment in order to secure their repair. In the development appraisal which accompanies the application, they estimate the repair costs at £169,000 for the historic barns, excluding fees and VAT but including contingency. This is in a similar range to the Council's own advisors' estimates produced for the last appeal. It is their case that 2 houses on the site would not generate sufficient financial return to fund the repair of the barns. However, they offer a legal agreement, that if the development went ahead, that they would ensure the repair of the barns even though the total scheme would make a loss.

There are a number of concerns with the figures, the amount of information supplied and whether the proposals would meet the stringent criteria as set out by English Heritage. It is considered that these criteria are not met in full because:

- The enabling development would materially detract from the heritage assets which it is seeking to preserve. It is considered that the barns, the farmhouse and the conservation area are intrinsically linked, and that the proposals for the house on the orchard and the house to the north of Barn B would detract from their character and setting, as well as causing harm to the character of the conservation area.
- There are concerns that the enabling development would not safeguard the future of the barns since the applicants indicate that the development would not be viable even with three houses. In the development appraisal accompanying the application, the applicants indicate that were consent to be granted for the current proposals for 3 houses, the scheme would still show a very considerable deficit (£0.94M compared to a deficit on a 2 house scheme of £1.15M). If the principle of enabling development were agreed for the site, the applicants might later argue, in view of the estimated deficit, that further development would be necessary to 'enable' the repair of the barns.

continued/

- There are concerns as to whether the enabling development proposed is indeed the minimum necessary to secure the future of the heritage asset. Whilst the applicants' evidence indicates that even a three house scheme would not generate sufficient funds, it is considered that these figures are not sufficiently robust. There are concerns that no market testing of the value of the site on the basis of a 2 house scheme has been carried out to support their claims. The applicants have included the purchase price they paid for the site in their calculations; yet on their figures, the site is worthless to anyone else because even with consent for 3 houses on it, its development would make a substantial loss. They have also included a significant sum for holding costs since acquisition, in the order of £300,000, which includes their costs expended in pursuing the previous unacceptable scheme. It is therefore considered that a substantial part of the claimed deficit is irrelevant.

The Council has taken on expert valuation and financial advice in order to better examine the development appraisal. It is considered that the financial evidence in support of the application overstates the costs of the works and includes unnecessary amounts for holding costs. The total envisaged development value (£2.735M for three houses) is disproportionate to the need to finance under £200,000 of repairs.

#### *The Way Forward*

Whilst the current proposals are unacceptable, it is important that a viable future for the site is achieved and that the barns are repaired. At the public inquiry, the Council submitted an alternative development scenario to the unacceptable proposals, indicating that the site could be redeveloped for one residential unit by converting Barn A to residential use and repairing the two barns as ancillary garaging/storage. The Inspector did not accept the financial evidence that this would secure the future of the barns.

However, having taken independent professional advice, it is considered that in principle a 2 house scheme, which limited the amount of housing development could be viable and would deliver the repair of the barns. The development would not be sited within the principally listed barns, nor on the Orchard, which are both considered too sensitive to change. Instead, in this scenario, Barn A would become one residential unit whilst another unit would be on the site of D, E and F. The Orchard would be left open, as garden space to this new house and each of the listed barns would act as a garage/storage space, one for each house. This would depend on appropriate designs for the new house and alterations to Barn A. The Council has recently received a valuation for the site from the District Valuers Office which indicates that a two house scheme would deliver the repair of the barns and a positive residual site value, suggesting that this alternative scenario would be viable.

continued/



Furthermore, a local consortium of neighbours has provided their own independent evidence of how they would redevelop the site, with a 2 house scheme, following the above model. On their calculations, again a 2 house scenario is confirmed as viable. They have formally offered to purchase the site, for more than the current owners originally paid, on the basis of a two house redevelopment scheme.

It is important that Members support the principle of 2 houses, rather than one, on the site, as this sets out the potential of the site, limiting the necessary residential development to the absolute minimum necessary to secure the repair of the barns and their long term future.

**3) Employment and Housing Issues**

The Inspector considered that the previous storage use did not generate sufficient funding to ensure the long-term well being of the buildings. He concluded that an element of residential use is required, and would be acceptable in land use planning terms, subject to considerations of numbers and effect on the buildings and their surroundings.

