



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

TUESDAY 15 MARCH 2005

ADDENDUM

This page is intentionally left blank

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

ADDENDUM

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 15TH MARCH 2005

Section 1

- 1/01 Three additional objections received raising the following concerns
- Additional traffic would be a hazard to the children of the the adjacent school and traffic in the area;
 - Flats would overlook school grounds
 - Design is unsympathetic to neighbouring property
 - If approved, the development would set a precedent
 - Size, height and bulk, and loss of views towards Harrow Hill
 - Overall loss of amenity
- 1/02 Addition to Applicants Statement
- Appeal decision in 1988 for 6 light industrial and storage units is a fallback position for applicants
 - Planting between Belmont Lane and proposed access road and within site could utilise indigenous species of shrubs and trees that would encourage wildlife
 - Existing site building coverage is 610m², proposed is 354m² – reduction of 41%
 - Existing hardsurfacing is 725m², proposed is 392m² – reduction of 46%
 - Development of site for less than 14 units not economically viable. Fallback position is to retain existing uses on site in current format, which is a material consideration in determination of the planning application and in the financial view of the applicants
 - Scheme not overdevelopment, provides sufficient open space and amenity land in and around buildings. Positive contribution to housing stock of area and gives opportunity to remove unsightly non-conforming industrial and storage use within residential area
 - Re-enforce considerations
 - Applicants have owned site for over 20 years

- Building used for commercial purposes in excess of 15 years
- Rents collected from commercial units by 3 independent agents, rent records have been kept
- Services installation records to the premises have been recorded by statutory authorities at time of initial commercial use
- Status quo of buildings not changed in over 10 years
- Existing use of garages was taken into account by Inspector in determining 1988 appeal

-If site is developed as proposed, access road from Kenton Lane could be transferred to Council for nominal sum for future improvement as identified in UDP

-Feasibility Report submitted by applicants to determine whether redevelopment is economically viable in relation to value of site from existing uses. Summary of Valuations:-

- Freehold market value of site subject to existing tenancies is £498,000
- Freehold market value of site with vacant possession and planning permission for 12 units is £430,000
- Freehold market value of site with vacant possession and planning permission for 14 units is £584,000

f) **Notifications** – 35 additional replies received

Summary of Responses: would add to overcrowding, would downgraded quality of life, overlooking, object to commercial use of site, inadequate access, inadequate on-site parking, traffic danger, harm to wildlife, 3 storeys out of character.

6) **Enforcement Considerations**

Previous investigations have been carried out with regard to the lawful use of the site. It is considered, based on the investigations, that commercial uses have existed at this site for a period in excess of 1 year. It is considered unlikely that the Council would be able to find evidence, to demonstrate on the balance of probability, that commercial uses in this location were not immune from planning enforcement action.

1/03 Additional letter of objection.

Additional comments: too high, existing flats are small scale overdevelopment.

1/04

One letter of objection
Comments – noise and disturbance

Additional conditions

- 2) Any plant and machinery, including that for fume extraction, ventilation, refrigeration and air conditioning, which may be used by reason of granting this permission, shall be so installed, used and thereafter retained as to prevent the transmission of noise and vibration into any neighbouring premises.
REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not give rise to noise nuisance to neighbouring resident
- 3) No music or any other amplified sound caused as a result of either attached to, or in the vicinity of, the premises to which this permission refers this permission shall be audible at the boundary of any residential premises.
REASON: To ensure that the proposed development does not give rise to noise nuisance to neighbouring resident
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.
REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

1/05

O/S Plan is numbered 3/01

Reason for Refusal 1:

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

The applicant's agent has made a number of points in support of the proposals in relation to the interpretation of Policy H9:

- Why does the council object to 'stacking' of residential units when in fact the council has no stacking policy?
- This caused the scheme to be redesigned at considerable cost to my client and has resulted in a layout which he feels is much less satisfactory than the original.
- Why does the council object on grounds of lack of amenity in the absence of any formal amenity space policy?

- Why was the application not reported to the February Committee?

2/02 Objection received to lack of renotification on revised drawings.

Requests that application be deferred for renotification.

