



# **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 15 JUNE 2005**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

<A1></A1>

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 15TH JUNE 2005**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

**SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

**SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT**

**SECTION 3 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL**

**SECTION 4 - CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES**

**SECTION 5 - PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS**

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

All reports have the background information below.

Any additional background information in relation to an individual report will be specified in that report:-

Individual file documents as defined by reference number on Reports

Nature Conservation in Harrow, Environmental Strategy, October 1991

1994 Harrow Unitary Development Plan

2002 Revised Deposit Draft Harrow Unitary Development Plan

Harrow Unitary Development Plan, adopted 30th July 2004

The London Plan (Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London), Mayor of London, February 2004

## DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 15TH JUNE 2005

### INDEX

					Page No.
1/01	<b>THE TIMBER CARRIAGE P.H., 19 NORTHOLT RD, SOUTH HARROW</b> REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 4 STOREY BUILDING WITH BASEMENT PARKING TO PROVIDE 21 FLATS (6 AS AFFORDABLE HOUSING)	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1108/05/CFU/TW</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>1</b>
1/02	<b>EASTERN PART FORMER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE</b> RENEWAL OF PERMISSION E/1061/99/OUT TO ALLOW SUBMISSION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING RESERVED MATTERS BY 29-JUN-07	CANONS	<b>P/1023/05/CRE/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>6</b>
1/03	<b>LAND R/O 25-28 BELMONT CIRCLE &amp; 13-25 BELLAMY DRIVE, STANMORE</b> OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 2 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 10 FLATS AND 2 HOUSES WITH CAR PARKING	BELMONT	<b>P/995/05/COU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>11</b>
1/04	<b>LAND R/O 481/493 &amp; 507 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH END</b> DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, DEVELOPMENT OF 3-6 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 25 FLATS, BASEMENT PARKING	HATCH END	<b>P/854/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	<b>19</b>

1/05	<b>21-28/31-40 PARK DONNEFIELD EDGWARE</b>	<b>CANONS CLOSE, AVE, EDGWARE</b>	CANONS	<b>P/797/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	<b>25</b>
	ADDITIONAL FLOOR ON BUILDING TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS, 2X3 STOREY DETACHED HOUSES, REMOVAL OF GARAGES, PARKING AREA IN FRONT GARDEN					
2/01	<b>LAND R/O 2, 4 &amp; 6 UPPINGHAM STANMORE</b>	<b>2, 4 &amp; 6 AVENUE, STANMORE</b>	QUEENSBURY	<b>P/430/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>31</b>
	TWO STOREY DETACHED HOUSE FRONTING STREATFIELD ROAD WITH FORECOURT PARKING (REVISED)					
2/02	<b>RIMA, 4 PRIORY CLOSE, STANMORE</b>	<b>4 PRIORY CLOSE, STANMORE</b>	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/761/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>39</b>
	PROVISION OF 2 PAIRS OF ENTRANCE GATES WITH BRICK PIERS					
2/03	<b>CANONS COURT, STONEGROVE, EDGWARE</b>	<b>CANONS COURT, STONEGROVE, EDGWARE</b>	CANONS	<b>P/448/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>42</b>
	ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION AT 3RD AND 4TH FLOOR LEVEL FOR 6 FLATS WITH NEW STAIRCASE AT REAR. REVISED PARKING					
2/04	<b>51 BRAMPTON GROVE, KENTON</b>	<b>51 BRAMPTON GROVE, KENTON</b>	KENTON WEST	<b>P/200/05/DFU/ML1</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>50</b>
	SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO REPLACE GARAGE					
2/05	<b>141 &amp; 143 HEADSTONE LANE, HARROW WEALD</b>	<b>141 &amp; 143 HEADSTONE LANE, HARROW WEALD</b>	HEADSTONE NORTH	<b>P/1045/05/COU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>53</b>
	OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A DETACHED BLOCK OF 7 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING					

2/06	<b>159 CANTERBURY ROAD, NORTH HARROW</b> SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, REAR DORMER AND CONVERSION OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO TWO SELF CONTAINED FLATS	HEADSTONE SOUTH	P/391/05/DFU/OH	GRANT	58
2/07	<b>KATIES, CHRISTCHURCH INDUSTRIAL CENTRE, FORWARD DRIVE, HARROW, MIDDX</b> SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO BAKERY BUILDING (KK1) AIR LOCK LOBBY, AIR CONDITIONING UNITS	KENTON WEST	P/1081/05/CFU/TEM	GRANT	63
2/08	<b>BENTLEY WOOD HIGH SCHOOL, BRIDGES ROAD, STANMORE</b> SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO ART CLASSROOM, WITH ADJACENT TIMBER DECKED AREA	STANMORE PARK	P/707/05/CFU/DT2	GRANT	66
2/09	<b>258 KENTON RD, KENTON</b> SINGLE & TWO STOREY SIDE & REAR EXTENSION, REAR DORMER & CONVERSION TO 3 SELF- CONTAINED FLATS	KENTON WEST	P/2969/04/DFU/AMH	GRANT	69
2/10	<b>GARAGES &amp; LAND REAR OF PERWELL COURT OFF CAPTHORNE AVENUE</b> OUTLINE: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES, REPLACEMENT WITH 36 PARKING SPACES AND 2/3 STOREY BLOCK OF 7 FLATS WITH ACCESS	RAYNERS LANE	P/708/05/COU/RJS	GRANT	73
2/11	<b>GREENHILL WAY CAR PARK, 247 STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> RENEWAL OF P/1097/03/CRE TO PERMIT CONTINUED USE OF PART OF SITE FOR GENERAL MARKET 08:00 TO 15:30 EACH THURSDAY	GREENHILL	P/891/05/CRE/RJS	GRANT	78

2/12	<b>5 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE</b> CONSERVATORY AT REAR	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/217/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>82</b>
2/13	<b>5 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE</b> LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CONSERVATORY TO REAR	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/218/05/CLB/AB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>82</b>
2/14	<b>86 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> CONSERVATORY AT REAR	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/2727/04/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>88</b>
2/15	<b>CLARENDON ROAD AND PART OF KYMBERLEY ROAD, BETWEEN ST. GEORGE'S CENTRE AND COLLEGE ROAD, HARROW</b> ELEVATED ILLUMINATED PLANTING STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PUBLIC HIGHWAY TO PROVIDE A SHARED SURFACE, MOTORCYCLE AND CYCLE PARKING, RE-SITING OF DISABLED PARKING	GREENHILL	<b>P/906/05/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>93</b>
2/16	<b>168-172 HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE</b> PROVISION OF 3 DETACHED BLOCKS TO PROVIDE A TOTAL OF 10 UNITS FOR B1c, B2 & B8 USE (LIGHT & GENERAL INDUSTRIAL & STORAGE) WITH ACCESS & PARKING (REVISED)	QUEENSBURY	<b>P/2810/04/CFU/TW</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>97</b>
2/17	<b>MULBERRY HOUSE, PINNER HILL, PINNER</b> DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE, DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT HOUSE	PINNER	<b>P/712/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>100</b>

2/18	<b>MULBERRY HOUSE, PINNERS HILL, PINNERS</b> CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE	PINNER	<b>P/713/05/CCA/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>100</b>
2/19	<b>136 SUSSEX RD, HARROW</b> TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; REAR DORMER	HEADSTONE SOUTH	<b>P/2854/04/DFU/MRE</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>107</b>
2/20	<b>34 BROOKSHILL AVENUE, HARROW</b> REAR CONSERVATORY	HARROW WEALD	<b>P/779/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>112</b>
2/21	<b>NTL BROADCAST TRANSMITTING STATION, GORDON AVENUE, STANMORE</b> INSTALLATION OF 3 ANTENNAE ON TOP OF EXISTING TOWER. THREE EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND FEEDER GANTRY	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/1139/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>115</b>
2/22	<b>CIVIC CENTRE, STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> INFILL OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AREA TO FORM ADDITIONAL 360 SQ. METRES OF OFFICE SPACE AT FRONT OF CIVIC 1 BUILDING	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1151/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>118</b>
2/23	<b>CIVIC CENTRE, STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> INFILL OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AREA TO FORM ADDITIONAL 247 SQ. METRES OF OFFICE SPACE AT FRONT OF CIVIC 1 BUILDING	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1155/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>121</b>
2/24	<b>ORMONT, 50 HARROW PARK, HARROW</b> REPLACEMENT DWELLINGHOUSE AND DOUBLE GARAGE WITH ROOM OVER	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/762/05/DFU/KMS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>124</b>

2/25	<b>ORMONT, 50 HARROW PARK, HARROW</b> CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF HOUSE AND OUTBUILDINGS	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/778/05/DCA/KMS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	<b>124</b>
3/01	<b>43 SOUTH PARADE, MOLLISON WAY, EDGWARE</b> TWO ANTENNAE ON FRONT ELEVATION, ONE EQUIPMENT CABIN AND ANCILLARY DEVELOPMENT	EDGWARE	<b>P/834/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	<b>130</b>
3/02	<b>3 BROADWAY PARADE, PINNOR ROAD, NORTH HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF PLANNING PERMISSION WEST/521/93/FUL TO ALLOW RESTAURANT/TAKE- AWAY USE UNTIL 1.00AM (MONDAY-SUNDAY)	HEADSTONE NORTH	<b>P/1067/05/DVA/OH</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	<b>134</b>
4/01	<b>NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL, WATFORD ROAD, HARROW, MIDDX, HA1 3UJ</b> CONSULTATION: ROOF EXTENSION TO OUTPATIENTS BUILDING	Adj Auth - Area 1(E)	<b>P/954/05/CNA/RJS</b>	<b>NO OBJECTION</b>	<b>137</b>

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

1/01

**THE TIMBER CARRIAGE P.H., 19 NORTHOLT RD, P/1108/05/CFU/TW  
SOUTH HARROW**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 4 STOREY BUILDING WITH BASEMENT PARKING TO PROVIDE 21 FLATS (6 AS AFFORDABLE HOUSING)

GRAHAM SEABROOK PARTNERSHIP for CLAM-WORTHY HOLDINGS LTD

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1288-05A, 06A, 07A, 08A.

1. The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within 12 months (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on the application relating to:-
  - a) the submission and approval by the Local Planning Authority of an affordable housing scheme to provide 6 units spread throughout the building as shared ownership/key worker housing. The scheme shall include a nomination agreement with the Council.
  - b) ensures that the affordable housing units are available for occupation in accordance with a building and occupation programme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work on the site.

All affordable housing units shall be provided in accordance with the definition of affordable housing set out in the deposit version of the replacement Harrow UDP.

2. A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued only upon completion of the aforementioned legal agreement.

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

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

Cont....

- 3 Landscaping to be Approved  
4 Landscaping to be Implemented  
5 Disabled Access - Buildings  
6 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.
- 7 Levels to be Approved  
8 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-  
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste  
has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The 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.
- 9 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  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
H5 Affordable Housing  
H6 Affordable Housing Target  
T13 Parking Standards

Cont....

---

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

1. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  2. Character of Adjacent Conservation Area (D15)
  3. Housing Policy (SH1, H5, H6)
  4. Car Parking/Highway Considerations (T13)
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

The same proposal was submitted to the Council under reference P/2251/04/CFU, and was reported to Committee on 11th January 2005. In error the existing building was referred to as being locally listed and this was a principal issue of concern. In this light a fresh application for the same proposal was submitted.

### **a) Summary**

Conservation Area:	None	
Car Parking	Standard:	Max 29
	Justified:	27
	Provided:	27
No. of Residential Units:	21	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- large 2 storey public house with beer garden at rear on junction of Northolt Road Waldrons Yard.
- Abbots Court to south is a three storey block of residential flats (the third floor is contained within a mansard roof).
- Sherbourne House, Northolt Road to the south is a 4 storey office block with a flat roof including a plant room and telecommunications antennae.
- Dublin Court, to the north on the opposite side of Waldrons Yard, is a three storey building comprising shops on the ground floor, offices and 1 flat on the first floor and flats on the second floor (there is a current application for conversion to the offices to flats ref: P/1367/04/CFU).
- opposite the site on Northolt Road lies a vacant site formerly occupied by a petrol filling station and to the north of this lies Shaftesbury Avenue.
- planning permission has recently been granted for a 3 storey block of 12 flats nearby at 4 Waldrons Yard.

Cont....

**c) Proposal Details**

- redevelopment of site to provide a 4 storey block of 21 flats.
- building to front Northolt Road and Waldrons Yard with main entrance at the corner.
- building to be of modern design with flat roof incorporating balconies to Northolt Road, Waldrons Yard and rear elevation.
- rear amenity area of some 250m<sup>2</sup> between building and access ramp.
- basement car park for 27 vehicles.

**d) Relevant History**

P/1106/04/CFU      Redevelopment: detached 4 storey building      WITHDRAWN  
with basement parking to provide 23 flats (7  
affordable housing)

P/2251/04/CFU      Redevelopment: detached 4 storey building      REFUSED  
with basement parking to provide 21 flats (6      14-JAN-05  
affordable housing)

The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The loss of a most attractive locally listed building would be detrimental to the character of the area because the style and architectural merit of the Public House offers a respite from the otherwise unprepossessing modern buildings.
2. The loss of a community facility, with its potential to be used by local residents as a meeting place, would be detrimental to the amenities of the area.
3. The design of the proposed development will not preserve or enhance the character of this part of the nearby Conservation Area.

<b>e) Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry	
		21-SEP-2004	
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	60	2	13-SEP-2004

**Summary of Responses:** Loss of community facility, lack of amenity space, loss of locally listed building suggest alternative use for building.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Visual and Residential Amenity**

The proposed replacement building would be sited on a similar forward building line as Sherbourne House to the south and Dublin Court to the north and would relate to both in terms of its bulk and presence in the streetscene.

Cont....

The design has been substantially revised in comparison with the previously withdrawn application.

The main rear elevation of the proposed block would be 21m from the boundary of Abbots Court which is sufficient to maintain a suitable level of amenity.

## **2. Character of Adjacent Conservation Area**

The boundary of the Roxeth Hill Conservation Area runs along the boundary of the site with Waldrons Yard and wraps around the northern flank of Abbots Court. Whilst there is a different character outside the Conservation Area to within it, the site has an effect on the setting on the Conservation Area by virtue of its proximity. It is considered that the appearance of the proposal and its reduction in scale and impact at the rear, would preserve the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

## **3. Housing Policy**

The offer of an element of affordable housing complies relevant UDP policy and is considered acceptable.

## **4. Car Parking**

The provision of 1.35 spaces per unit is close to the maximum requirement and is considered acceptable. No concerns are raised with specific regard to the vehicular access or the level of traffic generated.

## **5. Consultation Response**

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.

---

**EASTERN PART FORMER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS,  
HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE**

**1/02**  
**P/1023/05/CRE/TEM**  
Ward: CANONS

RENEWAL OF PERMISSION E/1061/99/OUT TO ALLOW  
SUBMISSION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING RESERVED  
MATTERS BY 29-JUN-07

PRP ARCHITECTS for DOMINION HOUSING GROUP

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: A1555/2.3/100 Rev.B

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

- 1 Surface water drainage works and source control measures shall be carried out in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 2 Details of drainage of the development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before commencement of the development hereby approved, and shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
REASON: To ensure a co-ordination of the interests represented by various sewerage and drainage authorities.

### INFORMATIVES:

- 1 The applicant is advised that outline planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT reserves all matters for future approval and does not give permission for a specific number of units.
- 2 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters (e.g. watercourses and underground waters), and may be required for any discharge of surface water to such controlled waters or for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such consent may be withheld.  
Please contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.
- 3 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for dewatering from any excavation or development to a surface watercourse.  
Please contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.
- 4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans

continued/

- 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:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SH1      Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SD1      Quality of Design  
D4      Standard of Design and Layout  
EP11     Development within Flood Plains  
H5      Affordable Housing  
H6      Affordable Housing Target  
EM14    Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Designated Areas  
Proposal Site 27
- 

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

- 1)      Affordable Housing (SH1, H5, H6)
  - 2)      Employment Policy (EM14, Proposal Site 27)
  - 3)      Impact on the Appearance and Character of Area and Neighbouring Amenity (SH1, SD1, D4)
  - 4)      Drainage Issues (EP11)
  - 5)      Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a)      Summary**

Site Area:                                    1.21ha  
Council Interest:                            None

**b)      Site Description**

- located on east side of Honeypot Lane south of junction with Whitchurch Lane/Marsh Lane/Wemborough Road
- comprises 1.21ha of land at eastern end of former Government Buildings site now cleared of buildings
- vehicular access from Honeypot Lane
- controlled footpath link, owned by London Transport, from north-east corner of site to Whitchurch Lane opposite Canons Park Station
- retained single storey Government buildings on land to north
- Jubilee railway line, on an embankment, abuts eastern boundary
- warehouse/office/industrial buildings within Parr Road industrial estate to the south
- vacant land previously occupied by Government buildings abuts western boundary
- land slopes down gently from north to south and west to east

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT to allow submission of affordable housing reserved matters by 29th June 2007
- all matters reserved for future approval

**d) Relevant History**

Brockley Hill Government Buildings Site

EAST/1060/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment: 4.86ha to provide 96 detached houses and 2.34ha for public open space, access from Brockley Hill	GRANTED 29-JUN-00
------------------	--	----------------------

P/1280/03/CDP	Details pursuant to Condition 2 (A,B,C) of planning permission EAST/1060/99/OUT	APPROVED 17-OCT-03
---------------	---	-----------------------

Application Site

EAST/1061/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment for affordable housing	GRANTED 29-JUN-00
------------------	---	----------------------

P/373/03/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT to allow submission of affordable housing reserved matters by 29 June 2005	GRANTED 15-APR-03
--------------	---	----------------------

P/190/05/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT to allow submission of affordable housing reserved matters by 29 June 2007	WITHDRAWN 13-APR-05
--------------	---	------------------------

P/166/05/COU	Outline: Affordable housing, 49 houses and 50 flats in single, 2, 3, 4 and 5 storey blocks: parking	WITHDRAWN 18-MAY-05
--------------	---	------------------------

Adjacent land to west of application site (former Asha Site)

EAST/1062/99/OUT	Outline: Redevelopment for D1, D2, A1, A3 and C1 uses – cultural and community facilities with retail, food and drink and short stay accommodation, access and parking	GRANTED 05-JUL-00
------------------	--	----------------------

P/571/03/CVA	Variation of Condition 1 of planning permission EAST/1062/99/OUT to allow submission of details of reserved matters by 5 July 2006	APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION DISMISSED 06-OCT-03 continued/
--------------	--	---

Application site plus former Asha site

P/2095/04/CFU	639 residential units (263 affordable), B1 offices, retail, finance/professional services, food/drink uses, community facilities, access and parking	CURRENT
P/2139/04/CFU	598 residential units (249 affordable), B1 offices, retail, finance/professional services, food/drink uses, community facilities, access and parking	CURRENT

Existing access between application site and Whitchurch Lane

P/2110/04/CFU	Reinstatement of existing pedestrian access route to Canons Park Station with associated landscaping	CURRENT
P/2272/04/CFU	Duplicate of P/2110/04/CFU	CURRENT

**e) Consultations**

EA: Condition suggested  
TWU: No Objections

**Advertisement** Major Development Expiry  
09-JUN-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
164 0 27-MAY-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Affordable Housing**

The provision of affordable housing on this site represents the policy requirement for Laings private housing development at Brockley Hill which is currently under construction.