**4) Archaeology and Underground Works**

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

**5) Residential Amenity**

These proposals would have several adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity.

The new house adjacent to Barn C shows a main living/dining room window directly opposite the kitchen window of East End Farm Cottage, at a separation distance of some 6m. This would introduce intervisibility where none currently exists. A first floor gallery window on the northern wall would face the far end of the rear garden of 90 Moss Lane at a distance of about 13m, but this is not considered to be excessively detrimental to amenity.

In terms of the new house proposed on the orchard, its western flank wall contains clear ground and first floor windows within 8m of the private garden area of Woodpeckers. The first floor windows would give rise to overlooking and a loss of privacy to Woodpeckers.

Its northern wall, which would contain main ground and first floor windows, would be about 6m from the new boundary of Little Acre in East End Lane. Although a row of ash and sycamore trees is sited along this boundary, it is not impenetrable so that a view from the proposed house into the neighbouring garden would be possible. In addition, it is considered that the close proximity of these trees to habitable room windows would result in pressure to lop, top, or fell these trees, thereby enabling further overlooking to take place.

continued/

Dormer Cottage is located some 9m to the south of the proposed house. Although the new dwelling is shown to be sited at a lower level than the Cottage, its presence, together with the gatehouse, would be destructive of the existing open outlook enjoyed by the Cottage and would thereby be detrimental to amenity.

To the north, the proposed gatehouse would be adjacent to a 35m deep garden at Charnwood, and would not excessively affect neighbouring outlook.

It is not considered that levels of activity generated by the proposed 3 houses would be unneighbourly, in the context of the extant employment use.

**6) Access and Parking**

Each house would be provided with 2 indoor parking spaces; either within each historic barn or within the proposed gatehouse. This provision is 1 space over the current maximum standard but is not considered objectionable given the disposition of the spaces around the site and the unusual nature of the proposals. Although slightly over the current maximum standard this is not objected to given the circumstances of the site.

A satisfactory access in terms of vehicle movements is shown.

**7) Trees**

While a number of existing trees on the site may not have individual merit, they do contribute to the character of the Conservation Area by providing collectively a green wedge of vegetation. The trees are important as a means of separating the conservation area from the development to the north, and reinforcing the semi rural informal character of the area. The trees and hedgerows which form boundaries around the Orchard are both highlighted as important boundary treatments in the conservation area study. Most of the small fruit trees would be felled in these proposals. Whilst these are not protected, they nonetheless give the area its Orchard character and are considered to add to the greenery and attraction of the area and so their removal would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.

The likely pressure to thin or remove trees to the north of the house on the orchard has already been described, and such works could be detrimental to the appearance of the area and neighbouring amenity, depending on their severity.

The gatehouse and associated hardsurfacing would require the removal of several fruit trees which would detrimentally alter the appearance of the land.

Otherwise it is considered that existing trees on the site need not be adversely affected.

continued/

**8) Consultation Responses**  
(To be completed)

**CONCLUSION**

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

## SECTION 4 - CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

---

**68-70 HIGH STREET, EDGWARE**

**4/01**

**P/168/05/CNA/CM**

Ward: Adj Auth - Area 1(E)

CONSULTATION: CONVERSION OF 1ST & PART 2ND FLOORS AND ROOFSPACE TO 7 FLATS, 3 REAR DORMERS AND ROOFLIGHTS AT FRONT, 4 PARKING SPACES

LONDON BOROUGH OF BARNET

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: JP-04-3473/1 Rev.C, JP-04-3473/2, 501\_P103, 501\_P104, 501\_P112, Site Plan

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

#### INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 34 – Consultation as a Neighbouring Local Planning Authority
- 2 INFORMATIVE:

#### SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| SD1 | Quality of Design                                       |
| D4  | Standard of Design and Layout                           |
| D5  | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| T13 | Parking Standards                                       |

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Parking (T13)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

None

#### b) Site Description

- property sited on eastern side of High Street, Edgware, within London Borough of Barnet
- three storey building in commercial parade with central access road to Forumside to rear

continued/

Item 4/01 – P/168/05/CNA continued.....