2/04 Objectors comments:
additional traffic, high density, out of character, local services inadequate.

2/05 Additional objection received raising the following matters:

- Pleased that the issue of the tree has been resolved
- However, there is still the issue with the gates which are inappropriate and out of keeping with Park View Road. There are no other properties with gates in the road, and gates will not enhance the environment of the road or the area.
- It would cause a precedent to have gates erected.
- Hope Committee will reject the application.

2/06 Add Condition

The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.

REASON:To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

2/09 Response to 2nd Notification:

Aware that the applicant has been petitioning locally (albeit to people/shops in Rayners Lane who will not be affected in any way).

Therefore our original comments on this matter still stand...

“Summary of Responses: Residents at rear 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.”

1 Further RESPONSE:

Area used as toilet; parking for Matrix patrons greatly reduced; difficulties for access to parking and manoeuvring; tree removed acted as buffer against traffic noise and pollution; parking pressure on site when weddings/functions are on leading to parking in Rowe Walk; intimidating behaviour; traffic hazard for vehicles entering or leaving site; parking layout incorrect; does not show floodlight location; continuous noise problems; likely to add to health problems.

2/10

Plan Nos:

Substitute "9430/0124" for "012"

Add "9430/13"

"Sherr, Killoch & Avairs letter dated 7-MAR-2005

a) **Summary**

Car Parking:	Standard:	max 4
	Justified:	3
	Provided:	3

2/12

APPRAISAL

End of 3rd para should read "Lastly, there would be a 50 metre separation distance between the rear of the extension and the rear of the terraces in Kenton Avenue."

2/14

Objection (rec'd 9-MAR-05):

Pumping station takes away the environment; causes danger in event of breakdown by spreading fumes into Chandos Recreation Ground; Danger of explosion – properties within 200 yards would be damaged; objection to associated ventilated column to be considered under P/226/05/DFU

Response: The application relates only to the installation of a control cabinet for use in association with other works permitted by virtue of the GPDO (1995).

The potential impact on the Recreation Ground (Open Space) is addressed in the full report.

It is considered that the other issues raised fall beyond the scope of this planning application.

2/15

Defer at officer's request to await amended plans.

2/16 Additional **RECOMMENDATION:**

If recommendation to grant is accepted officers be instructed to write to the owners of No.18 Barrow Point Avenue to advise that a resubmission of the previously – refused application would be unlikely to be favourably considered.

3/03 - DEFER duplication applications at Officer's request
3/05 - to enable consideration of revised proposals.
3/07

3/02 - CAAC: 28-FEB-95
3/03 Objections: Concerns over the design of the replacement building in that the proposals should look more like a barn structure with 2 storey pitched roof that continue the theme and rhythm of the existing. The current proposals do not respect this original design. Raised concerns about overlooking and amenity.

3/02 - Drawing Nos:
3/07 P/2678/04/CFU WP01E – 13E
P/2679/04/CLB WP001P, 002PA, A01P, A02 (1)P,
P/2681/04/CFU A02 (2)P, A02 (3)P, C01P, C02P, A003PA,
P/2682/04/CLB A02 (OPTION 2A)P, A02 (OPTION 2B)P,
H01 PA, H02 PA, H03 PA.
WPC01R, WP04R-07R, 10R-16R
P/2680/04/CAC & WP02E, WP04R
P/2638/04/CAC

2 additional neighbour notification replies received.

Summary of Responses: as per report

Pinner Association: Object, building on the Orchard must be restricted, overlooking, gatehouse unnecessary structure, design of house out of keeping with the area, no usable garden indicated, building too close to trees, design of house on D, E, F unacceptable, glazed ventilators would damage character of area.

SPAB: construction in orchard is questionable intrusion into undeveloped area, retention of land in undeveloped state would help protect former farm group's settings, concerns re: design, insertion of WC into Barn, and large louver proposed for roof of Barn A.

Pinner Local History Society: Object, policies and aims of East End Conservation Area Study should not be overturned, owner should repair listed buildings without delay.

Enabling Development Criteria, as published by English Heritage, attached.

Also attached, site plan showing locations of buildings A – F and The Orchard, for clarification.