Outline planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT reserves all matters for subsequent approval although an illustrative layout showed the provision of 63 units in a form which was compatible with the ASHA development which was proposed at that time. Although that layout is unlikely now to be relevant given the changed circumstances of the adjacent site, the development of this site for affordable housing would enable a valuable gain to the affordable housing stock of the borough.

No objection is therefore raised to the principle of the proposed extension of time.

continued/

**2) Employment Policy**

This site is part of a designated B1, B2 or B8 employment site in UDP Policy EM14, and an Industrial Business Park in the London Plan. However UDP Proposal Site 27 proposes comprehensive development for either B1, B2 or B8 use, or business/residential purposes when an element of residential use would be acceptable.

It is therefore considered that this proposal would comply with the development objectives for the area.

**3) Impact on the Appearance and Character of the Area and Neighbouring Amenity**

Outline planning permission EAST/1061/99/OUT reserves all matters for future approval at which stage the above impacts would be considered.

**4) Drainage Issues**

Environment Agency raised no objection to the original application EAST/1061/99/OUT and suggested that conditions and informatives be included in any planning permission.

However, following subsequent Government guidance in line with the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the Agency has introduced Flood Risk Standing Advice which requires the provision of a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) to accompany any application for operational development on a site greater than 1 hectare.

The applicant has supplied an FRA and in the light of this the Agency has raised no objections to the proposal, subject to the suggested condition.

**5) 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.

---

**LAND R/O 25 - 28 BELMONT CIRCLE & 13 - 25  
BELLAMY DRIVE, STANMORE**

**1/03**

**P/995/05/COU/TEM**

Ward: BELMONT

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT: DETACHED 2 STOREY  
BUILDING TO PROVIDE 10 FLATS AND 2 HOUSES WITH  
CAR PARKING

TRIAD PLANNING & DESIGN LTD for MR E RYAN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

**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, Landscaping)
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacingThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking areas and accesses shown on the approved plans have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Levels to be Approved
- 8 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (a) the boundariesof 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.

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/995/05/COU continued.....

9 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.

10 Alterations to the access road from Weston Drive shall be carried out in accordance with details shown on plan No. 04/366/02D before the development hereby approved is occupied.

REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory access to the site.

11 Contaminated Land - Commencement of Works

12 Contaminated Land - Prevention of Pollution

13 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.

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

3 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994

4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans

5 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

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)

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

---

continued/

## 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
- 

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	15
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	12
Site Area:	1790m <sup>2</sup>	
Habitable Rooms:	28	
No. of Residential Units:	12	
Density:	67 dph 156 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, some 12 garages recently destroyed in fire
- nearly all in use for car related activities such as mechanics, tyres/exhausts, remainder 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 10 flats and 2 houses in 2-storey L-shaped building sited some 6-7m from north-west boundary with Belmont Line, wrapping around corner and abutting part of Weston Drive service road
- 8 x 1 bed x 2 habitable room units and 4 x 2 bed x 3 habitable room units

continued/

Item 1/03 – P/995/05/COU continued.....

- 8 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

**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

continued/

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.
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 part 2 part 3 storey building to provide 2 houses and 14 flats with forecourt parking	WITHDRAWN 30-SEP-04
P/3347/04/COU	Outline: Redevelopment in form of detached 2/3 storey building for 2 houses and 12 flats with car parking	REFUSED 18-MAR-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “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.
2. The proposal will give rise to additional vehicular generation onto Weston Drive to the detriment of the free flow and safety of traffic.”

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

- revisions to previous application:
  - reduction in units from 14 to 12
  - reduction in parking spaces to 12 with associated reduction in manoeuvring area
  - additional landscaping with slightly larger amenity area
  - while access road would not be adopted would be made up to adoptable standards
  - not able to stop up access road leading to Kenton Lane
- 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 25 in same period for proposed development
  - would not have detrimental affect on highway network given that existing traffic flow on Weston Drive exceeds 12,000 vehicles in same period

continued/

**f) Consultations**

TWU: No objections  
EA: Unable to respond

**Advertisement** Major Development Expiry  
09-JUN-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
73 2 26-MAY-05

**Summary of Responses:** loss of light, security concerns, would devalue neighbouring properties, inadequate access, additional traffic, on-street parking, overcrowding

**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 can be 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 of Area**

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. Part of the site has also recently been fire damaged.

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.

The proposed 2-storey form of development would be in character with the neighbouring residential area and a commercial rear extension on the opposite side of the Weston Drive access.

The reduction in units in comparison with the last application has enabled a reduction in hardsurfacing for parking purposes and an increase in the scope for planting. In any case, the proposals would give rise to significantly less hardstanding and the provision of new landscaping in comparison with the existing layout of the site.

It is considered that an appropriate scale and form of development is now proposed which would benefit the appearance and character of the site and the locality.

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

The proposed building would be at least 6m further from the edge of the Belmont Line compared with the existing garages which directly abut the land, and a planted strip is shown next to the open space to soften the impact of the building. For these reasons the proposed 2-storey scale would not be overbearing in relation to the Belmont Line or impair its amenity.

continued/

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**

Redevelopment of the site for residential purposes would, in principle, provide a more appropriate neighbouring use for the adjacent dwellings than the existing industrial uses which, by definition, can be detrimental to 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.

2 first floor 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 as detailed in the Applicant's Statement, so that this would not result in detriment to neighbouring amenity.

**5) Parking and Access**

In terms of parking, it is suggested that a 1 to 1 level of parking can be accepted given the availability of public car parks in Belmont local centre, in particular nearby to the south at the end of the Belmont Line.

In terms of access, the Traffic Flow Assessment clearly suggests that a reduced level of vehicle activity would result from the scheme in comparison with the existing situation, notwithstanding the recent fire damage, to the benefit of traffic flows in the area and at the Weston Drive junction.

In these circumstances it is considered that an objection on grounds of additional vehicular generation would not be sustainable.

**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 10 years. 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.

continued/

**7) Consultation Responses**

- Security concerns - it is not considered with the provision of suitable boundary treatment that neighbouring security would be prejudiced
- Would devalue neighbouring properties - not a planning consideration
- 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 grant.

---

**LAND R/O 481/493 & 507 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH  
END**

**1/04  
P/854/05/CFU/DT2  
Ward: HATCH END**

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, DEVELOPMENT  
OF 3-6 STOREY BUILDING TO PROVIDE 25 FLATS,  
BASEMENT PARKING

BWC PARTNERSHIP for PAULDON DEVELOPMENTS LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1295/01, /P02, /P03, /P04, /P05, /P06, /P07, /P08, /P09

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

- 1 The proposal is an unacceptable overdevelopment of a backland site that, by reason of poor siting and layout, excessive site coverage by buildings and hardsurfacing, would have an incongruous and discordant effect on the townscape of the locality and would be an inappropriate form of residential development in this commercial location, resulting in poor living conditions for future occupiers.
- 2 The proposed development, by reason of excessive height, scale, bulk and massing, would be visually obtrusive and out of keeping with the character of neighbouring properties and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties to the detriment of the appearance of the area.
- 3 The proposed development, by reason of excessive height, scale, bulk, massing and siting, would result in unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy to residents of neighbouring properties.

### **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 Delivery  
D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery  
D10 Trees and New Development  
H4 Residential Density  
H5 Affordable Housing  
H7 Dwelling Mix  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SH2 Housing Types and Mix  
SEP2 Water  
EP12 Control of Surface Water Run-Off

---

continued/

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

- 1) Residential Character (SD1, D4, D9, D10)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (D5)
  - 3) Affordable Housing Policy (H5)
  - 4) Residential Amenity of Future Occupiers (SH1, SH2, D5, H4, H7)
  - 5) Trees on Site (D10)
  - 6) Topography of the Site (SEP2, EP12)
  - 7) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Town Centre	Hatch End
Car Parking	Standard: )
	Justified: ) See Report
	Provided: )
Site Area:	0.134ha.
No. of Residential Units:	25
No. of Habitable Rooms:	70
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- detached T-shaped single storey brick building that is used as additional retail showroom floorspace ancillary to the main store, a four storey mid-terraced property that has frontage on the Broadway, 481-493 Uxbridge Road and is designated frontage within the Hatch End Local Centre in the UDP
- the proposed redevelopment site is immediately south of the service road that runs behind the shops and restaurants
- to the east are several units of similar scale and appearance that are used for light industrial/storage purposes
- a row of lock-up garages is at the western side of the site and they adjoin the rear gardens of two storey houses on Wellington Road
- to the rear of the site are a series of lock-up garages, beyond which extend several three storey blocks of flats that have frontage on Devonshire Road to the south of the site, the exception to this being the flats of Avon Mews, the residential buildings that are nearest to the site, whose windows have an east/west orientation

### **c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of existing building
- erection of a three to six storey building to provide 16 x 2 bedroom flats, 7 x 1 bedroom flats and 2 x 3 bedroom flats
- basement parking for 24 cars

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/772/95/FUL	Single storey building to provide 2 light industrial workshops (Class B1) with parking and access (revised)	GRANTED 30-SEP-96
WEST/749/96/FUL	Single storey building to provide a Class A1 retail unit with ancillary storage, parking and access flats	GRANTED 14-JAN-97
WEST/445/01/CON	Retention of temporary detached single storey office building in car park	GRANTED 14-AUG-01

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- No loss of employment would occur, as the four workers would be re-employed in the main store.
- The parking land and road-widening strip that was provided in the previous permission for retail use would be adequate to be used as a service road. The stretch between the site frontage and Wellington Road is adopted, but a pedestrian footpath could be provided and the surface upgraded.
- Basement parking provision (served by car lifts) meets the Council's standard and takes account of local public transport accessibility
- There is adequate separation between existing and proposed housing. The building would be set in on its eastern boundary to avoid loss of daylight to the adjoining B1 building.
- Adequate and accessible amenity space is provided.
- Proposal is consistent with national guidance on maximum sustainable residential density
- proposal meets Council standards on servicing, accessibility and refuse storage.

**f) Consultations**

TWU:  
EA:

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Application	Expiry 09-MAY-05	
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 259	Replies 28	Expiry 09-MAY-05

continued/

**Summary of Responses:** Site address incorrect and misleading, plans indicate correct address, r/o 477-523 Uxbridge Road; overdevelopment of site, height, size, bulk too great in relation to surrounding buildings; overlooking, loss of openness and outlook; loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties; increase in traffic congestion, noise, fumes and disturbance; damage to or felling of established trees including Ash tree protected by TPO, basement parking would damage roots; area prone to flooding, when existing development built, which entailed tree loss, there was immediate impact on water table, resulting in damage to garages, if this development was allowed, and remaining trees felled, flooding could occur; proposal should be described as change of use; backland site unsuitable for residential occupation; poor access, basement parking impractical and inconvenient and would lead to on-street parking

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Character**

Proposal is a backland form of development i.e. the site does not have a road frontage and has housing on each side of it. Consequently, sensitivity should be shown in the siting and layout of development. However, the buildings would be located in the middle of the service area of buildings that are on the main road frontage, immediately to the north of the site. The main orientation of the building would be southwards, in the direction of the communal garden space of several purpose built blocks of flats that have their frontage on Devonshire Road; whereas the townscape of the area is predominantly one of dwellings whose gardens adjoin each other. The siting of the proposed development would therefore be contrary to the advice in Policy D4. It advises that development should have regard to the character and landscape of the locality.

Residential development of such sites needs to maintain the character of the area and the amenity of adjoining residential properties. There should be proper access for vehicles and pedestrians, the form, layout, siting and site area should respect the existing character and townscape of the locality and adequate separation between existing and new development should be maintained. It is in this latter respect in particular that the proposal comes into conflict with Policy D4.

Moreover, the businesses located on the Broadway who use the service road for deliveries etc., are predominantly restaurants and cafes. Much of their trade is conducted at night and it is considered that the activity associated with these uses would have an unneighbourly effect on the proposed development in terms of noise and disturbance, vehicle fumes and cooking odours. This indicative of the poor siting of the proposed development, as rear living rooms would be within 4.5m of the road.

continued/

The height of the proposed development would also be out of keeping with the scale of development in the locality. The form of the local townscapes varies, but is predominantly two and three storey in scale. A three to six storey building rising to a height of 17.7m would have an obtrusive effect on the local townscape, which would be accentuated by the relatively central location of the building and the high proportion of built mass within the overall site coverage. Again, this would be contrary to the advice in Policy D4 on the importance for development to have regard to the context, scale and character of the surrounding environment.

Finally, the applicants have not submitted a design statement in support of their proposal. Indeed, no reference is made to the design and elevational treatment of the proposed development, or a justification of how the proposal would relate to its setting.

**2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

The proposed site frontage would be within approximately 19 to 20m of dwellings in Avon Mews, a three storey block of flats on the southern boundary of the site and within 16m of the rear gardens of houses on Wellington Road, to the west of the site. It is considered that at such distances, the height, bulk and massing of the proposed development would cause overshadowing of these properties and their gardens and would also have an overbearing effect on them. This is unacceptable and contrary to the advice in Policy D5. It says that development should ensure that there is adequate separation between new and existing properties to ensure that privacy is maintained for existing and future occupiers.

**3) Affordable Housing Policy**

This proposal is in excess of 15 residential units and therefore invokes the requirement for affordable housing as expressed in UDP Policy H5. Other than a reference in their supporting statement acknowledging that the proposal is within the Council's threshold for affordable housing, the applicants have not submitted details of the proportion of affordable housing that they wish to provide or the tenures that would be offered.

**4) Residential Amenity of Future Occupiers**

Future occupiers would suffer from poor outlook and a poor quality of residential environment due to the proximity of commercial buildings and their service areas. Rear living rooms would be directly facing the rear of commercial buildings on 'The Broadway' and would also be adjacent to the service road. The proposed flats would also have B1 units adjacent to them to the east of the site. This would not be consonant with the advice in Policy D5. It maintains that all development should ensure that the amenity and privacy of occupiers of both existing and proposed dwellings is safeguarded.

continued/

**5) Trees on Site**

The applicants have not taken into account adequately in their proposal the existence of a mature Ash tree in the south west corner of the site, close to the boundary wall with Avon Mews. A Tree Preservation Order protects this specimen. Although it and other trees are shown in the plans, no reference has been made as to how damage to it could be prevented, other than a brief assurance that no damage would occur to them as a result of the proposal.

**6) Topography of the Site**

Proposal is in an area of land that is at risk of flooding, as occurred in 2000. It is within the 1:100 and 1:50 year flood envelope of the Woodridings Brook that is modelled as part of the River Pinn Additional Works Project by the Highways Agency. Development is at high risk of flooding and could increase the likelihood of flooding elsewhere. The Woodridings Brook is classified as a critical ordinary watercourse. It is programmed to be adopted as a Main River in the next twelve months.

Objection may be withdrawn if the developer could:-

- i) provide flood risk information in line with PPG25 and devise proposals that could be approved by the Council and the Environment Agency for development outside the flood plain and/or proposals for adequate compensatory measures for the loss of flood plain and/or
- ii) get approval from the Environment Agency on the basis that the construction of the flood relief scheme will precede the development and remove the site from the flood plain.

Applicant is advised to discuss these requirements with the drainage team before carrying out such work.

**7) Consultation Responses**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Incorrect address                                     | - to be rectified  |
| Overdevelopment of site                               | - addressed above  |
| Overlooking and loss of privacy                       | - addressed above  |
| Loss of daylight and sunlight                         | - not considered to be a harmful factor in terms of the effect of the proposal on neighbouring residential amenity |
| Increase in traffic congestion, noise and disturbance | - addressed above  |
| Harm to trees   | - addressed above  |
| Risk of flooding                                      | - 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.

**21-28/31-40 CANONS PARK CLOSE, DONNEFIELD AVE, P/797/05/CFU/DT2  
EDGWARE**

Ward: CANONS

ADDITIONAL FLOOR ON BUILDING TO PROVIDE 8 FLATS, 2X3 STOREY DETACHED HOUSES, REMOVAL OF GARAGES, PARKING AREA IN FRONT GARDEN

DAVID KANN ASSOCIATES for EMBER HOMES LIMITED

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: EHL/CPC/20, 21, 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35.

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

- 1 The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site by reason of a disproportionate relationship between buildings and spaces that would have an unacceptable effect on the symmetry of the two buildings forming Canons Park Close and would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the area.
- 2 The proposed development by reason of unsatisfactory design and excessive scale would detract from the character and appearance of the adjacent Canons Park Estate Conservation Area.
- 3 The proposed hard surfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and would detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene.
- 4 The proposed detached house on the northern boundary of the site, by reason of its height, scale, bulk, massing and siting would cause overshadowing and would have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property.

## **4 INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, D4, D5, D9, D10, D14, D18, SH1, SH2, H7, H10.

---

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

1. Residential Character (SD1 D4 D9 D10)
  2. Effect on the Conservation Area
  3. Neighbouring Amenity (D5 D10 D14 D18)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont....

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Conservation Area:	No; Adjoins MOL and Canons Park Estate Conservation Area
Car Parking	Standard: } Justified: } See Report Provided: }
Site Area:	0.317ha
No. of Residential Units:	10
Habitable Rooms:	34
Council Interest:	None

### b) Site Description

- Part two, part three storey purpose built block of flats on the east side of Donnefield Avenue at the junction with Canons Park Close comprising eighteen flats, five lock up garages, a store and front and rear communal gardens, concrete paved footpaths and a variety of trees. The site has twin flat roofed two storey wings arranged in two staggered rectangular blocks behind parapets and a central three storey section that has a hipped roof. The two wings have curved bays at intervals along the front elevation. The property is built in raised Fletton bricks and has a tiled roof. The five garages and an external store are on the northern boundary of the site. 'End House' is also on this boundary. It is a detached property that has a splayed configuration with the northern boundary. It has a distinctive curved roof with green tiling and is part of the conservation area.
- Thirty-two metres to the south of the site is an identical building, 1-20 Canons Park Close. To the rear of the site the pavilion and the playing fields of Arnold House School extend eastwards, the Bowling Green and tennis courts adjoin the rear of the site towards the northern end. The car park for Canons Park London Underground Station is on the opposite side of the road to the site.
- The site has no specific designation in the UDP, but it adjoins the Canons Park Conservation Area (Article 4 Direction), that extends to the north and west of the site. Canons Park is also designated as an Historic Park.

### c) Proposal Details

- A single storey roof extension to provide an additional eight self contained flats is proposed along with the erection of two x three storey detached houses.
- Demolition of eight garages, provision of two dedicated parking spaces for each of the proposed houses and nine communal parking spaces in the front garden.
- Cycle storage area.
- New vehicular access at the southern entrance to the building.

Cont....

- Paving of the remainder of the front garden, including the contrast paving of the pedestrian footpath.
- Removal of thirteen trees and their replacement by six new species, new shrubs, hedgerows, planting, a timber pergola in which new refuse bin storage would be provided.
- New boundary walls and fencing.
- New garden furniture, including benches and sculptures.
- New lighting and CCTV cameras.
- Replacement of existing windows in the front elevation by new UPVC windows.