- vacant retail unit and launderette at ground floor level, vacant snooker club and flat in use at upper floors
- garage and metal stairs for access to upper floors to rear

**c) Proposal Details**

- conversion of snooker club at first and part of second floors and roofspace to 7 flats
- 3 rear dormers and roof lights at front
- 4 parking spaces to rear

**d) Relevant History**

P/139/04/DNA	Conversion: 1st & 2nd floors from snooker club to 3 flats, and roofspace to 1 flat, 4 rooflights to front & 2 rear dormers	NO OBJECTION 25-FEB-04
--------------	--	------------------------------

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 6	Replies 0	Expiry 23-FEB-05
-------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Visual and Residential Amenity**

It is proposed to convert the snooker club upstairs and roofspace to seven flats, with access from the rear. This would involve modifications to the building in the form of three rear dormers and six rooflights to the front. The facing western side of High Street, falling within the London Borough of Harrow, is occupied by The Masons Arms public house, the vacant Grade II Listed Building formerly occupied by Everest restaurant, and the 1970s three storey office block and public house at Sunley House. There is a mixed pattern of development in the area in general, with a variation in the building line to the south and varying building heights to both sides of the road. It is not considered that the proposed alterations to the buildings frontage would lead to the resulting building appearing out of character with the pattern of development or detrimental to the character of the locality in the nearby area of the London Borough of Harrow.

**2) Parking**

The proposed residential units would potentially increase the demand for parking spaces in the area. The proposed scheme involves 4 parking spaces to the rear. While the provision would fall below the parking standards of Harrow's UDP, the site is located on a main road with local bus routes and within minutes walk of Edgware Underground Station, as well as in close proximity to the amenities and services of Edgware. It is considered that, were the application to be relating to land falling within the London Borough of Harrow, no objection would be raised on parking grounds.

**3) Consultation Responses**

None

**CONCLUSION**

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

CONSULTATION: BLOCK OF 10 FLATS AND 28 SEMI-DETACHED AND TERRACED HOUSES, ACCESS ROAD AND PLAY AREA

THREE RIVERS DISTRICT COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Council of the London Borough of Harrow, the local planning authority, OBJECTS to the development set out in the application and submitted plans for the following reasons.

Plan Nos: Location Plan 1:2500 (unnumbered A3 plan), Site Plan (unnumbered A3 plan)  
Drg ID: Plan 500, Dwg No: 952-P01, Dwg No: 952-P02, Dwg No: 952-P03,  
Dwg No: 952-P04, Dwg No: 952-P05, Dwg No: 952-P06, Dwg No: 952-P07

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its excessive size and bulk would be visually obtrusive, would encroach on nominated Green Belt land and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the London Borough of Harrow.
- 2 The extent of hard surfacing proposed to the south west corner of the site would be likely to have detrimental impact on the adjacent trees located with the London Borough of Harrow.

## **INFORMATIVES**

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

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

1. Impact on London Borough of Harrow
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

None

**b) Site Description**

- A large plot of currently undeveloped land (covered with trees and vegetation) located directly adjacent to a section of the borough northern boundary line;

Cont...

Item 4/02 - P/207/05/CNA Cont...

- The area of land located directly abutting the southern boundary of the subject site (within the Borough of Harrow), is open and undeveloped which has been classified with a Green Belt nomination;
  - Pedestrian walking paths through the Green Belt open land are located along the southern boundary of the site;
- c) **Proposal Details**
- Construction of a large scale residential development consisting of block of 10 flats and 28 semi-detached and terrace houses, with associated access road and play area;
  - The proposed dwellings would be two storey in scale, whilst the block of flats would be two storeys with further accommodation within the roofspace.
  - 60 on site parking spaces are proposed to be provided;
- d) **Relevant History**
- None
- e) **Notifications**
- | Sent | Replies | Expiry    |
|------|---------|-----------|
| 4    | 1       | 24-FEB-05 |

**Response:** The openness of the Green Belt between Hatch End and Carpenter's Park/Oxhey is considered very important and several Planning Inspectors with appeals in the area that this Green Belt is exceptionally narrow and must continue to prevent coalescence of Watford and Greater London. This proposal would conflict with Policy EP43 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004 as the height and scale of the buildings would be detrimental to views from within the Green Belt, particularly Pinner Park Farm Conservation Area, and secondly as the area south of the Country Boundary is designated a Countryside Conservation Area the effect on the local ecology and tree cover must be considered.