Additional Information

Since the committee report was drafted, an additional concern has come to light. It is now clear that the proposals include the removal of the petrol pump feature. Whilst not of particular historic merit, it is rather quaint and adds to the character of the area. Therefore an additional reason for refusal is proposed, as follows:

The proposed removal of the petrol pump would result in the loss of a local feature of interest and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the East End Farm conservation area.

There are some minor amendments to the committee report which also come to light.

Listed Building Description (p99)

Barn C is the older of the two (late 16th Century), rather than as described.

Barn A dates from the 1950s

Applicants Statement (pp102-103)

The application has been submitted as enabling development based on advice from the local planning authority.

Enabling Development (pp111-113)

(p111) Appendix A as below

(p112) To clarify, it is considered that it is the costs of the proposed two new houses, which are considered to be overstated.

(p113) To clarify, the local consortium of neighbours has intimated that they are minded to offer to purchase the site on the basis described in the report, but have not yet done so.

3/06 -
3/07

CAAC: 28-FEB-05

New House on Orchard:

Objection to the principle of building on an orchard. Design of new dwelling house and gatehouse on the orchard are not of local vernacular. Possible problems with overlooking and amenity. Object to the gatehouse in that it is too large and feel the developer is trying to put too much on the site. The Gatehouse is an extra dwelling in itself but is not being described as such but contributes to the overdevelopment of the plot. Objects to dormers on the gatehouse. The north elevation

of the house is too pastiche and it looks like a pavilion. The building is very close to the trees and there is not useable garden space.

New house on D, E & F:

Object strongly to the arrow like roof digging into Barn C. Current proposals look like a sports pavilion. A house on this site is appropriate but suggest other solutions: a simple articulated pitched roof would be much better, perhaps round a courtyard wit some rooms in the roof. The proposals should look more like a barn structure with 2 storey pitched roofs that continue the theme and rhythm of the existing. The current proposals do not respect this original design. Raised concerns about overlooking and amenity.

3/08 OS Plan is numbered 3/08.

4/02 **INDEX**
Recommendation to read 'OBJECTION'

5/01 Amend **RECOMMENDATION**
1 Prior approval of details of siting/appearance is required
2 GRANT prior approval of details of siting/appearance subject to the following conditions:

5/03	Notifications	sent 75	Replies 19	Expiry 22-MAR-05
------	----------------------	------------	---------------	---------------------

Response: The proposed mast would be harmful to the streetscene; the council owns land where it could be more appropriately sited, such as Pinnerwood/Pinnerwood Park; quite visible in a well preserved area; loss of outlook from flats; should be hidden from view; would set a precedent; an eyesore when viewed from Elmcote; detrimental to health; reduce values of properties; unfair that the company involved and the council should make financial gain; would bus stop have been relocated?; would trees be destroyed?; contribute negatively to the environment; bench in convenient to the elderly; area suffers from graffiti; pleasant environment near to site of historical interest on Waxwell Lane would be affected; space is too small; should not be placed in a residential area; will be more visible in winter when the leaves are down; would be a blot on the landscape; notification letters only received on the 3-MAR-05, so neighbours not being allowed the normal 21 days to respond; appearance of this mast significantly diminishes the appearing qualities of this picturesque part of Uxbridge Road; the siting near a busy road; a bus stop and in the middle of flats is not very commendable.

3) Consultation Responses

With regard to health concerns the applicant has provided an ICNIRP declaration relating to conformity with public exposure guidelines; property values are not a planning consideration; determination is being reported to this Committee Meeting as the application would expire prior to the next meeting; other matters dealt with in report above.

Main Agenda Items

Item 17a Withdrawn at request of officers – report tabled in error.

A.O.B Need to arrange a member site visit to BAE site.

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 15 MARCH 2005

AGENDA ITEM 9

**ADVANCE WARNING GIVEN OF REQUESTS TO MAKE REPRESENTATIONS ON
PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative
Item 2/02 3 Anselm Road, Pinner	Dr Tonks	Dennis Granston for P. Tomlin
Items 2/16 16 Barrow Point Aveneu, Pinner	Mr Rodin	E. Hannigan for Mr and Mrs McKenna

This page is intentionally left blank