**d) Relevant History**

None.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The existing building does not contribute to the visual quality of the adjoining conservation area, other than in providing an edge.
- The landscaping of the site at both the front and the rear of the site is undistinguished and in a poor condition.
- The design approach is to create an unobtrusive addition that is in keeping with the design style of the building and its surroundings.
- The extension to the roof has been designed as a separate entity that will give the building more definition
- The elevational treatment will contrast with and revitalise the nondescript brickwork
- The redesign of the front area will enhance the appearance of the site.
- Additional parking will be in accordance with the Council's standards for new residential development.
- Hard and soft landscaping will be of a high standard, replacing neglected and dead planting and supplementing it with new and similar planting and attractive and varied paved areas.

**f) Consultations**

CAAC:

Site is outside the conservation area, but is surrounded by development that would affect its setting. Flats form an attractive streetscene by virtue of articulated facades, curving shape and abundant landscaping to the front. They typify the 1930's development that is common in the borough. The 'End House' that adjoins the site is of architectural merit. The two buildings and the landscaping around them give an open aspect to the streetscene that counterbalances the car park opposite.

- Loss of soft landscaping on the frontage would be harmful to the setting of the buildings and the streetscene.

Cont....

- The two houses at either end of the block would give the site a cramped appearance, which would also be harmful to the settings of the buildings and to the streetscene. They do not have enough setting space and would obscure/damage trees that make a contribution to the streetscene. Being narrow and three storeys in height they appear incongruous and out of keeping with the general character of the area.
- Proposed cedar boarding to the top floor of the block would be an incongruous addition to the building. The flat boarding would not mirror the articulation of the brick facades, e.g. the bay windows and would not fit in with the appearance of the building.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area		Expiry 06-MAY-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 71	Replies 5	Expiry 06-MAY-05

**Response:** Loss of amenity and views due to the proposed extension and the front garden becoming an off street parking area. Additional storey will result in the destruction of the symmetry between the two buildings. Increase in traffic congestion and parking problems. Loss of daylight and sunlight for the 'End House'.

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Residential Character

In terms of the context, scale and character of the site, the increase that is proposed in height would result in an unsatisfactory relationship with the adjoining building immediate to the south of the site that is a mirror image of it. The increase in height would have an unbalancing effect on the two buildings that would destroy the symmetry between them and would introduce a discordant and incongruous theme to the streetscene. This would be contrary to the advice in Policy D4. It states that buildings should respect the form, massing, composition, proportions and materials of the surrounding townscape. The proposal fails to achieve such a relationship.

Furthermore, the introduction of two detached houses to the site and the transformation of the front garden would accentuate the discordance in the appearance of the two buildings, resulting in a cramped layout that would disrupt the proportionate relationship between buildings and spaces that currently exists. This would also be contrary to the advice in Policy D4. Furthermore, the property would lose much of its detached, purpose built profile and definition, as the space around the buildings would be diminished.

Cont....

The cramped effect that the two proposed houses would have on the existing layout would be compounded by the proposed changes to the site frontage. The demolition of the lock up garages and the creation of sixteen communal off street parking spaces in the front garden, along with a further two spaces for each of the proposed houses, would mean that the sense of spaciousness that the greenery provides would be lost, to be replaced by paved hardstanding, with new trees and planting confined to the periphery of the site. This would be contrary to the advice in Policy D9. It stresses that proposals involving the loss of landscaped areas that form a setting to flatted developments should be resisted.

In this respect the proposal would also be in conflict with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for development to have regard to the Public Realm. Whereas the existing building is screened from the highway by a semi private front garden, the transition between the main road and the building frontage would be sacrificed to provide extra parking and an additional means of vehicular access. This would result in a diminution in the privacy that existing occupiers enjoy along with increased noise and disturbance from road traffic and vehicle movement within the site.

Cedar boarding is inappropriate as is the construction of a third floor perpendicular to the eaves building line. The development of a third storey should acknowledge the low-lying, modernist nature of the building.

The fenestration and door treatment of the proposed third floor is out of keeping with the form, detailing and materials of the existing windows.

## **2. Effect on the Conservation Area**

The two buildings that form Canons Park Close provide an entrance to the Conservation Area that is the focal point of the streetscene. The overall effect of the proposed changes would be harmful to the appearance of the buildings and an entity, due to the loss of symmetry that would result from the proposed extension and the loss of green space that would result from the changes in the layout of the frontage and the addition of two detached houses.

The unsatisfactory contrast in the appearance of the two blocks of flats would, in turn, detract from the appearance of the Conservation Area, which is distinguished by its openness. This would be contrary to the advice in Policy D14. Its says that development should only be allowed when it would contribute to the preservation or enhancement of the Conservation Area.

Cont....

**3. Neighbouring Amenity**

The 'End House' would suffer in this respect. The increase in the height of the building would cause overshadowing of the house and its garden, while the erection of a three storey detached house only 3m from the common boundary with the property, extending nearly 8m in depth beyond its rear building line, would have an overbearing, unsatisfactory effect on the property, contrary to the advice in Policy D5. It says that development should ensure that adequate separation is maintained between buildings and distances between site boundaries so that the privacy and amenity of future occupiers is protected. The proposal fails to achieve such a relationship.

**4. Consultation Responses**

As addressed 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 refusal.

## SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**LAND R/O 2, 4 & 6 UPPINGHAM AVENUE, STANMORE**      **2/01**  
**P/430/05/DFU/PDB**  
Ward: QUEENSBURY

TWO STOREY DETACHED HOUSE FRONTING  
STREATFIELD ROAD WITH FORECOURT PARKING  
(REVISED)

PHD CHARTERD TOWN PLANNERS for HENRY HOMES PLC

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: F04.3946.20, 51, 52, 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 development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacingThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 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 occupiedThe 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.
- 4 PD Restriction - Classes A to E
- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 6 The bathroom window(s) in the first floor rear wall(s) of the proposed development shall:
  - (a) be of purpose-made obscure glass,
  - (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.8m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

continued/

Item 2/01 – P/430/05/DFU continued.....

7 Disabled Access - Buildings

8 The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme for the landscaping of the forecourt to include refuse/recycling storage has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The new dwelling shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure that the forecourt of the development has a satisfactory appearance in the streetscene, in the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

**INFORMATIVES:**

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

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

4 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans

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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

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

H18 Accessible Homes

C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1) Relationship to P/586/04/DFU

2) Amenity and Character (D4, D5)

3) Parking and Access (T13)

4) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

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

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- land to rear of nos. 2, 2A and 6 Uppingham Avenue to form 11m wide building plot fronting Streatfield Road
- western boundary abuts nos. 1A, 1, 3 and 5 Morley Crescent East
- detached double garage to rear of nos. 1 and 1A Morley Crescent East fronts adjacent part of Streatfield Road; single detached garage to rear of nos. 2 and 2A on part of application site also fronts Streatfield Road; single triple width crossover serves all three
- a further single crossover serves a gated access to the rear of nos. 2 and 2A; remainder of Streatfield Road boundary delineated by a 2m high close boarded fence
- a street tree fronts the site in Streatfield Road
- overall site area of 273m<sup>2</sup>
- on-street parking not controlled; Streatfield Road designated a Borough Distributor Road and served by local bus services

**c) Proposal Details**

- two storey detached house, details comprise:-
  - 9.2m wide, east flank wall 7.6m deep and west flank wall 8.1m deep
  - hipped roof over including subordinate gable roof over forward projection and canopy over front door/garage
  - no windows in flank elevations
  - main two storey front wall sited between 4.8m and 6.2m from the pavement boundary; flank walls 1m each from side boundaries
  - rear garden depth 11m; rear garden area of 120m<sup>2</sup>
  - two parking spaces and integral garage; access to utilise the existing crossover
- application form states materials 'to be agreed' but drawings show brick walls with some render to first floor front and tiled roof
- accommodation would comprise 6 habitable rooms (of which 4 would be bedrooms)

**d) Relevant History**

P/586/04/CFU	Two storey detached house fronting Streatfield Road with forecourt parking	REFUSED
		22-APR-04

Reason for refusal:

"The proposal, by reason of the limited depth of the site at the rear, would appear as an overdevelopment of the site when viewed from surrounding gardens, would unduly limit the amount of amenity space for the development and would give rise to unreasonable overlooking of the adjoining garden at the rear, to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers and the character of the area, resulting in inadequate living conditions for the future occupiers of the proposed dwelling."

An Informative was included on the decision notice, as follows:-

"INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that a revised application including the following amendments would be likely to be more favourably considered: expand the site to incorporate the rear part of the adjacent garden in Uppingham Avenue."

continued/

**e) Applicants Statement**

Application has been designed to overcome refusal P/586/04/CFU. House will be set behind the building lines of 2 Uppingham Avenue and 1A Morley Crescent West. Site access is via existing crossover; an integral garage and parking space is provided. Amenity space provision in excess of 120m<sup>2</sup> in accordance with the Council's adopted supplementary planning guidelines will be provided and the garden depth (from roof overhang) of 11m. Off-street parking provision is in accordance with the Council's standards having regard to the location of the site and the needs of the applicant developer.

The proposal would make effective use of an under utilised urban site well served by public transport and other services. The building will accord with the Council's spacing standards and would compliment the area's character and appearance. It would reflect the characteristics of this area of tightly packed suburban dwellings fronting established roads. As such the proposal would accord with development plan policies and PPGs 1, 3 and 13.

In relation to the previous refusal the gap between the house and rear boundary has been increased and the number of first floor habitable room windows has been reduced to one. A gap of 1m would be maintained either side of the dwelling (taken from the roof overhang).

In relation to objector issues: density of area below range advocated in PPG3; would utilise existing crossover with garage and parking; in light of PPG3 proposition of inadequate amenity space is unreasonable and unfounded; dwelling would be away from private patio areas of surrounding houses and no worse than existing overlooking levels; plot size is smaller than some in area but so too is the plot for 1A Morley Crescent West and the proposal is at a sustainable density of 37 dwellings per hectare, depth of rear garden would not be perceptible from public realm; amended proposal overcomes previously identified components of over-development.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	18	6 + petition of 6 names	30-MAR-05

**Summary of Responses:** Loss of light, overlooking, parking pressure, baby has dust allergy (will be affected by construction), accidents on busy main road, additional hazard, out of character, will reduce green space, overdevelopment, will open-up noise from road, circumstances have not changed from previous refusal to warrant support, site provides visual relief in built-up area, new access/reversing vehicles detrimental to highway safety, inadequate amenity space detrimental to privacy and amenity of surrounding occupiers, plot size and shape out of keeping with surrounding development, inadequate landscaping opportunity at front/space for vehicles to turn, erosion of open character between streets, contrary to Policies D4, D5 and PPS1, PPG3 and PPG17, ugly side elevation, increased density, loss of trees, additional on-street parking unsafe/congested, loss of security, dwelling should be moved further away from Uppingham Avenue/back from main road, climbing plants should be used on side elevation, brick wall should delineate boundaries, house should be finished in brick.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Relationship to Proposal P/586/04/CFU**

The development the subject of this application differs from that the subject of unsuccessful application P/586/04/CFU in the following material respects:-

- The dwelling would be sited further forward in the plot, increasing the rear garden depth from 9.5m to 11m and the rear garden area from 105m<sup>2</sup> to 120m<sup>2</sup>. Consequently the forecourts depth would fall from a range of 6 – 7.7m to 4.8 – 6.2m.
- The internal arrangement now includes an integral garage, reducing the number of habitable rooms from 7 to 6, and has only one bedroom at the rear reducing the number of first floor habitable room windows from 2 of 3 to 1 of 3.
- The roof over the front projection would now be gabled and not hipped.

In addition there are inconsequential changes to the positions/design of windows and doors, the front canopy and the materials indicated on the plan.

However the proposal does not, as suggested on the last refusal notice, incorporate the rear part of the adjacent garden.

### **2) Amenity and Character (SD1, D4, D5)**

Nearly all of Streatfield Road is fronted by houses or other built development, with the rear garden interface of Uppingham Avenue and Morley Crescent West (to which the application relates) forming the only substantive spatial break. The prominence of the spatial break in the wider streetscene is somewhat limited, however, by reason of the two storey side extensions to No.2 Uppingham Avenue/No. 1 Morley Crescent West and the relatively straight alignment of Streatfield Road. Although of some amenity contribution to the most immediate, adjacent part of the streetscene, the break is not considered to provide significant visual relief within this built up locality. In these circumstances the principle of developing the site is considered to be acceptable.

As a two storey dwelling, the proposal would be consistent with the character of buildings in this locality and while the local form is predominantly semi-detached, in Streatfield Road (where others occur) the introduction of a detached dwelling is not considered to be significantly at odds with the grain/pattern of development. The proposal would be sited further forward in the plot than that of the last refused scheme, but the forecourt depth would remain consistent with existing property on the opposite side of this part of Streatfield Road and sufficient to keep the dwelling behind the adjacent building lines. Adequate space would be provided for an appropriate scheme of landscaping. The depth of the dwelling and its hipped roof form is also considered to be in keeping, and together with the width would be of satisfactory bulk in the streetscene.

continued/

Item 2/01 – P/430/05/DFU continued.....

The formation of the site would curtail the gardens of nos. 2-6 Uppingham Avenue to 15m and areas in the range of 92m<sup>2</sup> and 143m<sup>2</sup>. By comparison, as noted above, the proposed dwelling would have a rear garden depth of 11m and a rear garden area of 120m<sup>2</sup>. Nearby dwellings in Uppingham Avenue typically have rear garden depths of 25m and areas in the region of 175m<sup>2</sup>.

In respect of 4 and 6 Uppingham Avenue, being modestly sized single family dwellinghouses, and Nos. 2/2A (which would have the larger area retained) it is considered that the depth/areas retained would be sufficient to satisfy the amenity requirements of the occupiers of those properties. Although the application site area has not increased from that of the previously refused scheme, the amended siting of the dwelling, the reduction in the number of first floor rear habitable windows and the reduction in the number of habitable rooms are considered to be significant, material differences.

The provision of 120m<sup>2</sup> amenity space is considered to be sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers of the dwelling now proposed. Whilst such a level of provision would fall below that of established development in this locality, the original requirement in draft Policy D4 that new development should have rear gardens that respect the character of the surrounding area was dropped at the recommendation of the Inquiry Inspector, in recognition that much of the inter-war development characteristic of the borough makes over generous amenity space provision, and that it would be inappropriate to try to emulate this.

Subject to suitable boundary treatment, that could be required by condition, it is considered that the form and amount of amenity space for the dwelling now proposed would be sufficient to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers in relation to ground floor windows and outdoor activity.

The increased distance to the rear boundary (of 11m) and the reduction in the number of first floor habitable room windows (to one) is considered sufficient to safeguard the privacy amenity of the occupiers of the property abutting the rear. The other two first floor rear windows would serve bathrooms and could therefore be the subject of standard glazing controls.

In terms of the previous reason for refusal, it therefore remains to consider whether the increase in distance by 1.5m to the rear boundary is sufficient to give the building a suitable spatial setting, when viewed from surrounding gardens, to avoid the appearance of an overdevelopment. In this regard it is considered that, whilst the increment is small the overall depth of 11m is acceptable, having regard to the limited degree to which this effect the character of the locality when perceived from surrounding gardens and the streetscene. On balance it is concluded that the proposal, as amended from the last scheme, would not lead to an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site.

continued/

Item 2/01 – P/430/05/DFU continued.....

Overlooking from first floor rear windows of dwellings and their gardens to the sides would be at an oblique angle and insufficient, it is considered, to be detrimental to the privacy amenity of the occupiers of those properties. No windows are proposed in the flank elevations and future openings could be controlled by condition.

The proposed house would be sited west of Nos. 1/1A Morley Crescent West and would therefore cause some overshadowing of the immediately adjacent area. That area, however, is occupied only by a driveway and double garages. In this circumstance and given the open aspect to the south of the garden area of that property, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the residential amenity of its occupiers.

**3) Parking and Access**

The provision of two forecourt spaces and one garaged space would exceed the Council's applicable maximum parking standard by one space. However it is not considered that a reason for refusal, based on an over-provision of just one space, would be reasonable. Given this over-provision the potential for over-spill parking onto surrounding road is considered to be minimal and not likely to be detrimental to highway safety/free-flow conditions.

Neither is it considered that the loss of one garaged space in respect of Nos. 2/2A Uppingham Avenue could be sustained as a reason for refusal.

Use of the existing crossover onto Streatfield Road is considered to be acceptable in terms of the safety and free flow of traffic using the highway. The retention of the existing crossover and with a scheme of boundary treatment to prevent injudicious crossing, the existing street tree could be retained.

A scheme of landscaping for the remainder of the forecourt, to incorporate control of the materials for the parking spaces and a scheme for the storage/screening of refuse can all be satisfactorily controlled by condition.

**4) Consultation Responses**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| baby has dust allergy (will be affected by construction)             | - not a material planning consideration                                      |
| will open-up noise from road   | - not considered to be significant   |
| contrary to Policies D4 & D5 and PPS1, PPG3 & PPG17                  | - proposal considered to be consistent with UDP and national planning policy |
| ugly side elevation/climbing plants should be used on side elevation | - appearance of dwelling acceptable  |
| increased density  | - not considered to be unacceptable  |
| loss of trees  | - trees on site not protected and of limited amenity value                   |
| loss of security   | - not considered to be materially affected                                   |

continued/

Item 2/01 – P/430/05/DFU continued.....

- dwelling should be moved further away from Uppingham Avenue/back from main road - proposal is considered acceptable as submitted
- brick wall should delineate boundaries - boundary treatment to be determined as a condition

**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.

PROVISION OF 2 PAIRS OF ENTRANCE GATES WITH BRICK PIERS

OCHARD ASSOCIATES for MR & MRS POOJARA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 339-152, 20429C, 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 The materials to be used in the construction of the brick piers hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented

## **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:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5 Structural Features

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

SD1 Quality of Design

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

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP32 Green Belt-Acceptable Land Uses

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

---

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

1. Green Belt Land & Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, EP32, EP33, D4)
2. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
3. Consultation Responses

Cont....

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

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

### b) Site Description

- Replacement two-storey house recently constructed on site, with detached double garage to east.
- Thick laurel hedge on front site boundary and high trees along flank boundaries with Hazelnuts and properties to west.

### c) Proposal Details

- Erection of two sets of entrance gates and brick piers on front site boundary

### d) Relevant History

P/784/03/CFU	Redevelopment to provide detached house with basement and accommodation in roofspace	GRANTED 01-JUN-2004
--------------	--	------------------------

The house has recently been constructed following a series of refused and approved full applications and certificates of lawfulness, along with a detached double garage and swimming pool.

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	3	0	04-MAY-2005

## APPRAISAL

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

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 and the Green Belt. The existing dense laurel hedge which runs along Priory Close would not be affected, save for the insertion of the brick piers. This hedge would be of the same height as the piers, with the lanterns rising above by a further height of 0.5m. While the entrance to Hazelnuts to the west has a more rural appearance, there are a variety of entrance gates similar to the proposal in the surrounding area including Woolmer House directly opposite and Hamstede on Priory Drive. The brickwork for the piers would match the facing bricks of the new house. Due to the modest scale of the proposal and, in particular due to the remote siting of the property at the end of Priory Close, the proposal is not considered to affect the character, appearance, setting or openness of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

Cont....