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Impact on London Borough of Harrow

The subject site forms a section of the borough boundary between Harrow and Three Rivers District Council. The proposal site would link in with the residential street network directly to the north (within Three Rivers District Council). However the development would remove the current undeveloped land buffer that exists between this and the open Green Belt classified land within the Borough of Harrow. Although policies of Harrow's adopted UDP do not technically apply to the consideration of developments within an adjacent borough, nevertheless it provides a policy framework. Specifically Policy EP43 states: *"THE COUNCIL WILL RESIST DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS ADJACENT OR CLOSE TO GREEN BELT OR METROPOLITAN OPEN LAND WHICH WOULD HAVE A DETRIMENTAL VISUAL IMPACT ON THE OPEN CHARACTER OF THAT LAND OR AN ADVERSE ECOLOGICAL IMPACT"*.

Cont...

The proposal for this currently undeveloped land would result in the removal of existing buffer space and associated trees and vegetation to accommodate the buildings. This would have a resultant impact of extending the nearby built up residential area to directly abut the boundary of the Green Belt. Broadly, it is considered that this scale of development constitutes an unreasonable encroachment directly adjacent to Harrow's Green Belt classified land. Additionally, it is considered that due to the development's excessive size and bulk it would be visually obtrusive, would encroach on nominated Green Belt land and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the London Borough of Harrow.

On a more specific matter, the proposed hard surfacing of the driveway area to the south western corner of the site is identified as potentially having a detrimental impact on the adjacent trees located within the Borough of Harrow. Therefore it is considered that an objection to the development should also be raised on such grounds.

## **2. Consultation Responses**

Considered above.

## **CONCLUSION**

For all the reasons considered above, and weighing up the development plan policies and proposals, and other material considerations, including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as set out above, this Council raises objections.



PREMIER HOUSE, CANNING ROAD, WEALDSTONE, P/274/05/CDT/RJS  
MIDDX

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

DETERMINATION: 2 REPLACEMENT AND 6 NEW EQUIPMENT CABINS AT ROOF LEVEL

MASON D TELECOM

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drawing Number 30/GLN3086/01 Issue E  
Drawing Number 30/GLN3086/02 Issue F  
Drawing Number 30/GLN3086/03 Issue F

**GRANT** approval of details of siting/appearance subject to the following condition(s):

- 1 Noise from Plant and Machinery
- 2 The colour of the development hereby approved shall match the colour of the existing building.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 The development hereby approved shall not produce any radio waves outside the building.  
REASON: In the interests of the locality.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
  - 2 Standard Informative 28 - Telecommunications Dev't 1
- 

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Compliance with ICNERP
  2. Visual Amenity/ Character of the Area
  3. Consultation Response
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

None.

### b) Site Description

- The site is located at the junction of Canning Road and High Street, Wealdstone, and is within the Wealdstone High Street retail shopping area;

Cont...

Item 5/01 - P/274/05/CDT Cont...

- The subject site accommodates a 2-5 storey building used for retail and as a library, healthy living centre, youth centre, medical centre & day nursery;
- The flat roof of the building accommodates a large red brick plant room (12.0m x 7.0m x 3.0m) and a variety of telecommunications equipment cabinets and associated antenna and microwave dishes;

**c) Proposal Details**

- Removal of two existing equipment cabinets installed on the roof of the building and the further installation of six equipment cabinets in their place;
- The equipment cabinets would be installed towards the north east corner of the building, directly adjacent to large existing rooftop plant room;
- Other associated telecommunications equipment within the vicinity of the proposed facility would be retained;
- The six proposed equipment cabinets would have a combined footprint of 4.55 m x 5.05 m and height ranging from 1.94 to 2.0 metres;
- The cabinets would setback between 2.6 to 6.0 metres from the northern parapet edge of the building and setback 3.6 metres for the western parapet edge;

**d) Relevant History**

E/736/00/DTD      Determination: replacement equipment cabin      GRANTED  
15-AUG-2000

E/778/00/DTD      Determination : equipment cabin on roof      REFUSED  
15-AUG-2000

REASON FOR REFUSAL: "The proposed equipment cabinet would be visually obtrusive in the street scene and detract from the appearance of the building and the character of the locality.

E/97/01/DTD      Determination: 2.5 m lattice mast to support 6      REFUSED  
antenna & microwave dish      26-FEB-2001

REASON FOR REFUSAL: "The proposed development would give rise to a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area".

E/285/01/DTD      Determination      of      telecommunications      REFUSED  
development: six panel antennae & radio      23-APR-2001  
equipment cabin on roof

REASON FOR REFUSAL: "The proposed antennae, by reason of their siting and appearance would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the area".

E/651/01/DTD      Determination      of      telecommunications      GRANTED  
development: six panel antennae and radio      19-JUL-2001  
equipment cabin on roof

Cont...

P/699/01/DTD      Determination: installation of 10 cabinets, 6 antennae, 4 microwave dishes and associated equipment on roof      REFUSED  
30-JUL-2001

REASON FOR REFUSAL: "The proposed antennae, by reason of scale, siting and appearance would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the area".

P/778/03/CDT      Determination: installation of 10 equipment cabinets, supporting grillage and safety hand railing on roof      REFUSED  
30-MAY-2003

REASON FOR REFUSAL: "The proposed development, by reason of scale, siting and appearance, would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area".

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The proposed development consists of the removal of 2 existing equipment cabinets and the installation of six equipment cabinets to be mounted on a steel grillage;
- The proposed development has been designed so that the cabinets are as close to the plant room as is practicable, which means that due to the presence of the parapet wall the development will barely be visible from ground level. This means that the overall visual impact of the development will be minimal;
- The proposed equipment upgrade will increase the capacity of the existing site and thus prevent the need for an additional site, therefore the proposed site is required to be fully operational in order to provide the necessary service;

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 75	Replies 0	Expiry 02-MAR-04
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1. ICNIRP Compliance**

It is highlighted that the proposal is for equipment cabinets only, as no antennae or dish transmitting equipment are proposed. Essentially the proposed equipment cabinets would increase the capacity of the existing transmitting facilities on site and would likewise remove the requirement for additional facilities within the immediate area. The details of the Planning Application includes an ICNIRP declaration confirming the proposal's compliance with the public exposure guidelines.

Cont...

## **2. Visual Amenity/ Character of the Area**

The proposed cabinets would be located alongside the existing red brick roof top plant room, and would be set back from the parapet edge of the building. Due to the 5 storey height of the building and the existing parapet wall, the available sight lines at ground level from either High Street or Canning Road, would ensure that the proposed equipment cabinets would not be visible along the street frontages. The cabinets would only start to become visible when moving away further away from the subject site. However at the point where the equipment cabinets would become visible it is likewise nominated that their 2.0 metre height would be set against a backdrop of the 3.0 metre brick wall of the rooftop plant room. This siting and setting would ensure that the equipment cabinets would not be an obtrusive visual element within the context of the existing building. Furthermore a condition of approval would require the colour of the cabinets to match the colour of the existing building to safeguard the appearance of the locality.

## **3. Consultation Responses**

None.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

DETERMINATION: 12.5M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND 2 EQUIPMENT CABINS

WALDON TELECOM

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: P/11971D/GEN/050; 051A; 051-1A

**REFUSE** approval of details of siting/appearance for the following reason(s):

- 1 Prior approval of siting and appearance IS required.
- 2 **REFUSE** approval of details of siting and appearance for the following reason(s):  
The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance and proximity to existing street furniture and telecommunications masts, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of the visual amenity of residents and appearance of the street scene and the area in general.
- 3 The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance and proximity to an adjoining residential property would appear overbearing and obtrusive to the detriment of the amenity of those residents.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D24 Telecommunications Development

---

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

1. ICNIRP Compliance (D24)
  2. Visual & Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D24)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

None

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- Outside edge of the footpath on the north-western side of the roundabout by the junction of Uxbridge Road and Clamp Hill
- Footpath outside food and wine shop with flat above and hairdresser adjoining. Proposed area of footpath has existing street light, rubbish bin, steel barriers and large freestanding sign.
- Roundabout is a busy junction on a distributor road with shops and residential properties surrounding Parkland sited to the north of the site
- 2 similar telecommunications masts and ancillary equipment cabinets located approximately 30m and a further 44m southwest of the site outside the Texaco filling station

**c) Proposal Details**

- Provision of 12.5m high steel column telecommunications mast to be sited towards the front edge of the footpath
- 2 ancillary equipment cabinets to be sited adjacent to the column. (Dimensions: Cabinet 1 - L 1.402m x H 1.3m x W 0.79m & Cabinet 2 - L 0.36m x H 1.2m x W 0.185m)
- Colour to be galvanised steel grey or to LPA requirements

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/373/00/DTD	Determination:	15m	high	REFUSED
	telecommunication pole with 3 antenna and			05-MAY-00
	equipment cabinet			

Reason for Refusal:

“the proposed mast would result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenity and the bulk of the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area”.