**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. Furthermore the proposal is of modest scale.

**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.

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION AT 3RD AND 4TH FLOOR LEVEL FOR 6 FLATS WITH NEW STAIRCASE AT REAR. REVISED PARKING

LANGLEY HALL ASSOCIATES LTD for BEAZER INVESTMENTS LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1830-01, 1830-02 Rev A, 1830-03 Rev A, 1830-04 Rev A, 1830-05.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacing
  - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Levels to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment including retaining walls to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 7 No development shall take place until further details and samples of the materials to be used for the new external rear staircase have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking and turning area(s) shown on the approved plan number 1830-02 Rev A have been constructed and surfaced with impervious materials, and drained in accordance with details submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The car parking spaces shall be permanently marked out and used for no other purpose, at any time, without the written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To ensure the satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

Cont...

Item 2/03 - P/448/05/CFU Cont...

- 9 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-  
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste  
(b) and vehicular access thereto  
has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 10 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until further details of the screening to the rear of the roof terraces and the rear balcony access have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: In the interests of residential amenity.
- 11 The roof area over the central part of the building at 4th floor level and the roof area to the north of the third and fourth floor penthouses shall only be used as a means of escape and not 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.
- 12 Development shall not begin until a scheme of sound insulation between the new and existing flats has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and all works which form a part of the scheme shall be completed before any of the flats are occupied.
- 13 Completed Development - Buildings
- 14 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 15 Construction work in connection with the development hereby approved shall not take place outside the following times:  
(a) 8.00 hours to 18.00 hours, Monday to Friday inclusive;  
(b) 8.00 hours to 13.00 hours, Saturdays;  
without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of the existing residents of Canons Court.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 35 - CDM Regulations 1994
- 4 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  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

Cont...

- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Appearance and Character of the Area (SD1, SH1, D4, D5)
2. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
3. Character of Conservation Area (SD2, D15)
4. Parking (T13)
5. Consultation Responses

---

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	8 additional
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	7 additional
Habitable Rooms:	18	
No. of Residential Units:	6	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Western side of Stonegrove opposite junctions with Mill Ridge and Hillside Drive in L.B. Barnet
- Occupied by 3 storey block, 78m in length, containing 30 flats, low pitched tiled roof, rendered walls, brick stair towers
- Metal fire escape staircases at rear
- Vehicular accesses provided from northern and southern corners of site
- Front access road with parking at one side
- Open lawn at rear of building, planted strip at front
- Two-storey maisonettes to north at Ashbrook
- Single storey petrol station to south, with garage block for Lodge Close to rear
- Semi-detached properties in Canons Park estate Conservation Area to rear of site
- 4/5 storey flat block Peters Lodge opposite and 3/4 storey Castleham Court in L.B. Barnet
- Other 3/4 storey flat blocks in L.B. Harrow further north at Orchard Court, Rydal Court, Coniston Court etc

Cont...

**c) Proposal Details**

- Provision of 6 additional units at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> storey levels, with associated roof terraces
- Replacement staircase to rear
- 7 new parking spaces to rear

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/825/02/FUL	Provision of four 3 x bed penthouse flats with mezzanine & terraces, 4 external lifts on rear wall	WITHDRAWN 02-SEP-2002
P/375/03/CFU	2 additional floors at roof level to provide 4 penthouse flats with roof gardens & lifts at rear	WITHDRAWN 03-JUN-2003
P/1545/03/CRE	Renewal of p.p EAST/869/97/ful to provide additional storey over part of roof to provide 4 flats with roof terraces and parking.	GRANTED 15-SEP-2003
P/2808/04/CFU	Additional floor at roof level to provide 6 flats, roof gardens, new and refurbished stairs and lift at rear, 6 additional garages and new gates	REFUSED 06-DEC-2004

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Proposal limits the size and bulk to the north while increasing it to the less sensitive south end; isolated penthouse flats will break-up the bulk and massing while providing a varied and interesting outline to the building; design reinforces the horizontality that was typical of the architectural style current when the original building was built.

**f) Consultations**

**CAAC:** 1st Notification: Like the design but questions impact on the properties in the conservation area. Must ensure the Crittal windows would be installed as per appeal drawings as they are an integral part of the scheme. Feel it should be an application for whole building, not just the flats at the top. Need details of the gates.

2nd Notification: No further comments to make from those made at April 2005 CAAC.

**L B Barnet:** Awaited

**Advertisement:** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
02-MAY-2005

Cont

<b>1st Notification</b>	Sent 73	Replies 11	Expiry 28-APR-2005
-------------------------	------------	---------------	-----------------------

**1st Summary of Response:** Area is already overcrowded with flats; traffic and parking; building structurally unsuitable; water pressure; poor upkeep by management; lift will block light to kitchens; increased service charges; would look incongruous and aesthetically unpleasant; overlooking and loss of light; t.v. reception; lift and eyesore and nuisance; inconvenience from building work; noise from lift; site manager has no respect for neighbourhood; loss of privacy; over-development; 'site office' to rear and other breaches of planning; block skyline from Peters Lodge; scaffolding will affect health and safety for existing flats.

<b>2nd Notification</b>	Sent 73	Replies 5	Expiry 31-May-2005
-------------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------

**2nd Summary of Response:** Traffic and parking; building structurally unsuitable; water pressure; poor upkeep by management; use of stairs will be nuisance to present occupiers; would look incongruous and aesthetically unpleasant; overlooking and loss of light; inconvenience from building work; site manager has no respect for neighbourhood; loss of privacy; over-development; 'site office' to rear and other breaches of planning; would spoil the character of the 1930s building.

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Appearance and Character of the Area

The building at Canons Court is currently three storeys in height, stepping up to the north where ground levels rise. Several previous applications for additional floor(s) have been refused, with one scheme for 4 flats allowed on appeal and permission was subsequently renewed.

In allowing the previous appeal, the Inspector noted that there are residential blocks of 3 and 4 storeys in the vicinity of the site, and Peters Lodge opposite reaches to five storeys. He concluded that the proposed changes to provide a 4<sup>th</sup> floor over part of the building would be in character with its appearance and in keeping with other flat blocks nearby, and thus would not unduly affect the character of the area. The appeal schemes retained a 7m element at each end of the building at third storey level, which provided relief and interest and thus the central 4<sup>th</sup> storey element did not appear overbearing.

Cont

The current proposal involves development of a 4<sup>th</sup> storey over the centre of the building, similar in terms of height and design to that allowed on appeal. To the north, the bulk is to be broken up by the provision of a penthouse with substantial glazing. At this end, the only bulk additional to that allowed on appeal is that which extends north of the stairwell. The height of the penthouse is lower than that previously approved on this part of the site, and is lower than the chimney. Furthermore, it does not extend to the full width of the building in the manner of the previously refused schemes. Although higher than the adjacent two-storey maisonettes at Ashbrook, there is considered to be adequate distance and trees located to the front between the properties, thus the proposed height would not appear overbearing in comparison. A similar relationship exists opposite, where the five storey Peters Lodge is adjacent to the two-storey detached property 'The Cedars'.

To the south, the current proposal exceeds the bulk of the approved scheme in providing a unit at 4<sup>th</sup> storey level and a penthouse on top. However the proposed height and bulk is considered to be acceptable given the fall in ground level to the south of the site, and the use of substantial glazing for the penthouse which would reduce the perceived bulk. The building is set well back from the highway and there are high trees on the boundary with the petrol station to the south. The petrol station building is single storey but of a totally different form, design and siting to the application property, thus the proposal would not detract from the pattern of development. There is considered to be adequate distinction and separation between the buildings and again a similar relationship exists opposite where a single storey garage building is located between the 5 storey Peters Lodge and 3/4 storey Castleham Court.

Overall, given the rise in ground levels to the north, the setback of Canons Court from the road, the high trees around the site and the existence of other buildings of similar heights at Lodge Close, Peters Lodge, Castleham Court and further north at Orchard Court and other 1960s/1970s flat blocks, the proposed additional height and bulk over and above that approved previously is not considered to be excessive.

The proposed replacement staircase should be as transparent as possible, in the manner of the existing staircase, so as not to detract from the appearance of the building. Further details of the materials to be used are required by condition.

There is also a range of design merits to the current proposal. In terms of urban design and architectural quality, the façade of the existing building appears quite modern, with flat concrete canopies over doorways, vertically articulated stairwells to eaves level and curved bay windows with narrow horizontal glazing bars. The existing pitched roof appears awkward and out of character with the rest of the building. It would appear good practice that any improvement of this fairly dilapidated building should reinforce and celebrate its dominant architectural features (although the whole building should form part of the application). The proposal goes some way to improving the character of the streetscape by incorporating penthouse apartments setback from the eaves line with flat roofs, extending the vertically articulated stairwells above eaves level, providing vertical glazing bars on new windows, and designing the shape of the penthouses with curved corners, all of which are characteristic of the modern (1930s) style of architecture. Cont

Overall, it is considered that the proposed additional bulk and height would not be unduly obtrusive in this location and the proposal would improve the quality and appearance of this modern style building which needs updating.

## **2. Residential Amenity**

In considering this issue the Inspector for the appeal scheme noted that the residents of the 4 flats would be able to overlook Nos.5 and 6 Canons Close from their balconies, but considered that due to the substantial distance from their boundary (some 25m) and the screening effect of trees along it, that the living conditions of adjacent residents would not be seriously harmed. Although the setback of the rear walls of the central part of the development has been reduced from the 2m allowed on appeal to 1.5m this is not considered to exacerbate the overlooking of 5 and 6 Canons Close to an unacceptable degree. Indeed, the previously refused scheme P/2802/04/CFU involved a setback of only 1m and this was considered to be acceptable. The only significant variations to that previous scheme relate to the additional units to the north and south of the main central block. To the south, the third floor unit extends to the full depth of the existing building, however this is considered to be acceptable given the distance from and siting and orientation of the house at 6 Canons Close. Furthermore, an etched glass screen over the parapet wall, of a total height of 2.1m above roof terrace level is proposed to mitigate overlooking. Access has been restricted from the part of the roof terrace between the penthouse and the roof edge at 4th floor level, to be used for emergency only. To the north the design of the penthouse has ensured that no windows would overlook Ashbrook and access has been restricted to maintenance only for the roof terrace north of the staircase for that reason. The roof terrace over the central part of the building is to be used as a means of escape only, and not for use as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission.

The lift shaft to the rear of the building as originally proposed has been omitted in the interests of protecting the amenity of the occupants of the existing units in terms of light and noise. The replacement staircase would be relatively transparent once materials similar to the existing metal staircase are used, and thus it would not result in loss of light to the existing flats.

Given the distance of the flat block from the nearby residential properties, it is not considered that the proposal would result in undue loss of light or outlook.

A condition has been attached to restrict the hours of construction work on site, in order to safeguard the amenity of the existing residents.

Cont

### **3. Character of Conservation Area**

The property is not sited within a Conservation Area but is in relatively close proximity to Canons Drive Estate to the rear. However, despite this, no objections have been raised on conservation grounds due to the distance of the building from any property in the Conservation Area. Furthermore the building is fronting Stonegrove, a busy distributor road, and thus does not have the same residential character as Canons Drive or the roads that lead off it. While the design of this proposal differs from previous schemes, it does not alter the scheme from a conservation perspective and thus no detrimental impact on the character and setting of the Conservation Area would occur.

### **4. Parking**

It is considered that the provision of parking on a one-to-one basis with one extra space would be acceptable in this location, in view of the close proximity of the site to Edgware District Centre and the high level of public transport options in the area. The low level of additional generated traffic would not adversely affect the amenity of residents and the loss of a small amount of rear amenity space for this purpose would be acceptable.

### **5. Consultation Responses**

- water pressure - not a planning issue.
- increased service charges - not a planning issue.
- tv reception - not a planning issue.
- health and safety - not a planning issue.
- other issues - see 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.

---

**51 BRAMPTON GROVE, KENTON**

**2/04**

**P/200/05/DFU/ML1**

Ward: KENTON WEST

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION  
TO REPLACE GARAGE

MRS SHUHAMA ABDUL-CADER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: CS/SAC/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
- 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 plans shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

- 4 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 4 **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

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to the Committee as the Applicant works for Harrow Council

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- two storey, semi-detached property on the northern side of Brampton Grove
- the application property currently has a 3.6m deep single storey rear extension
- adjoining property at No. 49 is unextended
- adjacent property at No. 53 has an approximately 3.3m deep single storey rear extension
- there is a shared driveway between Nos. 51 and 53
- there is a rear garage at the application property at the head of the shared driveway, No. 53's original garage in this location having been demolished
- No. 53 has a garden building along its rear garden boundary
- there is a gate marking the boundary between the application property and the shared driveway
- there is a 1m fence marking the boundary between the application and the adjoining property
- there is a 1.6m fence marking the boundary between the application and the adjacent property
- No. 51 has a rear garden depth of approximately 20m

**c) Proposal Details**

- single storey rear extension on site of existing garage

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
2

Replies  
0

Expiry  
18-MAY-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Amenity Space**

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

**2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The proposed single storey extension is largely similar in dimensions and siting to the existing detached garage at the head of the application property's shared driveway with No. 53. This proposal is for an element 5.3m deep along the boundary with the adjacent property which would be 3m wide. This element would be joined to the existing single storey rear extension by a 1m deep by 0.9m wide lobby area which would contain external doors to both the shared driveway and the rear garden. This proposed extension would have a mono pitch roof with a parapet height of 3.2m along the boundary with the adjacent property. Although this proposed single storey rear development does not strictly comply with SPG recommendations for single storey rear extensions on this type of property, it is felt that the proposed depth and height are acceptable due to the location of the existing detached garage. This proposal would also see an environmental improvement to visual amenity compared to the present situation, where the existing detached garage has a corrugated iron roof and contains asbestos. It is not considered that the extension will have any negative effect on the adjacent or adjoining dwelling.

continued/

Item 2/04 – P/200/05/DFU continued.....

In conclusion it is considered that the proposal would have no unreasonable effect on the visual and residential amenity.

**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.

---

**141 & 143 HEADSTONE LANE, HARROW WEALD**

**2/05**

**P/1045/05/COU/RJS**

Ward: HEADSTONE NORTH

OUTLINE: REDEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE A DETACHED BLOCK OF 7 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING

ANTHONY KEATING

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS, 05101/1, 05191/201; 202

**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 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.

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 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                                       |
| SH1  | Housing Provision and Housing Need                      |
| SH2  | Housing Types and Mix                                   |
| SEM1 | Development in the Borough's Regeneration Strategy      |
| SEM2 | Hierarchy of Town Centres                               |
| SEM3 | Proposals for New Employment-Generating Development     |
| D4   | Standard of Design and Layout                           |
| D5   | New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy |
| T13  | Parking Standards                                       |
| C16  | Access to Buildings and Public Spaces                   |

---

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

- 1) Character of Area and Site Layout (SD1, SEM1, SEM2, D4, C16)
  - 2) Housing and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)
  - 4) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	10 (maximum)
	Justified:	8
	Provided:	8
Site Area:	998m <sup>2</sup>	
No. of Residential Units::	7	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- the site forms two adjoining residential properties located on a corner, with the main frontage to Headstone Lane and a secondary frontage to Almond Way
- the residential premises currently accommodate two semi-detached single storey bungalows
- the property abuts:
  - to the north: Almond Way with a detached double storey dwelling beyond
  - to the south: semi-detached double storey building
  - to the east: access lane and garages beyond
  - to the west: Headstone Lane and semi-detached double storey dwellings beyond

### **c) Proposal Details**

- outline application with details of siting and means of access only to be determined, for redevelopment to provide a detached block of 7 flats
- the existing buildings would be demolished as part of the proposal
- the proposed building would be 2 storey in scale, with accommodation within the roofspace
- design, appearance and landscaping are to be determined via a later application, an indicative streetscape elevation details that the building would match the eave height and general roof pitch and form of other detached and semi-detached buildings in the locality
- although the internal floor layout would likewise be determined via a later application, the plans indicate that the proposed building would accommodate 7 x 2 bedroom dwellings
- 8 on-site parking spaces are proposed to the rear of the property, accessible via a laneway to the rear boundary of the site
- bike racks and bin storage facilities are indicated to be located to the rear boundary of the site

### **d) Relevant History**

P/552/05/COU	Outline: redevelopment to provide a detached block of 10 flats, access and parking	WITHDRAWN 15-APR-05
--------------	--	------------------------

continued/

**e) Consultations**

TWU: Awaited  
EA: Awaited

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	43	24	30-MAY-05

**Summary of Responses:** Devaluation of property; out of character; over development; traffic, parking and highway safety; no rights of access to rear lane; impact on water pressure; inadequate bin storage; overlooking; lack of school places in locality; children's safety

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area and Site Layout**

The character of the locality is clearly residential, consisting of a mixture of detached and semi-detached double storey dwellinghouses and rows of smaller double storey terraces. The character along Headstone Lane is relatively uniform with pairs of semi-detached double storey dwellings set in landscaped gardens. Due to the angle of Headstone Lane the pairs of semi detached dwellings along the eastern side of the road are uniformly stepped back from the frontage between Parkfield Gardens and Almond Way.

Although the proposed development encompasses a large double storey building on property that currently accommodates two single storey, semi detached bungalows, it is highlighted that the land allotment is of relatively large size. This would allow a building to be proposed that could retain a large area of open space around it.

When assessing the development in the context of the streetscape, the proposed building would specifically retain a stepped effect with the frontage setback. The proposed building would be offset 3m behind the front elevation of the adjoining properties of 137-139 Headstone Lane. Coupled with this the siting of the building would likewise not interrupt a 45° splay measured from the rear corner of the building of 139 Headstone Lane. It is considered that the proposed siting of the building would generally accord with the existing development patterns of the locality.

Although specific aspects of design and appearance are not being determined via this outline planning application, from the site layout and nominal streetscape elevations it is considered that the building would be appropriate for the context of the locality as it picks up on the prevailing scale of the residential buildings within the locality. The outline development indicates a proposal that would have regard to the prevalent scale, massing and bulk of buildings adjoining the site and within the vicinity. The building would respect that form and height of the buildings along Headstone Lane. As details of design, appearance and landscaping would be reserved matters for the subject of a later application, at such a time as an application is made, it would be ensured that the development is designed in such a manner so as to avoid any detrimental impact on the character of the locality.

continued/

With respect of the layout of the rear of the site, the use of the rear lane for access to the on-site parking areas is considered to be an appropriate solution. This would specifically take advantage of an existing lane, whilst minimise the amount of hard surfacing that otherwise would be required to provide an additional crossover and driveway from Almond Way. Although an objection is raised to the development on the basis that the use of the lane would block informal parking of cars to front of the adjacent garages, this is not a valid reason for refusal. While the adjoining neighbour may currently enjoy the use of the lane for parking, it is not something they have formal entitlement to.