Other relevant planning history is outlined below including:

74 Uxbridge Road

EAST/1263/01/DTD	Determination:	15 metre high monopole	REFUSED
	mast with tri Band antenna and 2		12-FEB-2002
	equipment cabins		

APPEAL ALLOWED 15-AUG-2002

EAST/1344/01/DTD	Determination:	15 metre high monopole	REFUSED
	mast with antennas and 2 equipment		21-JAN-2002
	cabinets		

APPEAL ALLOWED 30-SEP-2002

Cont...

Previous reasons for refusal include:

“The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring properties

The proposed mast and its associated equipment cabins, by virtue of their proximity to a similar mast and other street furniture in this locality, would result in a cluttered stretch of pavement and be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene

The proposed cabinets and their plinths reduce the effective width of the footway to a level that is inconvenient and which, by forcing pedestrians to walk close to the kerb, will contribute to discouragement of making journeys on foot (which is contrary to the furtherance of Government policy)”

76 Uxbridge Road

P/2224/04/CDT	Determination: Provision of 12m high column antenna with 3 equipment cabinets	REFUSED 09-SEP-2004
---------------	---	------------------------

APPEAL AWAITED.

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed development, by reason of its proximity to existing similar telecommunications equipment and street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of the visual amenity of residents and appearance of the street scene and the area in general”.

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

- Modern telecommunications are an essential part of modern life and bring benefits to, and enrich communities and business, as well as playing an important role in meeting national sustainability objectives.
- The proposal is a necessary telecommunications installation to accommodate the requirements of O2 UK under the provisions of the Telecommunications Act. O2 has a requirement to maintain this UMTS cell in order to cover the Stanmore West and surrounding residential areas.
- Proposed development involves the installation of a 12.5m high street column, associated equipment cabinets and ancillary development.
- Antennas will operate in accordance with ICNIRP Public Exposure Guidelines.
- There is a clear need for the development.
- The location of the installation has been chosen to have a negligible impact on the locality, and a sensitive design has been chosen in order to ensure this.

Cont...

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 65	Replies 2	Expiry 02-MAR-2005
-------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

**Response:** Already 2 of these sited within a few metres of each other - another would set a precedent; adverse visual effect on area and land bordering green belt in terms of height and appearance; 72 Uxbridge Road is not an industrial estate; Health hazard; concerned about impacts on children; developer may think masts are in keeping with petrol station but what happens when this closes down and proposed health centre is built.

## APPRAISAL

### 1. ICNIRP Compliance

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

### 2. Visual & Residential Amenity

There are 2 similar telecommunications columns together with ancillary cabinets located southwest of the site outside the adjoining service station at a distance of 30m and 44m respectively. There are also various items of street furniture next to the proposed site including a street lamp, large freestanding advertising sign, rubbish bin and railings. The combined effects of an additional telecoms column and cabinets together with miscellaneous street furniture and adjoining telecommunication masts would result in a cluttered form of development. This would be harmful to the visual amenity and appearance of the area.

In allowing a previous appeal for an existing mast outside the service station, the Inspector considered that the proposal would largely be seen against the backdrop of a commercial petrol filling station with its associated buildings and signage and as such would not look unacceptably intrusive. The context of the current proposal is different, being situated on the footpath outside an adjoining food and wine shop on a prominent corner of the roundabout. It is considered that the height and appearance of the mast would be harmful to the appearance of the street scene particularly in views along Uxbridge Road and up Kenton Lane from the south. It is also considered that the height and appearance of the column would be harmful to the outlook from first floor windows of the residential property above the food and wine shop and would appear unduly obtrusive and overbearing. This would be harmful to the residential amenity of the occupiers of that property. A similar application relating to the same general area of footpath was also refused for a similar reason on 05-MAY-2000.