As floor plans have not been submitted at this outline stage, disability access for the building cannot be assessed. Therefore the applicant will be made aware by Informative of the obligations contained within the Disability Discrimination Act, 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises), implemented on 1st October 2004.

**2) Neighbouring and Residential Amenity**

Due to the siting and orientation of the plot, the proposed building would be relatively isolated from the residential properties to the north, east and west. The horizontal separation distances to these properties would ensure that a double storey building would not be imposing or overbearing, nor cause detrimental impacts of overlooking or overshadowing. With respect of the adjoining residential dwelling to the south, the proposed building has a nominated footprint that steps back from the adjoining residential dwelling, so as to avoid visual bulk impacts on the rear garden area. At the later design and appearance application stage, the location of windows would be carefully assessed to ensure overlooking impacts are prevented.

With regard to the residential amenity of future occupants, the large areas of communal gardens located to the front and rear of the building are considered more than adequate for the use of 7 residential flats.

**3) Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the adopted 2004 UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. Although at a preliminary outline application stage, with the siting and access issues discussed above, the current scheme is considered to be acceptable and would provide for additional housing in line with relevant UDP policies.

**4) Parking/Highway Safety**

With each flat nominated to accommodate 2 bedrooms, the proposed scheme would generate a maximum requirement of 10 on-site spaces. The proposed development has proposed 8 on-site spaces. This level of on site parking, coupled with the availability of on-street parking, it is considered that the development has an adequate parking provision in line with UDP policy. Added to this the site has reasonable access to a range of modes of public transport. Access to on-site parking is via the less trafficked Almond Way. For this reason there are no concerns regarding vehicular movements and highway safety. Accordingly there is no objection to the scheme on grounds of insufficient parking provision or highway safety.

continued/

**5) Consultation Responses**

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

- Devaluation of property value - devaluation of property is not a valid reason for the refusal of a proposal
- No rights of access to rear lane - Applicant has signed 'Certificate B' on the planning application, nominated that all owners of land associated with the development site have been notified
- Impact on water pressure - potential impact on water pressure is not a matter for consideration by Planning, however Council's Engineering Services, Drainage & Surveying Department were notified of the proposal, who did not raise any objection to the scheme
- Inadequate bin storage - the plans nominate adequate area for the storage of bins on the site
- Lack of school places in locality - lack of school places is not a matter for consideration by Planning

**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.

---

**159 CANTERBURY ROAD, NORTH HARROW**

**2/06**

**P/391/05/DFU/OH**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, REAR DORMER AND CONVERSION OF DWELLINGHOUSE TO TWO SELF CONTAINED FLATS

ANDREW LASHLEY DESIGN for MS N GLUMAC

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: PL-01A, 02B, 03A, 4A, 05

**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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented

**INFORMATIVES:**

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

**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
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SH2 Housing Types and Mix
- 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) Single Storey Rear Extension and Rear Dormer (SD1, D4, D5)
- 2) Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
- 3) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
- 4) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
- 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 6) Consultation Responses

---

continued/

## INFORMATION

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

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2.8 (max)
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	1
No. of Residential Units:	Existing: 1	Proposed: 2
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- two storey, un-extended mid-terrace dwelling located on northern side of Canterbury Road
- existing rear garden to an approximate depth of 18 metres
- front garden currently bare top-soil, with front wall 1 metre in height
- the site is located in close proximity to bus services along Pinner Road and North Harrow District Centre and all associated amenities including North Harrow Underground Station

### c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension and rear dormer
- conversion of dwelling to two self-contained flats: 1 x 2 bedroom flat on the ground floor; 1 x two bedroom flat on first floor (second bedroom in converted loft space)
- access to the units would be via the existing entrance door, with the internal communal hallway split into two for the respective flats
- one parking space on the front curtilage supplemented with landscaping
- refuse storage on the front curtilage

### d) Relevant History

None

### e) Notifications

Sent	Replies	Expiry
7	4	06-APR-05

**Summary of Responses:** Two front doors out of keeping, parking concerns, sewage pipe affected, rear extension would entail loss of light to rear of adjacent neighbours, disturbance between the walls, overcrowding, and conversion would be out of character.

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Single Storey Rear Extension and Rear Dormer

The proposed single storey rear extension is to a depth of 2.4m and to a height of 3m at the mid point of the pitch. Whilst it is recognised that there may be some loss of light to the immediate rear of the adjoining properties, this impact is not considered unreasonable as the dimensions of the proposed single storey extension comply with the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The single storey rear extension is therefore considered acceptable.

continued/

The proposed rear dormer window is set in from each party wall by 0.5 metres and set up from the eaves by 1 metre. These dimensions also comply with the advice contained in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. There is the retention of a clearly visible section of roof around the side of the dormer window therefore visually containing it within the roof slope. There are not considered to be any issues with regards to unreasonable overlooking of the adjacent properties. Whilst it is recognised that some degree of overlooking may occur as a result of this dormer, any overlooking would occur at an oblique angle and would therefore not be unreasonable, the rear dormer is considered acceptable.

## 2) **Conversion Policy**

### **Suitability of the new units created in terms of sizes, circulation and layout**

The circulation arrangements of each of the flats are considered to be satisfactory and the sizes of the rooms are considered to be appropriate to their proposed functions. The submitted plans show the layout of the rooms in each unit to be acceptable in relation to one another (i.e. 'stacking' of the units with living areas above living areas). Originally it was proposed to have two separate entrances on the front elevation. This has since been amended to retain the existing front door with an internal hallway now split into two for the flats.

In accordance with policy H9 the ground floor unit is accessible to disabled people (the door widths are not less than 0.8m and there is a ramp up to the front porch to eliminate the step). The size, circulation and layout of the flats are therefore considered appropriate for this type of development.

### **The standard of sound insulation measures between units**

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above and it is considered that the proposed layout would be acceptable in terms of noise reduction. The adjoining neighbours have highlighted party wall issues in relation to conflicting uses. Sound insulation measures can be controlled by condition and therefore, subject to this, this proposal is not considered to affect the amenity of the adjoining dwellings by way of noise and/or disturbance.

### **The level of useable amenity space available**

In relation to outdoor amenity space, the property would have a rear garden length of approximately 15 metres (taking into consideration the proposed single storey rear extension) and an overall area of 105m<sup>2</sup>. Due to site circumstances, the ground floor flat would have sole access to the rear garden. Paragraph 6.53 of policy H9 states, "The Council acknowledges that access to rear gardens in conversions involving terraced houses could be a problem especially for those flats above the ground floor level... it would be inappropriate to insist on all the units in a conversion to have their own private garden. The Council also acknowledges that some residents may prefer access to an area of outdoor recreational or amenity space adjacent to their dwelling rather than a private garden." This is a mid-terrace property and there is considered to be reasonable access for the future occupiers of the first floor flat to a sports ground directly to the rear and a recreation ground located off Beresford Road within a short walking distance (approximately 5 minutes) of the property. In view of central Government advice in PPG3 and due to the close proximity of two areas of open space, the levels of amenity space for all of the proposed flats is considered to be acceptable.

continued/

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

The recently adopted UDP sets a maximum standard of 1.4 spaces per unit. The submitted plans indicate the provision of one space on the front curtilage of the site. Many of the surrounding properties within the vicinity of the site have off-street parking, therefore it is considered that providing parking (see section 3) in the front garden is not out of character with the surrounding area. In accordance with policy H9 and D9, the amended plans indicate the parking area supplemented with additional tree and shrub planting to enhance the attractiveness of the area and the appearance of the property on the street scene. Likewise, the submitted plans also indicate details related to storage of refuse/waste, which is considered to be acceptable.

**3) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking**

The existing front garden of the site does not provide off street parking. The proposal originally entailed providing two off-street spaces, with no landscaping. However, in accordance with policies H9 and D9 the plans were amended to facilitate remedial landscaping along with one parking space on the frontage. The recently adopted UDP sets a maximum of 2.8 parking spaces overall. The site is located close to Pinner Road for local bus services, and within reasonable walking distance to North Harrow Underground Station. North Harrow District Centre is similarly conveniently located in relation to the site.

Therefore it is considered that the parking standards comply with Government advice, which is seeking to discourage reliance on the private motor vehicle. It is considered that the proposal could not be reasonably refused permission on these grounds, given the minor nature of the deficiency.

**4) Character of Area**

Given that the proposal complies with the criteria set out in policy H9, it is not considered that any detrimental change to the character of Canterbury Road would occur as a result of this proposed conversion. The proposal would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the street scene, by the retention of a single door to the front elevation. It is recognised that activity associated with the property at the front would be likely to intensify with occupation by two households, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Canterbury Road.

**5) Residential Amenity**

Similarly, given that the proposals comply with the criteria set out in policy H9, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

continued/

**6) Consultation Responses**

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Two front doors out of keeping   |   | addressed above  |
| Parking Concerns   | - | “ “  |
| Rear extension would entail loss of light to rear of adjacent neighbours | - | “ “  |
| Conversion would be out of character                                     | - | “ “  |
| Disturbance between the walls  | - | “ “  |
| Conversion would be out of character                                     | - | “ “  |
| Overcrowding   | - | the size of the units comply with the Institute of Environmental Health standards for habitable floor space and as such would not contribute to overcrowding |
| Sewage pipe affected   | - | not a material planning consideration, matter for Building Regulations   |

**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.

**KATIES, CHRISTCHURCH INDUSTRIAL CENTRE, P/1081/05/CFU/TEM  
FORWARD DRIVE, HARROW, MIDDX**

Ward: KENTON WEST

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO BAKERY BUILDING (KK1) AIR LOCK LOBBY, AIR  
CONDITIONING UNITS

LANCHESTER & LODGE ARCHITECTS for GEEST PROPERTIES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1376-100B, 102A, 103C, 104A, 106A.

**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 existing air conditioning plant on the roof of building KK1 shall be removed  
within 3 months of the commencement of use of the replacement facilities hereby  
approved.  
REASON: To benefit the appearance of the area and residential amenity.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 35 - CDM Regulations 1994
- 4 **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  
EP25 Noise  
EM14 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use -  
Designated Areas  
EM22 Environmental Impact of New Business Development

---

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

1. Employment Policy (EM14)
  2. Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, EM22)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Employment Area: Ind and Business Use  
Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- located between Masons Avenue and Euston railway line within Christchurch Industrial Estate.
- occupied by Katie's which manufactures foodstuffs.
- site comprises several single/2 storey buildings used for manufacturing with ancillary offices.
- railway line abuts southern boundary.
- residential properties in Herga Road next to western boundary.
- Masons Avenue abuts northern boundary.
- car parking at front of site adjacent to Masons Avenue.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- identical proposals to P/586/05/CFU except the acoustic fence has been deleted.
- 2 x single storey extensions to southern side of main bakery building (KK1) with floor mounted air conditioning plant in between, metal clad elevations and metal deck roofing, enabling removal of existing air conditioning plant on roof of KK1 building.
- infill extension between KK1 and spacer building to house temporary tray wash, metal panelled wall and roof.
- single storey extension to western end of KK1 building to provide entrance lobby air lock and ancillary accommodation, brick elevations, metal deck roof.

### **d) Relevant History**

Various permissions relating to the expansion and modernisation of facilities have been granted over the years.

P/586/05/CFU	Single storey extensions to Bakery Building (KK1), air lock lobby, a/c units and acoustic fence to Herga Road boundary	REFUSED 22-APR-05
--------------	--	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed 3m high acoustic fence, in the context of the existing boundary treatment and absence of landscaping, would by reason of excessive height be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of neighbouring residents.

### **e) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
37	0	02-JUN-2005

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Employment Policy**

The site is allocated for B1, B2 and B8 purposes. The proposals are appropriate in principle to support and consolidate the employment use of the site.

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

The proposed extensions are fairly modest structures, the design of which would be compatible with existing adjacent buildings. Removal of the existing air conditioning plant on the roof of KK1 would be beneficial to the appearance of the area. 4 floor silos rear of 118/120 Herga Road have recently been removed to the benefit of both visual and neighbouring amenity.

### **3. Residential Amenity**

The 2 extensions and air conditioning plant on the southern side of building KK1 plus the infill extension would be screened by the existing building and would not impact on residential amenity.

The extension to the western end of KK1 would be some 5m from the boundary but would be a maximum of 4.5m high so that minimal harm to amenity would result.

### **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.

---

**BENTLEY WOOD HIGH SCHOOL, BRIDGES ROAD,  
STANMORE**

**2/08**

**P/707/05/CFU/DT2**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO ART CLASSROOM,  
WITH ADJACENT TIMBER DECKED AREA

RICKARD EASTMENT PARTNERSHIP for HARROW COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 3032/01, /03B, /10

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 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
- SEP5 Structural Features
- SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- EP8 Energy Conservation and Efficiency
- EP32 Green Belt - Acceptable Land Uses
- EP33 Development in the Green Belt
- EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

---

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

- 1) Appearance of Existing Buildings and their Setting (SD1, D4)
  - 2) Impact on Green Belt (SEP5, SEP6, EP8, EP32, EP33, EP34)
  - 3) Neighbouring Residential Amenity (D5)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	)
	Justified:	) See report
	Provided:	)

Area of Special Character

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/707/05/CFU continued.....

Green Belt  
Site Area: 3.4 ha.  
Floorspace: 72.5m<sup>2</sup>  
Council Interest: Council owned

**b) Site Description**

- site to the north west of houses on Binyon Crescent
- the school is a low rise brick built structure that is rectangular in shape and has two wings extending from it at the northern and southern ends of the site
- the art classroom is on the northernmost boundary of the site
- the buildings and their grounds are within the Green Belt

**c) Proposal Details**

- single storey extension to an art classroom
- a strip of timber surface decking is proposed alongside the extension

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/987/8	Erection of four mobile classroom units	GRANTED 16-JUN-78
-----------	---	----------------------

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 9	Replies 0	Expiry 03-MAY-05
-------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Appearance of the Existing Buildings and their Setting**

The proposed extension would have a height of 2.7m, a depth of 5.3m and a width of 14.4m, which is roughly two thirds of the width of the classroom. The extension would have a flat parapet roof and would be built in brickwork that matches the original structure. In terms of its effect on the existing buildings, the scale, bulk and extent of site coverage of the proposal would not have a noticeable impact and would be in keeping with the appearance of the buildings and their setting. As such, the proposal would comply with the advice in Policy D4 and the advice in Policy EP34 that advises specifically in relation to extensions to buildings in the Green Belt.

**2) Impact on Green Belt**

The proposed extension is relatively small scale both in relation to the proportions of the existing school buildings and the surrounding land that is designated Green Belt. Policy EP33 advises that development in the Green Belt may be acceptable if it is well designed in relation to the size and shape of the site and if there is sufficient space within the site and its surroundings. Proposals must also ensure that the openness and character of the Green Belt are retained. It is considered that the proposal is able to achieve such a relationship. In terms of the spacious green setting that the school is located in, the proposal would be a modest and unobtrusive development.

continued/

Item 2/08 – P/707/05/CFU continued.....

- 3) **Neighbouring Residential Amenity**  
There are no residential properties nearby that could be affected by the proposal.
- 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.

---

**258 KENTON RD, KENTON**

**2/09**

**P/2969/04/DFU/AMH**

Ward: KENTON WEST

SINGLE & TWO STOREY SIDE & REAR EXTENSION, REAR DORMER & CONVERSION TO 3 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

CAROLYN SQUIRE for MR RAITHATHA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 0453/1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11a

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 **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
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- T13 Parking Standards
- H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats

---

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

1. Conversion Policy (H9)
  2. Character of Area (SD1, D4, T13)
  3. Residential Amenity (D4, D5)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

This application is reported to the Committee at the request of a nominated member.

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	3
	Justified:	3
	Provided:	3
No. of Residential Units:	3	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- Site to northern side of Kenton Road occupied by semi-detached dwelling.
- Existing hard-standing in front garden.
- Single storey garage abutting single storey garage to number 256.

### c) Proposal Details

- Single and two storey side and rear extension and rear dormer to semi-detached dwelling house.
- The ground floor element of the extension would run from level with the main front wall, along the boundary with the adjacent 256 (forming new party wall), to 3m beyond the main rear building line, and across the rear elevation to the boundary with 260.
- The first floor element would be set back from the main front wall by 1m, set 300mm in from the flank boundary with 256, project 3m beyond the main rear wall of the building and wrap around the rear elevation, terminating 3.35m from the boundary with 260.
- The roof above the extension would be subordinate and hipped.
- The rear dormer would be contained within the original roof slope sited 500mm from the boundary with 260, 1000mm above the eaves, and below existing ridge level.
- Conversion of extended dwelling house into two 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom self contained flats.

### d) Relevant History

None.

### e) Consultations: Brent Council - No Objection

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	4	2	08-DEC-2004

**Summary of Response:** provision of sufficient off-street parking; Kenton Rd is one of the most dangerous traffic spots in the Borough; new door closer to that of number 256; increased noise from door slamming car starting/parking and people shouting; front garden will become a car park.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Conversion Policy**

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

The proposed new units are considered to be adequate in terms of size, circulation and layout. The vertical stacking of the different rooms between the units would be appropriate, with bedrooms above bedrooms bathrooms above bathrooms and living rooms above living rooms and the first floor kitchen above main entrance to the ground floor. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units.

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

The acceptability of the internal layout is acknowledged above. To safeguard against detriment to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling and to secure optimum living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed flats it is further recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

- **The level of useable amenity space**

The proposed ground floor flat would be provided adequate private amenity space, immediately adjacent to the building. The two first floor units would be provided communal garden space, beyond that proposed for the ground floor unit. This arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

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

Two car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the building, on an existing paved forecourt, to be accessed via a new vehicular crossover.

The provision of two off-road spaces would be consistent with the provisions of the UDP, and the siting of the spaces would allow an improvement in the appearance by the introduction of a small area of landscaping.

It is considered that the size of forecourt is such that adequate refuse storage arrangements, parking, pedestrian access and landscaping could be facilitated.

- **Traffic and highway safety**

It is not considered that the scheme would be in any way prejudicial to pedestrian or vehicular safety in the locality.

Cont...

## **2. Character of area**

The proposed conversion would retain the appearance of the property as a single dwelling in the streetscene, by the retention of a single door to the front (relocated towards western boundary). Although activity associated with the property at the front would be likely to intensify, and be closer to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling house, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Kenton Road.

The proposed two-storey extension to the side with a 1m set back and subordinate hipped roof would satisfy the adopted Householder SPG, and would have an acceptable appearance in the streetscene. The single storey elements would also satisfy the adopted Householder SPG, and would have a negligible impact on the character of the area.

## **3. Residential amenity**

It is recognised that the intensity of the use of the building would be likely to increase as a result of the proposal, and that the relocated front door would be closer to the adjacent dwelling to the west, however it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed extensions would have an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties. The two storey elements would satisfy both horizontal and vertical elements of the Council's 45° code as defined by the adopted Householder SPG. The single storey element, projecting only 3m beyond the main rear wall of the adjacent dwelling would again satisfy the adopted Householder SPG.

It is considered that the proposed extensions would have an acceptable relationship with the adjoining and adjacent dwellings and would not have any significantly adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent units.

## **4. Consultation Responses**

Planning considerations have been 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 grant.

---

**GARAGES & LAND REAR OF PERWELL COURT OFF  
CAPTHORNE AVENUE**

2/10

P/708/05/COU/RJS

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

OUTLINE: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGES,  
REPLACEMENT WITH 36 PARKING SPACES AND 2/3  
STOREY BLOCK OF 7 FLATS WITH ACCESS

STUART HENLEY & PARTNERS for MOUNTVIEW ESTATES PLC

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: O.S, 3194\_01, 02, 03

**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 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
    - (b) design of the building(s)
    - (c) external appearance of the building(s)
    - (e) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
  - 3 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:
    - a: before the use hereby permitted is commenced
    - b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
    - c: in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authorityThe 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.
  - 4 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- INFORMATIVES:
- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
  - 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
  - 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  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need

continued/

Item 2/10 – P/708/05/COU continued.....

SH2	Housing Types and Mix
EP25	Noise
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development
D8	Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-usable Materials in New Developments
T13	Parking Standards
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

- 1) Residential Character, Site Layout and Accessibility (SH1, SD1, D4, D8, C16)
  - 2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity (SD1, EP25, D4, D5)
  - 3) Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)
  - 4) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	9.2
	Justified:	36 (shared with Perwell & Warden Courts)
	Provided:	36 (shared with Perwell & Warden Courts)
No. of Residential Units:	7	
Habitable Rooms:	18	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- a relatively small plot of land fronting Capthorne Avenue that accommodates a row of 36 attached garages
- the parcel of land is currently part of a larger site that accommodates 2 x 3 storey mansion apartment buildings (Perwell Court and Warden Court), both of these buildings front Alexandra Avenue and accommodate a total of 39 apartments
- the garages front onto a sealed lane, accessed from Capthorne Avenue
- well over half of the garages are derelict and currently boarded up, whilst the remainder do not appear to have been recently utilised for the purpose of parking motor vehicles
- the garages that are the subject of this application appear to have been constructed as part of the original development of Perwell and Warden Court.
- Although it is unclear as to why the garages are disused, resulting in their dereliction, there is available on-street parking and existing on-site parking (to the service roads located to the front and rear of the buildings)
- the area of land between the garages and the service road to the rear of Perwell and Warden Courts is taken up by informal open rear garden area
- the buildings within Capthorne Avenue consist of two storey semi-detached or terraced dwellinghouses

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application for siting and means of access to be determined for a development to provide 7 flats within a 2/3 storey detached building.
- additionally the development proposes the demolition of the existing garages and replacement with 36 open parking bays
- although design is not to be specifically determined by this outline application, the 2/3 storey building would be sited 4m back from Capthorne Avenue. An indicative streetscape elevation illustrates that the building would step down from 3 to 2 storeys, to provide a vertical transition between the 3 storey Perwell Court building and the 2 storey semi-detached dwelling at 2 Capthorne Avenue
- a number of medium sized trees would be removed to allow the siting of the building (not protected)

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Consultations**

TWU: No objections

EA: No comments

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	174	2	06-JUN-05

**Summary of Responses:** Area is heavily congested so development would cause overcrowding; additional dwellings would exacerbate existing parking problems; development would cause loss of greenery and turn area into a concrete jungle, development would result in loss of light, reduction in air flow, overlooking and devaluation of property value.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Character, Site Layout and Accessibility**

Although there are different forms and scales of buildings within the surrounding locality, the character of the area is clearly residential. More specifically large 3 storey mansion apartment blocks are located along Alexandra Avenue, whilst the dwellings to Capthorne Avenue consist of pairs of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings and groupings of 4 x 2 storey terraces. The mansion apartments are sited towards Alexandra Avenue, with access, parking and open rear garden amenity space. The dwellings along Capthorne Avenue follows a pattern of the buildings being oriented toward the road frontages of the site, whilst providing a large garden amenity space to the rear.

continued/

The land forms a bridging site between the 3 storey scale of the mansion apartment block fronting Alexandra Avenue and the 2 storey scale of the residential dwellings within Capthorne Avenue. As this proposal is an outline application for siting and access only, matters of design and appearance of the building are to be determined via a later application. Nevertheless an indicative streetscape elevation illustrates that the building would provide a vertical step down from 3 to 2 storeys in response to the 3 storey Perwell Court building and the 2 storey semi-detached dwelling at 2 Capthorne Avenue. The siting of the proposed building at 4m from Capthorne Avenue is likewise complimentary to the streetscene, as it would provide a horizontal stepped effect in setback from Perwell Court (3m) to 2 Capthorne Avenue (5m). Additionally it is noted that due to the location of the sealed access way, there would be an 8m horizontal separation distance between 2 Capthorne Avenue and the proposed building. Therefore on the basis of the above, it is deemed that the proposed development has been designed in such a manner that has regard to the prevalent residential character of the locality, to avoid posing a detrimental impact on the streetscene.

As floor plans for illustrative purposes only have been submitted at this outline stage, disability access for the building cannot be fully assessed. Therefore the applicant will be made aware by an Informative of the obligations contained within the Disability Discrimination Act, 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises), implemented on 1st October 2004.

**2) Neighbouring and Residential Amenity**

As the building would generally follow the building line of the dwellings along Capthorne Avenue, whilst providing a transition in siting and height between the adjoining properties, it is considered the proposed building would not be imposing or overbearing, nor cause detrimental impacts of overlooking or overshadowing. As design and appearance would be dealt with at a later stage if the outline application is approved, at such time the location of windows would be carefully assessed to ensure overlooking impacts are prevented. With regard to the residential amenity of future occupants, the large areas of communal gardens located to the rear of the building are considered adequate for the use of 7 residential flats.

**3) Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the adopted 2004 UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. Although at a preliminary outline application stage, with the siting and access issues discussed above, the current scheme is considered to be acceptable, and would provide for additional housing in line with relevant UDP policies.

continued/

**4) Parking/Highway Safety**

The application also proposes to demolish 36 existing garages located to the rear of the mansion apartment blocks Perwell and Warden Courts. As has already been highlighted, the majority of the garages are in a derelict state and therefore not used for the parking of motor vehicles. Therefore by proposing to demolish the 36 garages and replacing them with 36 open parking bays, it will dramatically increase the amount of on site parking available for both the existing mansion apartment blocks Perwell and Warden Courts and the proposed block of 7 flats. Furthermore at the full design and appearance application stage, details of associated landscaping, fencing and lighting would be required, to ensure adequate surveillance and security of the parking bays is provided and to encourage their maximum usage, which in turn would alleviate any reliance on available on street parking.

On the basis of the proposed development of 7 flats including a scheme to bring existing parking areas back into maximum use, it is considered that the development has adequate parking provision in line with UDP policy. Added to this the site has reasonable access to a range of modes of public transport. Access to on site parking is via the rear laneway off Capthorne Avenue. For this reason there are no concerns regarding vehicular movements and highway safety. Accordingly there is no objection to the scheme on grounds of insufficient parking provision or highway safety.

**5) Consultation Responses**

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

- Would cause loss of greenery - although the proposed building would result in the loss of some incidental trees, nevertheless there would be ample space around the building to allow for appropriate landscaping
- Devaluation of property value - devaluation of property value is not a valid reason for the refusal of a proposal

**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.

---

**GREENHILL WAY CAR PARK, 247 STATION ROAD,  
HARROW**

**2/11  
P/891/05/CRE/RJS  
Ward: GREENHILL**

RENEWAL OF P/1097/03/CRE TO PERMIT CONTINUED  
USE OF PART OF SITE FOR GENERAL MARKET FROM  
08:00 TO 15:30 EACH THURSDAY

LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: File No. 510/189 ES No. 10053 Issue A

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

- 1 The market use hereby approved shall be for a period of 2 years from the date of this permission.  
REASON: To prevent prejudicing the consideration of the future use of the site and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.
- 2 The market use hereby approved shall only operate on Thursdays.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity.
- 3 The times of operation of the market shall be restricted to 6am to 5.30pm for trade and 8.00am to 3.30pm for the public market.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity.
- 4 On market days, barriers shall be erected prior to the commencement of trading on the boundary between the site and the remaining area of the public car park to preclude any encroachment of stalls. Details of the barriers and their location to allow pedestrian access shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the use hereby approved. The barriers shall be removed and stored off-site, or at a location on-site to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, at the cessation of the use each day.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity and pedestrian safety.
- 5 During market days there shall be no use of amplified sound within the market.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity.
- 6 At the end of each market all barriers, stalls, crates, boxes, rubbish and associated market goods shall be cleared from the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the site left in a clean and tidy condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity.
- 7 Market trading shall only take place within the area defined on the submitted plans and not across the barrier with the pay and display car park.  
REASON: In the interests of local amenity and public safety.
- 8 Vehicles associated with the trading use of the site hereby permitted shall not park during trading hours on the remaining part of Greenhill Way Car Park (south side).  
REASON: To maximise the remaining parking provision.

continued/

- 9 Vehicles associated with the trading use of the site shall not enter or leave the market site between the hours of 8.00am and 3.30pm, unless the entire market closes early.

REASON: In the interests of pedestrian safety.

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 For the purpose of Condition 4, the applicant is advised that the use of traders vehicles to form a barrier between the market and the pay and display car park is acceptable. Further details are only required if any changes to this practice are proposed.

- 2 The Christmas and New Year trading period for the market will be covered by the licence agreement.

- 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:

EM10 Open Air Markets

EP25 Noise

T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Retail Provision
  - 2) Parking and Access
  - 3) Residential Amenity
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Town Centre	Harrow
Site Area:	0.8ha
UDP Proposal Site:	PS1
Council Interest:	Council owned site

**b) Site Description**

- southern side of Greenhill Way close to the junction with Station Road
- provides 274 parking spaces and is the largest surface short term public car park in the town centre
- separate access and egress available from Greenhill Way
- surrounding uses mainly commercial though there are residential flats above the Station Road shops and houses opposite the southern part of the site in Greenhill Way
- service access to major stores and Station Road shops to south of site

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/891/05/CRE continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- continued use of one third of car park for general market on Thursdays, open trading from 8am to 3.30pm

**d) Relevant History**

E/1152/99/FUL	Use of part of site for general market 08:00 to 15:30 each Thursday	GRANTED 16-FEB-00
---------------	---	----------------------

This application was for a 6 month temporary permission.

E/578/00/CON	Continued use of art site for general market 08:00 to 15.:30 each Thursday	GRANTED 24-JUL-00
--------------	--	----------------------

This application was for a 12 month temporary permission.

E/328/01/CON	Continued use of part of site for general market 08:00 to 15:30 each Thursday	GRANTED 14-JUN-01
--------------	---	----------------------

This application was for a 2 year temporary permission.

P/1097/03/CRE	Renewal of E/328/02/CON to permit continued use of part of site for general market from 08:00 to 15.30 each Thursday	GRANTED 11-JUL-03
---------------	--	----------------------

This application was for a 2 year temporary permission.

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	155	0	19-MAY-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Retail Provision**

The permissions granted for the market to date have been temporary in order not to prejudice the continued consideration of the future permanent use of the site. The market has proven successful during its presence on this site and there has not been a discernable detrimental effect on nearby shops. Instead it has added life and variety to the town centre and been a supplement to the existing shops.

A further temporary permission would be appropriate, however, given the present lack of an identified developer for the site or a planning application for its redevelopment, a two year permission would be reasonable. This would not affect the licence arrangements.

**2) Parking and Access**

The arrangements for the set-up and clear-up of the market have proven satisfactory. Whilst some 90 spaces are displaced when the market is open, the remaining area of the car park has only been full during the lunchtime period. Use of the nearby car park on the northern side of Greenhill Way has increased, though spaces there are generally available. Spaces continue to be available in other major car parks in the centre although these are concentrated at the other end of the centre.

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/891/05/CRE continued.....

The issue of closing the market over the Christmas and New Year trading period in order to maximise the parking availability in the town centre would continue to be dealt with through the licence arrangements.

**3) Residential Amenity**

There has not been a noticeable effect on residential amenity from the market during its temporary run. Subject to the previous conditions continuing to apply a further permission it is considered unlikely to give rise to amenity concerns.

**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.

---

**5 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE**

**2/12**

**P/217/05/CFU/RJS**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

CONSERVATORY AT REAR

COLIN JUPP, BAC CONSERVATORIES for MR & MRS GOTTLER

---

**5 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE**

**2/13**

**P/218/05/CLB/AB**

Ward: STANMORE PARK

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: CONSERVATORY TO REAR

COLIN JUPP, BAC CONSERVATORIES for MR & MRS GOTTLER

---

P/217/05/CFU

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Ordinance Survey, HA3BZ (scale 1:50), HA73BZ (scale 1:100)

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

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

### **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **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  
SD1 Quality of Design  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

Cont...

---

P/218/05/CLB

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Ordinance Survey, HA73BZ (scale 1:50), HA73BZ (scale 1:100)

**GRANT** listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the following

- 1 Time Limit - Listed Bldg./Cons. Area Consent
- 2 Listed Building - Details  
Detailed drawings, specifications, or samples of materials as appropriate in respect of the following shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
  - a) Brick wall
  - b) Joinery, including windows and doors
  - c) Method of fixing to wallsThe works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.
- 3 Listed Building - Making Good

**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  
D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

---

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

1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character
2. Character of Listed Building
3. Character of Conservation Area
4. Residential Amenity
5. Consultation Response

---

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Listed Building:	Grade II
Conservation Area:	Little Common
Green Belt:	Green Belt
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- The property is situated on Little Common adjacent to the Vine Inn Public House and within the Little Common Conservation Area, Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Special Character.
- The property consists of two separate but adjoined buildings that now form a single family dwelling house. The south-western end of the property is an imposing two storey, symmetrical building, with a two storey wing attached at the rear that was formerly used as a bakery. A small lean-to extension was attached to the two-storey wing and existed prior to 1948, but was demolished in the 1980s.
- A detached garage was built at the rear of the property in the 1960s, along with a single storey rear extension built off the two-storey wing. This extension has created a small courtyard at the rear of the property.

### **c) Listed Building Description**

- Late 18<sup>th</sup> century or earlier. Two storeys. At right angles to road. Three bays with central door and blind window over top. Red brick with tile roof, double-pitched. Gauged flat arches to openings and later shutters to some windows. Two-storey outbuildings to rear with casement windows and tiled roof. Formerly a bakery.

### **d) Proposal Details**

- Construction of a conservatory at rear of property, within one corner of the existing courtyard, adjacent to existing kitchen and dining room.
- Conservatory would measure 3.5m in depth and 3.45m in width, and would have a pitched, roof measuring between 2.1m and 3m in height.
- Conservatory would be constructed from white hardwood and would sit on a 0.6m high brick wall.
- Existing walls and openings on main property would remain in place.
- The proposal has been amended from a conservatory that would occupy the full width of the rear courtyard to one that occupies less than half of the courtyard width. The roof arrangement has also been simplified.

Cont...



## APPRAISAL

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

Although the subject site is located within the Green Belt it is highlighted that Little Common does not have the typical appearance of open Green Belt land. With respect to the extension of dwellinghouses, Green Belt polices aim to restrict the increase in size of dwellings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard its openness.

With respect of the openness of the Green Belt it is highlighted that the proposal is for a small conservatory (3.5 m x 3.45 m), that would infill a small corner to the rear of the building. As such the conservatory would not block or interrupt any views across the property, nor amount to a reduction of the openness of Green Belt land. Furthermore it is considered that the proposed extensions are appropriate and are not disproportionate in size when compared to the size of the original house. Accordingly it is deemed that the proposed additions would not be harmful to the Green Belt.

	Original	Existing	% over original	Proposed	% over original
Footprint (m2)	132.0	152.5	+15.5%	164.6	24.7%

### 2. Character of Listed Building

The proposal has been amended in line with CAAC concerns. The revised scheme would preserve the character and appearance of the listed building, given its relatively discreet size and design. The revised plans have reduced the width of the conservatory by over 50% and ensured that the attractiveness of the rear courtyard is maintained. The simple pitched roof structure is an improvement on the original scheme and would not overpower or detract from the architectural character of the main property. The front wall of the conservatory would be set back by 0.2m from the wall of the main building to ensure that it is subservient. The proposed materials, hardwood frames and brick plinth, would be in keeping with the property, subject to the submission of appropriate samples.

The plans show that the existing external kitchen and dining room walls and openings will be retained within the proposed conservatory. This would ensure that the structure has a minimum impact on the original property and could be removed at a later date without significant harm to the building.

### 3. Character of Conservation Area

The proposal would also preserve the character and appearance of Little Common Conservation Area. It would not be visible in the street scene, given its concealed siting at the rear of the property. The limited bulk and scale of the conservatory would ensure that it respects the existing property and the space around it, while the simple design of the structure would be in keeping with the property and surrounding conservation area.

Cont...

**4. Residential Amenity**

The proposed single storey outbuilding would be sited away from any neighbouring property and would therefore not have any effect on them by way of overshadowing, loss of light or loss of privacy.

**5. Consultation Response**

It is considered that the objections raised by CAAC to the original scheme have largely been overcome by the revised plans. In particular, the design of the roof has been simplified, removing the awkward, curved section at one end of the structure.

**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.

CONSERVATORY AT REAR

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN PRACTICE for G MARX

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1821/1 Rev F, /2 Rev A, /3, 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 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 3 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 4 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.
- 5 Detailed drawings, specifications or samples of materials as appropriate in respect of the following shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
  - a) samples to be submitted of all external materials.
  - b) a drawing showing the exact profile of all timber glazing bars to be used in the construction of the new conservatory.
  - c) sample brick panel showing proposed brick, bond type and mortar type.
  - d) further details of the works required to attach the new conservatory to the weather-boarded element of the rear elevation of the listed building.
  - e) further details to be submitted showing the exact design of the proposed replacement windows and doors to the rear elevation of the main building.The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

### 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:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SEP5 Structural Features

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/2727/04/DFU continued.....

SEP6	Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
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
D10	Trees and New Development
D11	Statutorily Listed Buildings
D14	Conservation Areas
D15	Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
D16	Conservation Area Priority
EP25	Noise
EP31	Areas of Special Character
T13	Parking Standards
EM25	Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

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

- 1) Amenity and Character (D4, D5, EP25, EM25)
  - 2) Parking (T13)
  - 3) Refuse Storage (D4)
  - 4) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (D14, D15, D16)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

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

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area: Harrow Village

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- single storey building fronting High Street, Harrow-on-the-Hill with two/three storey element at rear and rear yard; premises in use as restaurant
- adjoining building to north-east, no. 84, similar in arrangement with ground floor front element used as antiques shop; presumed residential flat above and garden to rear; shed and tree to adjacent boundary (fenced)
- adjoining building to south-west is the former King's Head Hotel, listed grade II, has planning permission (allowed on appeal) for extension and conversion to provide 16 flats and part A3 use, two blocks of flats and thirteen houses with access and parking at the rear
- within Harrow-on-the-Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; also an area of archaeological importance

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/2727/04/DFU continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- rear conservatory 11.7m deep into rear recess with glazed pitched roof to second floor window-cill height
- wraps around rear to width of 6.57m incorporating enclosed bin store
- south-west flank abuts King's Head Hotel redevelopment
- north east flank elevation 1m from side boundary; rear elevation 1.5m from nearest part of rear boundary

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/223/99/FUL	Conservatory at rear	REFUSED 12-MAY-99
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's minimum requirements in respect of the development, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highway(s) would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the neighbouring highway(s).