Cont...



### **3. Consultation Responses**

Whilst there is a current application for redevelopment of the adjoining service station for mixed use comprising residential and health centre, it is yet to be decided and each application is considered on its own merits. The site is located near to the Metropolitan Green Belt however given the close proximity of similar installations and mix of commercial and residential uses an objection on Green Belt terms could not be justified. Other matters covered by report.

### **CONCLUSION**

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

**LAND ADJACENT TO ELMCOTE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, PINNER, MIDDX**

Ward: PINNER

DETERMINATION: 13M HIGH MONOPOLE MAST AND ANTENNA AND EQUIPMENT CABIN

STAPPARD HOWES

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 47000B/001 Revision A, 47000B/002 Revision A, 47000B/003 Revision B, 47000B/004 Revision B, 47000B/005 Revision C

- 1 Prior approval of siting and appearance IS required.
- 2 REFUSE approval of details of siting and appearance for the following reason(s):
  1. The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and the area in general.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, D4, D24

---

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

1. ICNIRP Compliance (D24)
  2. Visual & Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D24)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:	Special Advert Cont
Listed Building:	Not Listed
Conservation Area:	None

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- Edge of grass area on southern side of Uxbridge Road, to front of three-storey apartment block at 'Elmcote'
- Proposed siting between street bench and bus shelter/bus stop sign, with trees to rear and sides
- Other street furniture nearby includes Transco hut to east, post box and road sign for 'Elmcote' to west, and street light to rear at parking area front of 'Elmcote'
- Fall in ground levels to east and west along Uxbridge Road and from north to south; with proposed area of siting at prominent height on road and at higher level than residential properties at 'Elmcote'
- Skillen Lodge opposite set at higher ground level but largely screened from highway by high evergreen trees, bus stop and shelter to front

**c) Proposal Details**

- Provision of 13m high olive green colour pole, with glass reinforced plastic shroud in olive green colour on top, to be sited towards the front edge of the grass area on the boundary with the footpath
- Ancillary equipment cabin to be sited adjacent to the column, colour olive green. (Dimensions: L 1.3m x H 1.05m x W 0.9m)

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The proposal has been designed in order to minimise visual impact through the use of screening, colouring and by sympathetic relationship with existing street furniture
- Firstly there are substantial trees in the area, which entirely screen the proposal from the residential properties in the area
- Secondly the colouring of the mast has been adopted in order to have the minimum impact on the visual amenity of the area, by using a low impact colour which will camouflage against the trees, especially in the summer months
- Lastly the pole has been designed to accord with the existing street furniture. The cabinet will be situated in the context of the existing bus stop and bench

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
75

Replies  
0

Expiry  
22-MAR-05

**Response:** Awaited.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. ICNIRP Compliance**

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

### **2. Visual & Residential Amenity**

The proposed monopole would be sited on the grass area rear of the pavement, between the bus shelter and bus stop sign on the pavement edge. The associated equipment cabin would be sited adjacent to the existing bench to the east. Coupled with the bus shelter/bus stop sign, the bench and the Transco hut further to the east and the postbox and road sign to the west, it is considered that the proposed telecommunications equipment would result in a proliferation of street furniture, to the detriment of the character of the area. The impact of this proliferation as well as the excessive height of the pole at 13m would be particularly obtrusive due to the prominent siting at a higher level than the land to east and west along Uxbridge Road. Furthermore it is not considered that the sparsely-located trees to the side or rear of the proposed siting would adequately screen the pole from the highway, in particular as they are deciduous.

The proposed mast would be sited a distance of approximately 40m from the front of the apartment block at 'Elmcote', and a greater distance from the relevant elevations of the other neighbouring residential properties at Dingles Court, 'Skillen Lodge', and the nearest detached properties on Uxbridge Road, Waxwell Lane and Blythwood Road. Due to the significant distance to these properties and the screening offered by the evergreen trees to the front of 'Elmcote' and 'Skillen Lodge' in particular, it is not considered that the proposed mast and associated equipment cabin would be detrimental to residential amenity.

In summary it is considered that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to other street furniture, and would thus be detrimental to the character of the area and the appearance of the streetscene in general.

### **3. Consultation Responses**

Awaited.

## **CONCLUSION**

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