A subsequent appeal against this decision was allowed.

P/951/03/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Conservatory and stairs at rear, internal alterations	GRANTED 24-MAY-04
--------------	--	----------------------

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections due to planning appeal history.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 31-MAR-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 8	Replies 0	Expiry 22-MAR-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Amenity and Character**

Details submitted with the King's Head Hotel application show that the flank wall of the adjacent part of the old hotel building will rise to a height of some 7m above the level of the application site. The application drawings show that the conservatory would rise to a maximum height of 6.5m within the building recess and would not, therefore, project beyond the adjacent flank wall. The flank wall of the adjacent part of the King's Head Hotel redevelopment will not contain any windows or openings.

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/2727/04/DFU continued.....

The rear boundary of the application site staggers around a part of the King's Head Hotel site that will accommodate a single storey projection. This projection will form a kitchen/dining area to one of the new ground floor flats and will be lit by a glazed conservatory-type roof over. Again, details submitted with the King's Head Hotel application show that this single storey projection will have a parapet wall to its outer sides rising 2.05m above the rear ground level of the application site. The subject conservatory would be sited on rear ground level and whilst it would be sited within 1.5m of this projection would not, in the circumstances described, lead to direct overlooking. The higher part of the proposed conservatory, within the building recess, would accommodate a staircase between front ground and rear ground levels. As the front ground level and upper part of the stairs would be over 12m from the rear projection neither is it considered this aspect of the proposal would be detrimental to the privacy amenity of future occupiers, by reason of actual or perceived overlooking.

The conservatory would bring restaurant activity out towards the rear of the site that could increase noise and disturbance associated with the existing use at this part of the site. It could also permit outdoor use adjacent to the garden boundary of the new dwelling beyond. However the appeal scheme pre-dates the King's Head Hotel redevelopment and no objection was raised to the 1999 proposal on the basis of impact to the garden of the adjoining High Street property. In these circumstances it is considered that a refusal on residential amenity grounds would be injudicious, but in recognition of the new circumstances a condition controlling noise is recommended.

In all of the above circumstances it is not considered that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of privacy and residential amenity.

In terms of bulk, the main part of the conservatory would have an eaves height of 2.6m but rising to a ridge height of 3.8m. The structure would be largely glazed, as with that allowed in 1999, and although the impact when viewed from the nearest rear gardens in the new development would be exacerbated by the fall in levels the resulting impact is not considered to be so harmful as to warrant refusal.

The proposal differs from that approved in 1999 in so far as the return part of the conservatory would have a lean-to glazed roof reaching a greater height (to just below second floor window cill level). However this element of the scheme would be largely screened from surrounding vantage points by the adjacent part of the Kings Head Hotel and the adjoining part of the existing building. Again, therefore, it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the locality.

continued/

**2) Parking**

In considering the car parking reason for refusal in 1999, the Inspector concluded that: "...the proposals would be unlikely to cause a significant increase in pressure upon available car parking spaces in the area. On this issue I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect upon highway safety and would not add significantly to parking congestion in the locality. I consider that this is not a situation where the developer should be required to meet current parking standards and I consider that there would be no conflict with the aims of Policy T13". There is no evidence to suggest that parking conditions in the locality have substantially deteriorated since 1999; although the Kings Head Hotel development has been allowed and is under construction in the intervening period that scheme makes its own provision for the parking of future residents and users. In these circumstances and taking into account policy development since that time in terms of parking and new development, it is not considered that a parking reason for refusal is justified or could be sustained.

**3) Refuse Storage**

The subject proposal makes provision within the development for the storage of waste bins (within a brick and gated enclosure). This is considered to provide an adequate safeguard against visual and environmental nuisance. The bins can be collected via the rear and side of nos. 80-84 as per the existing arrangements.

**4) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area**

The subject development has already received listed building consent and therefore no objections on listed building grounds are raised. Conditions are suggested relating to materials samples, the provision for approval of details of glazing bars and a brick panel, works to the existing building (the weather boarded section) and the exact design of the windows and doors. Subject to satisfactory details in these regards, it is considered that the development would have no detrimental affect on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

It is not considered that the development would have any adverse affects on any feature that contributes to this part of the Harrow-on-the-Hill area of special character.

To safeguard the survival and future health of the adjacent tree it is also recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement of any underground works relating to the development.

Archaeological matters have already been dealt with under the listed building application.

**5) 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.

**CLARENDON ROAD AND PART OF KYMBERLEY ROAD, BETWEEN ST. GEORGE'S CENTRE AND COLLEGE ROAD, HARROW** P/906/05/CFU/TEM  
Ward: GREENHILL

ELEVATED ILLUMINATED PLANTING STRUCTURES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PUBLIC HIGHWAY TO PROVIDE A SHARED SURFACE, MOTORCYCLE AND CYCLE PARKING, RE-SITING OF DISABLED PARKING

ALSOP DESIGN LTD-CAROLINE KOO for LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1162-P-001P2, 90P2, 100P2, 110P2, 120P2, 130P2, OP-160P2, OP-300P2, OP-301P2, OP-400P2, OP-500P2, 1000P2, 1010P2

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacing
 The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Landscaping to be Approved
- 4 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 5 Details of illumination of the elevated planting structures shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to their being brought into use.  
REASON: In the interests of the appearance of the area.
- 6 Notwithstanding the highway layout shown on the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall not commence until revised details of the highway layout have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of a satisfactory highway layout.

**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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/906/05/CFU continued...

D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D7	Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres
T9	Walking
T12	Reallocating Available Roadspace and Managing Traffic
T14	Public Car Parking
C16	Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

- 1) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, D7)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Highway Issues (T9, T12, T14)
  - 4) Accessibility (C16)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

This application was deferred from the meeting of 17th May 2005 to enable further consideration to be given to the impact of the proposals on the St. Georges Centre. Since then revised proposals have been received showing the deletion of an elevated planting structure adjacent to the eastern flank wall of St. Georges Centre, plus other minor changes.

**a) Summary**

Site Area: 2400m<sup>2</sup>  
Council Interest: Highway Authority

**b) Site Description**

- Clarendon Road between College Road and south side of town square in front of St. Georges Centre
- 3 storey building on east side of northern end of Clarendon Road with 7 storey building on east side of southern end, open service yard with ramps to and from multi-storey car park located between
- 8 storey building, King's House on western side together with 5 storey high St. Georges Centre
- site also includes sections of Kymberley Road on north and south sides of Kings House

**c) Proposal Details**

- provision of 2 x elevated illuminated planting structures consisting of a rectangular planting box with an illuminated glass panel on each side, mounted on circular columns to a height of 4 – 4.7m to stainless steel underside of planting box, total height of some 5.2 – 5.9m
- 1 structure on eastern side of Clarendon Road between College Road and exit from St. Anns car park, columns and lighting coloured various shades of blue and purple
- second structure adjacent to part of western flank wall of shop unit on southern side of St. Georges town square, green columns, orange/yellow planting box
- alterations to public highway to provide shared vehicular/pedestrian surface, with different materials used to define vehicle carriageway, pedestrian channel, double yellow lines, boundaries with Kymberley Road, and crossing places

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/906/05/CFU continued...

- reconfiguration of 4 parking spaces for disabled badge holders at northern end of Clarendon Road
- provision of 10 parking spaces for cycles/motorbikes on northern side of junction of Kymberley/Clarendon Roads

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicants Statement**

- application accompanied by Road Safety Audit carried out before application was submitted, together with Preliminary Access Statement

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	118	1	24-MAY-05

**Summary of Response:** Inappropriate scheme, threat to security due to obstruction of CCTV cameras, creation of loitering areas, potential to climb onto planter from St. Anns car park ramp and possibility of vandalism to neighbouring property; report by Crime Prevention Officer suggested; would reduce visibility and prominence of retail area and harm the retailing environment of the centre; would not complement surroundings; commitment to maintenance required; relocation of bicycle and motorcycle spaces to less visible locations would deter potential usage and increase potential for vandalism; encroachment onto disabled parking spaces would contravene Disability Discrimination Act.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Appearance and Character of Area**

Clarendon Road is a relatively narrow, currently unattractive street which serves as a major pedestrian link between the St. Anns Precinct, with its major shopping facilities and the bus/underground stations in College Road. As well as providing a feature of distinctive interest, in accordance with Policy D7, the proposed elevated structures would also provide lighting and greenery to improve the appearance of the street and area and its function as a public thoroughfare.

The proposed highway works would, inter alia, involve the provision of more attractive surface materials than existing, and the removal of unattractive railings and street furniture, thereby benefiting the character of the area. As further refinement of the submitted highway works is required, a condition requiring the provision of revised details is suggested.

**2) Neighbouring Amenity**

The planting structures would mostly be located in front of blank walls, and would have no undue impact in terms of amenity.

**3) Highway Issues**

The proposals would improve the local area for pedestrians by the provision of better lighting and surfacing. They also cater for the parking needs of blue badge holders, cyclists and motorcyclists in compliance with relevant Transportation policies in the UDP.

continued/

#### 4) Consultation Responses

- Threat to security due to obstruction of CCTV cameras, would reduce visibility and prominence of retail area and harm the retailing environment of the Centre - the removal of the structure next to the St. Georges Centre should address these concerns
- Creation of loitering areas, potential to climb onto St. Anns car park ramp and possibility of vandalism to neighbouring property - the applicant states that the structures have been designed so as not to encourage loitering, hiding or congregation, and to deter people from jumping onto them
- Relocation of bicycle and motorcycle spaces to less visible locations would deter potential usage and increase potential for vandalism - the relocated spaces would still be in visible locations
- Commitment to maintenance required - this would be a matter for the applicant

#### **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.

PROVISION OF 3 DETACHED BLOCKS TO PROVIDE A TOTAL OF 10 UNITS FOR B1c, B2 & B8 USE (LIGHT & GENERAL INDUSTRIAL & STORAGE ) WITH ACCESS & PARKING (REVISED).

MICHAEL SPARKS ASSOCIATES for UK & EUROPEAN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 2049-PL-012B, -13, -014, -015C, -011

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacing
  - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 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:
  - a: before the use hereby permitted is commenced
  - b: before the building(s) is/are occupied
  - c: in accordance with a timetable agreed in writing with the local planning authorityThe 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.
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented

## **INFORMATIVES**

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

continued/

SD1	Quality of Design
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D6	Design in Employment Areas
T13	Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Character of the Area (SD1, D4)
  - 2) Amenity of Neighbours (D4)
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

This application relates to part of a larger redevelopment proposal on a site which straddles the borough boundary with Brent. That part of the scheme within Brent has been granted permission.

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	33-50
	Justified:	33-50
	Provided:	39
Site Area:	0.98ha	
Floorspace:	5711 (most within Brent)	

**b) Site Description**

- site on the north eastern side of Honeypot Lane currently occupied by an industrial factory building containing a variety of uses
- the major part of the site is within the London Borough of Brent
- residential properties within Harrow bound the site along its northern edge
- to the east of the site is a retail warehouse (within Brent)

**c) Proposal Details**

- redevelopment to construct 10 industrial/storage units within 3 separate buildings
- a central access to Honeypot Lane is proposed, with units and parking on either side
- the building would be 7.3m in height to the eaves with a shallow pitched roof

**d) Relevant History**

P/2077/04/CFU	3 detached blocks to provide 10 units for light/general industry + storage with access and parking	REFUSED 14-OCT-04
---------------	--	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal (in particular Units 4 & 5) by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting of buildings and the proximity of the vehicle turning area, would be unduly obtrusive and would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in Everton Drive and Lowther Road.”

continued/

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 187	Replies 2	Expiry 18-NOV-04
----	----------------------	-------------	--------------	---------------------

**Response:** Cars will block adjacent roads, buildings too close.

## APPRAISAL

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

The site as a whole is industrial in character with parking and servicing at the rear. Buildings to the south east, in particular are large and accommodate retail and commercial uses. The general scale and mass of buildings is considered to be acceptable

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

Units 4 and 5 of the proposed development would be sited partly on land within Harrow. The rear elevation of these units would be sited at a distance of between 7m and 10m from the rear garden boundary of houses on Everton Drive. In addition the ground level of the proposed units would be 1.5m lower than ground level of those rear gardens.

The proposed turning area for large vehicles using the site has been amended since the previous refusal in order to pull it away from the boundary with properties in Lowther Road and to provide a landscaped buffer on the land between.

It is considered that the revisions to the proposal would now serve to protect the amenity of neighbours.

### 3) **Parking/Highway Safety**

The proposed access onto Honeypot Lane at the middle of the site frontage represents an improvement over the existing access and egress.

### 4) **Consultation Responses**

Building too close	-	addressed above
Cars will block roads	-	“ “

## 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.

---

**MULBERRY HOUSE, PINNER HILL, PINNER**

**2/17**  
**P/712/05/CFU/RJS**  
Ward: PINNER

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE, DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT HOUSE

ORCHARD ASSOCIATES for MR & MRS R WEERASEKERA

---

**MULBERRY HOUSE, PINNER HILL, PINNER**

**2/18**  
**P/713/05/CCA/RJS**  
Ward: PINNER

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE

ORCHARD ASSOCIATES for MR & MRS R WEERASEKERA

---

P/712/05/CFU

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 402:11 to 402:17 inclusive

**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 details of a written scheme to reclaim existing materials of the house to be demolished have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Specifically as much of the original materials as possible should be re-used (including bricks, tiles, chimney pots, windows etc). The written scheme shall also include details of brickwork, brick bond, mortar colour, pointing etc. of the original house and how these elements will be exactly replicated within the rebuilt house and extension. Additionally the development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of any new materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:
  - a) the buildings
  - b) the ground surfacing
  - c) the boundary treatment
- 3 REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building
- 4 Parking for Occupants - Garages
- 5 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

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:

- SEP6     Areas of Special Character, 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
  - EP34     Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
  - D4        Standard of Design and Layout
  - D14      Conservation Areas
  - D15      Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- 

P/713/05/CCA

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos:    402:11 to 402:17

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

- 1        Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2        The demolition hereby permitted shall not commence before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and all the approvals required by the conditions attached to planning permission reference P/712/05/CFU have been obtained.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

**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:

- SEP6     Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land
- SD1      Quality of Design

continued/

SD2	Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
EP33	Development in the Green Belt
EP34	Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D14	Conservation Areas
D15	Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (SD1, D4, D14, D15)
  - 2) Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, EP33, EP34)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD2, D4)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Area of Special Character

Conservation Area: Pinner Hill

Green Belt

#### a) Site Description

- large residential property located on the prominent north west corner of Pinner Hill and Hillside Road
- the building on the site is a two storey detached dwelling sited within a large landscaped garden setting
- a recent development for a part single, part two storey side extension with rear dormers and rooflights was granted on 9th December 2004

#### c) Proposal Details

- demolish existing dwelling and its reconstruction, including recently approved alterations

#### d) Relevant History

LBH/12427	Outline: Erection of detached house and garage on land at rear fronting onto Hillside Road	GRANTED 21-JUL-77
LBH/12427/1	Erection of domestic garage (Rondor House)	GRANTED 05-AUG-77
P/1559/04/CFU	Single and two storey side extensions, rear dormers, rooflights and alterations	REFUSED 02-AUG-04

Reasons for refusal:

“1. The proposed alterations, by reason of unsatisfactory design and/or appearance, would detract from the character and appearance of the property and this part of the Conservation Area.

continued/

2. The proposed extension, cumulatively with the existing buildings, would result in a disproportionate and therefore inappropriate increase in size of the building, resulting in a loss of openness in this Green Belt location, to the detriment of the Green Belt.”

P/2724/04/CFU Part single, part two storey side extension with rear dormers and rooflights GRANTED  
09-DEC-04

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- With reference to the current planning application of the proposed demolition and construction of a replacement house together with approved alterations (P/2724/04/CFU), a report produced by Brace Associated, Structural Engineers, provides comment upon the fabric and structure of the existing building
- It is proposed to match the design detailing and materials of the existing house. Indeed, it is intended that the existing brickwork be re-used given that the existing mortar is so weak and friable and the bricks can be easily lifted
- The structural engineers report highlights the inherent weakness of the existing structure
- Given the condition of the existing structure the most appropriate approach is to rebuild the house on designed foundations to suit the local ground conditions with wall and floors built to modern day standards in respect to structural integrity, insulation and energy efficiency, and material sustainability
- The existing facing bricks are to be re-used, particularly on the principle elevations. The brickwork will be in the same bond, mortar colour and pointing as the existing house. This will allow a visual consistency to the elevations
- Brickwork detailing such as the red quoins, header courses over the external openings and stacks will be identical to that of the existing house
- The windows and external doors will be painted timber with leaded glass to match the existing fenestration
- In all aspects the new house will match the external appearance of the existing property and will continue to maintain and preserve the character of the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area

**f) Consultations**

CAAC: Concern that no guarantees about how the house would be rebuilt and demolished. Need justification and needs to ensure that there is a link between the demolition and the new house. Need to check bond and brick are the same.

EH: Do not wish to make any representations and the case should be determined in accordance with Government guidance, development plan policies and local conservation advice.

P/712/05/CFU

**Advertisement** Demolition in Conservation Area Expiry  
05-MAY-05

continued/

Items 2/17 & 2/18 – P/712/05/CFU & P/713/05/CCA continued.....

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 28-APR-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

P/713/05/CCA

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 05-MAY-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 02-MAY-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

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

The site and surrounds are predominantly characterised by medium to large sized dwellinghouses, set in ample landscaped plots. With respect of the extension of existing dwellinghouses, Green Belt policies aim to restrict the increase in size of dwellings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard the openness of it. It is noted that the existing dwelling has previously accommodated a few small additions. With regard to the current proposal, it incorporates the construction of a building that essentially is the rebuilding of the existing house, along with the additions approved via the planning application P/2724/04/CFU. No objections were raised to the prior approved development on the basis of it having a detrimental impact on the openness of the locality with respect of the Green Belt land classification. Therefore no objections to Green Belt issues are raised against the current proposal.

**2) Conservation Area Character and Appearance**

Mulberry House is located on the corner of Hillside Road and Pinner Hill. It plays an important part in the streetscape of both roads, the junction at which it is located and as part of Pinner Hill estate as a whole. Mulberry House makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. It is built of red brick and set in large gardens. The semi rural character of the Pinner Hill Conservation Area is enhanced by the presence of Mulberry House's slightly arts and crafts inspired design. The front and side boundary treatment and the garden also both enhance the character of the Conservation Area. The house was constructed in the late 1920s and it stands in a large corner plot, surrounded, especially to the Pinner Hill elevation, but mature landscaping.

In the local context, Policy D14 of the Adopted 2004 UDP states that:-

“There will be a presumption against the demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. If a building makes a neutral contribution, its value will be assessed against any proposed redevelopment.”

As such it is considered that Mulberry House makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

continued/

PPG15 also states that there is a general presumption against demolition of buildings within Conservation Areas that make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. Any proposals to demolish such buildings should be assessed against the same criteria used for the judgement on the merits of demolishing listed buildings:

- condition of the building, costs of repairing it and maintaining it in relation to its importance and value
- merits of alternative proposals for the site
- adequacy of the efforts made to continue the use of the building

As part of the proposed development the following reports were submitted for consideration:

- extensions, alterations and refurbishment to form revised accommodation at Mulberry House, Pinner Hill, Pinner by ATC (Andrew Turner & Co.)
  - Mulberry House, Pinner Hill by Brace Associates
  - photos submitted by John Orchard of Orchard Associates

From an assessment of the above submitted information, it is clear from the structural engineers report and the photos submitted that Mulberry House is structurally unsound and that major underpinning would be required to keep the building standing in the long term future. It appears from the Brace Associates report that these structural issues have been going on since 1997, when Mr. Brace first inspected the property.

Photos submitted by Orchard Associates, confirm many of the structural issues, and again it is obvious that to keep this house, which makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, that major works, in one form or another, must be undertaken.

The report submitted by ATC shows the cost of extensions, alterations and refurbishment, including underpinning of Mulberry House to come to a total cost of £827,000. Demolition and rebuilding of Mulberry House, re-using the original material and locating the building in the same place on the plot, would cost £629,000. Although financial issues are not usually a conservation or planning consideration, in this case, the character of the Pinner Hill Conservation Area will be preserved because there will be no change, once the works have been completed. Therefore whilst the existing building provides a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, its demolition and reconstruction with the same building would provide an equal contribution and would ensure that the character of the Conservation Area is preserved.

### **3) Residential Amenity**

As the proposal involves the reconstruction of the existing dwelling along with an already approved side extension, there is no concern that the proposed additions would pose a detrimental impact for any adjoining neighbours. Nevertheless it is highlighted that due to the size of the plots in the locality, there would be ample horizontal separation from neighbouring dwellings, thus there is no concern that the proposed development would pose a detrimental impact for any adjoining neighbours.

continued/

**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.

---

**136 SUSSEX RD, HARROW**

**2/19**

**P/2854/04/DFU/MRE**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION; REAR DORMER.

S S & PARTNERS for MR S O AHMAD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 414/03/1B 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 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s) shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 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:

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

---

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

1. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

Details of this application are reported to Committee following the submission of petition comprising the names of 12 neighbouring occupiers.

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

None.

### b) Site Description

- Two storey, semi-detached property on the northern side of Sussex Road with an original gabled roof.
- Front building line of applicant's dwelling set approximately 1m in front of adjacent dwelling at No.138.
- No.138 has a single storey side to rear extension abutting boundary with applicants property.
- Adjoining dwelling, at No.134 also has an original gabled roof.
- Property set back 3.5m from public highway.

### c) Proposal Details

- A significant amount of the proposed scheme was granted planning permission in July 2003. The only additional elements to this scheme beyond that which has already gained planning permission is a proposed rear dormer and a minor alteration to the rear extension.

### d) Relevant History

P/1194/03/DFU	Two storey side and single storey rear extensions	GRANTED 03-JUL-2003
P/1747/04/DFU	Two storey side, single storey rear extension, rear dormer.	REFUSED 19-AUG-2003

### e) Notifications

	Sent	Replies	Expiry
2005	4	2	23-FEB-
		(1 x Petition, 12 names)	

**Summary of Responses:** Considers sunlight to their property would be obstructed by proposed dormer window. Considers loss of privacy would occur by way of dormer overlooking rear garden. Has no objection to principle of loft extension, of smaller size. Addressing the overall development, considers scheme to be over intensive use of site. Would dominate the street and be out of character. Potential intensification of site could increase parking problems. Considers there would be a loss of light to No.138 by way of proposed two-storey side extension and rear dormer. Considers loss of privacy would occur at No's.142, 140, 138 & 134 by way of additional windows.

Cont...

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Visual and Residential Amenity

#### **Two Storey Side Extension (Planning permission still active - Granted 03-JUL-2003)**

The scheme proposes the construction of a two-storey side extension to attach to the western flank of the dwelling. The extension would span the property's side plot, abutting the flank boundary to a width of 2.9m.

At first-floor a set back of 1m is proposed to the front. In accordance with the Council's guidelines, it is considered that the 1000mm first-floor set back would be sufficient in retaining the visual significance of the front corner of the original dwelling. It is proposed that the roof be subordinate with a gabled end. The use of a subordinate roof would, it is considered, secure an adequate visual break between original and additional elements. While the construction of a gabled end over a two storey side addition would not normally be appropriate, it is considered to be acceptable in this instance due to this and the adjoining semi having original gabled roofs. The provision of a gabled extended roof is therefore deemed to be in keeping with the character of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Also, an adequate visual break will be retained between this and adjacent pair of semis to the east as neither dwellings (No.134 & 132) can extend to the side, retaining the 2m spacing between the dwellings. The adjacent dwelling to the applicant's, at No.138 has no side extension at first-floor level. In the possible event of this future development it is considered that the provision of a 1m set back at first floor with a hipped roof over would be sufficient in retaining a visual break between the two pairs of semis on this side.

At first-floor level the extension would run down the flank boundary to terminate level with the rear main wall of the dwelling. Accordingly, it is considered that the extension would have any effect on light to, or outlook from, the rear habitable room windows of this neighbouring property. It is also considered that there would be no unreasonable overshadowing of the neighbouring garden, nor that the proposal would appear unduly bulky or obtrusive when viewed from this neighbour's rear amenity space.

#### **Single Storey Rear Extensions (Planning permission still active for the element abutting the boundary with No.134 - Granted 03-JUL-2003)**

Two separate elements are proposed to adjoin an existing rear element, approximately central to the plot.

The resultant overall rear development would span the entire plot width, abutting both boundary lines, to a width of 8.9m. The element abutting the easterly flank boundary with No.134 would project 3m beyond the section of rear wall on this side and hence beyond that of the adjoining dwelling with it not having been extended to the rear. This element of the scheme is unchanged from the granted scheme – 03-JUL-2003.

Cont...

The proposed rear element on the opposite flank boundary with No.138 would project 2.85m beyond the original rear wall on this side. No.138 has a single-storey side to rear extension abutting this boundary line. The proposed element would project approximately 0.1m beyond the adjoining extension. This adjoining extension has a kitchen window spaced approximately 0.8m from the boundary and hence the proposed 0.1m overhang would not cause any degree of overshadowing on this window. With the roof being to 2.7m in this overhanging section, below that of the adjoining extension it is considered that no detrimental impact would be imposed on the amenity at the rear of No.138.

### **Rear Dormer**

The proposed dormer window would be situated in the rear slope of the of the dwelling's original gabled roof. The dormer would be sited 500mm from the existing roof edge, 500mm from the party wall and 1m from the roofs eaves. The dormer would be 5.3m in width and 1.9m in height to 0.5m below the ridge of the roof.

The westerly edge of the dormer window would be spaced approximately 3.3m from the flank boundary with No.138 to which the extended gabled roof would extend. Sitting in an overall roof width of 9m with a gabled end it is considered that the 5.3m wide dormer, sited appropriately above the roof eaves and below the roof ridge would be sufficiently subordinate to the roof. It is deemed the roof extension would not dominate the dwelling or impair its proportions and hence would not appear overbearing or unreasonably obtrusive as viewed from adjacent rear gardens. The revised proposal has been significantly reduced in bulk from the previous 8m-width proposal (Refused Planning Permission 19-AUG-2004) and is considered to be more sympathetic than the creation of two separate dormers spanning the entire roof width.

The nature of the proposed rear dormer means it will potentially overlook the neighbouring properties. Existing boundary treatments will not significantly reduce this potential overlooking, but given the proposals compliance with guidance in sufficiently recessing the dormer back from the roof eaves this is not considered to be significant or unreasonable.

## **2. Consultation Responses**

S P Sharma, 134 Sussex Road

It was considered the reduced dormer was not unreasonably bulky in relation to the overall extended roof size and would be sited appropriately in the roof so as to sufficiently reduce potential for overshadowing. The amount of glazing proposed is to a standard level and was considered to not be unreasonable.

Cont...

R Chaudhary, 138 Sussex Road

Main objections concerned elements of scheme which have been permitted planning permission. Regarding the objection concerning the proposed rear dormer it was considered that the dormer, being sited 3.3m away from the flank boundary with No.138, would raise no issue of unreasonable overshadowing.

**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.

---

**34 BROOKSHILL AVENUE, HARROW**

**2/20**

**P/779/05/CFU/RJS**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

REAR CONSERVATORY

ANGLIAN HOME IMPROVEMENTS for MR D BRAND

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS, 099/31845 Sheet 1 of 4 through 4 of 4 inclusive

**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 west flank elevation (3 windows) of the conservatory hereby approved shall be fitted with solid fixed panels and shall thereafter be retained in that form.  
REASON: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

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

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

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character  
Green Belt

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- the site is located on the northern side of Brookshill Avenue, west of the junction with Clamp Hill

continued/

Item 2/20 – P/779/05/CFU continued.....

- the building is a two storey semi-detached dwelling
  - the dwelling has been extended after the period in which it was originally constructed
- c) **Proposal Details**
- construct a rear conservatory in the space between the single storey flat roof garage and the west side boundary
  - the conservatory would have a dept of 3.5m, would be sited 0.8m from the west side boundary and the conservatory would have an eave height of 2.3m and ridge height of 3.1m
- d) **Relevant History**  
None
- e) **Notifications**
- |  |      |         |           |
|--|------|---------|-----------|
|  | Sent | Replies | Expiry    |
|  | 2    | 1       | 04-MAY-05 |

**Response:** No specific objection to the plans, however understand that there is issue with regard to a 'glass' perimeter wall that abuts my property, the wall in question would be mainly viewed by family where the preference is for glass and not brick wall, there is currently a dividing wall separating the properties which stands some 2m or more high, another higher wall would be overbearing and out of character.

## APPRAISAL

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

Although the site is located within the Green Belt it is highlighted that Hilltop Way does not have the typical appearance of Green Belt land due to its somewhat suburban character of two storey semi-detached dwellings. With respect of the extension of dwellinghouses, Green Belt policies aim to restrict the increase in size of dwellings within the Metropolitan Green Belt, in order to safeguard its openness. However as highlighted above, the locality is not typical of Green Belt land. Likewise many of the dwellings within the street have had extensive additions undertaken. The building has been previously extended with a two storey side extension.

With respect to the openness of the Green Belt it is highlighted that the proposal is to infill the space between the rear wing and side boundary with a single storey conservatory. As such this would not block any significant views across the property nor amount to a reduction of the openness of the Green Belt land. The percentage increase for footprint, floor area and volume are as follows:-

	Original	Existing	% increase over original	Proposed	% increase over original
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	73.75	81.00	9.8	94.00	27.5

continued/

With respect of the above percentages, it is highlighted that the original dwellinghouse was quite small in size and the proposal represents a modest addition to the building. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would not detrimentally impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

**2) Residential Amenity**

It is noted that the immediately adjoining neighbour to the west has raised no objection to the proposed conservatory and additionally would prefer a glazed wall rather than brick to face his property. Nevertheless Supplementary Planning Guidance states at C.6: "Conservatories sited within 3 metres of a boundary would normally be required to have a brick flank wall or be finished with solid panels, to avoid any overlooking or perception of overlooking". As it is considered that there are no material circumstances that would justify the setting aside requirements of Policy C6 of Harrow's Supplementary Planning Guidance, a condition of approval would require that the flank elevation be fitted with solid fixed panels and thereafter retained in that form.

With respect of siting, as the conservatory is sited 0.8m from the common boundary and includes splayed corners, the depth of 3.5m is considered reasonable. Additionally its maximum height of 3.1m, with eave height of 2.3m is well below the average height of 3m. Accordingly it is considered that the proposed conservatory would not pose any detrimental impact for any person or property.

**3) Consultation Responses**

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 grant.

INSTALLATION OF 3 ANTENNAE ON TOP OF EXISTING TOWER. THREE EQUIPMENT CABINETS AND FEEDER GANTRY

M SMITH - SITE SOLUTIONS for NTL BROADCAST

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: DO.P2-24602 Sht.1 of 1 Rev.1 and DO.E1-01149 Sht.1 of 1

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Noise from Plant and Machinery

### **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:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D24 Telecommunications Development
- 

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

- 1) Compliance with ICNERP
  - 2) Visual Amenity/Character of the Area
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- existing radio mast tower located off Wolverton Road, Old Church Lane, Stanmore
- structure is 19.6m in height (to the top of the tallest antenna attachment)
- radio mast tower is located on a parcel of land that is adjacent to the car park and clubhouse of Stanmore Golf Club
- site bounded on north and west sides by 2.4m high palisade fence and screened by tree belt to north boundary and intermittent vegetation to golf club car park

continued/

Item 2/21 – P/1139/05/CFU continued.....

- nearest residential properties sited 40m away in Wolverton Road, behind substantial buildings and the old Belmont railway
- further residential properties at a further distance to north west, north and north east of at least 60m away

**c) Proposal Details**

- install 3 x 0.9m tall 'Dual Polar' antennas on a 'rocket' extension to the existing radio mast tower
- the 3 antennas would each measure 0.9m in length and would be attached to the mast, via a pole mount attached to the centre of the existing tower. The pole mount with antenna attached would extend up to a height of 21.6m, being 2m taller than the existing structure
- the antenna re proposed for the transmission of wireless broadband
- install 1 x broadband equipment cabinet (1000mm x 470mm x 1000mm) adjacent to the base of the existing tower
- install 2 x broadband equipment cabinets (770mm x 980mm x 2175mm) adjacent to the base of the existing tower
- install associated cabling and ancillary equipment

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/803/95/FUL	20 M. mast with 6 antennae, 6 amplifiers, 1 x 0.6 m. dish with 2 cabins, meter cabinet, chain link fence & minor works	GRANTED 12-FEB-96
EAST/124/96/FUL	20m lattice tower,6 antennas 6 amplifiers, 1 x 0.6 metres dish with 2 cabins, meter cabinet,2m fence, minor works	GRANTED 08-MAY-96
EAST/1076/99/DTD	Determination: Equipment cabin and cabinet, 1 dish antenna and 3 sector antennae	PERMISSION NOT REQUIRED 25-NOV-99
EAST/547/00/FUL	6 polar antenna and four dishes on existing mast and additional equipment cabin	GRANTED 24-JUL-00
EAST/853/00/DTD	Determination of telecommunications equipment cabin	GRANTED 13-SEP-00
EAST/953/00/DTD	Determination: three replacement equipment cabinets and three additional equipment cabinets	GRANTED 28-SEP-00

continued/

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Site share request for the transmission of wireless broadband
- Proposal is to install three dual polar antennas at a height of 20.7 – 21.6m supported by a 'rocket' extension to the existing tower. The intended antennas are designed to be mounted in a compact, slim-line fashion which will minimise the impact of visual intrusion
- It is necessary to install the antenna system above the tower as there are no available apertures lower down on the structure that would meet the necessary technical requirements of the service

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
84

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
10-JUN-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Compliance with ICNERP**

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

**2) Visual Amenity/Character of the Area**

The proposed works are relatively minor, in that they encompass the addition of 3 x 0.9m tall antennas attached to a single, centrally sited pole, mounted on the existing radio mast tower. The existing telecommunications mast has a height of 19.6m to the top of the highest facility mounted on the structure. The proposed facility would be centrally mounted, and would extend an additional 2m in height up to 21.6m. As the facility being proposed is to be centrally mounted and of a narrow slim-line design, it would give it the general appearance of a lightning spike or radio transmitting beacon. Although it would be visible to the top of the existing structure, as it encompasses 3 x 0.9m tall antenna attached to a single mount, it is considered that it would not result in visual bulk, nor an unreasonable proliferation of telecommunications facilities. Furthermore, the dual location of telecommunications and sharing of existing masts and facilities is specifically encouraged by Planning Policy D24 of the Adopted 2004 UDP. The Policy in this capacity seeks to avoid the potential proliferation of individual telecommunications masts if co-location were not encouraged. For these reasons it is considered that the proposed mounting pole and antennas have been designed so as to minimise visual impact and would not compromise the character of the locality.

With respect of the proposed equipment cabinets, these are relatively small facilities that would be installed at ground level adjacent to the base of the telecommunications tower. Therefore they would blend in with the existing facilities and would also not compromise the character of the locality.

**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.

INFILL OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AREA TO FORM ADDITIONAL 360 SQ. METRES OF OFFICE SPACE AT FRONT OF CIVIC 1 BUILDING

WORLD VISUAL for LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 00/01, 00/02

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Disabled Access - Buildings

## **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
- 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
- C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

1. Effect on the Appearance and Character of the Building and the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9, D10)
  2. Accessibility and Community Services (C16)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	
Site Area:	360 sqm	
Council Interest:	Council Offices	

### b) Site Description

- the Civic Centre is a complex of flat roofed rectangular buildings that have their frontage on Station Road. The buildings are interspersed with shallow watercourses and have broad, open car parking areas at the front and rear of the site.

### c) Proposal Details

- it is proposed to provide an extension to the Council's reception service area by infilling and under croft that is part of the ground floor frontage. It provides a circulation area within the central core of the building.
- the exterior cladding for the office would be double glazed aluminium framed window sections.
- the proposal is part of an initiative to improve the Council's service delivery to customers. The office would be a 'one-stop shop' and contact centre in an ideal location.

### d) Relevant History

None.

e) <b>Advertisement:</b>	Section 65 Notification		Expiry 05-JUL-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 05-JUL-05

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. The Effect on the Appearance and Character of the Building and of the Area**

The transparent, lightweight character of the proposed development would maintain the good balance between buildings and spaces that is a feature of the site and its setting. As such, the proposal complies with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for the siting and setting of development to respect the character of the area and to maintain the public realm. With regard to the latter, this is particularly important, as the Civic Centre is a prominent site and the Council's chief building and busiest point of contact with members of the public.

As the proposal is an infill scheme, no changes to existing building lines or off street parking facilities would occur, although pedestrian access to the courtyard would no longer be possible.

### **2. Accessibility and Community Services**

The extension will be fully accessible and details of access to the unit for people with disabilities are to be submitted for approval under Part M of the Building Regulations, taking into full account the legal obligations of service providers under Part III of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

### **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.

INFILL OF EXISTING GROUND FLOOR AREA TO FORM ADDITIONAL 247 SQ. METRES OF OFFICE SPACE AT FRONT OF CIVIC 1 BUILDING

CAPITA for LONDON BOROUGH OF HARROW

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: ARP(PL)01, ARP(PL)02, ARE(PL)03, ARE(PL)04, A(PL)05.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Disabled Access - Buildings

## **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
- 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
- C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

1. Effect on the Appearance and Character of the Building and the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9, D10)
  2. Accessibility and Community Services (C16)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard: Justified: Provided:	See Report
Site Area:	247 sqm	
Council Interest:	Council Offices	

### b) Site Description

- the Civic Centre is a complex of flat roofed rectangular buildings that have their frontage on Station Road. The buildings are interspersed with shallow watercourses and have broad, open car parking areas at the front and rear of the site.

### c) Proposal Details

- it is proposed to provide an extension to the Council's reception service area by infilling and undercroft that is part of the ground floor frontage. It provides a circulation area within the central core of the building.
- the exterior cladding for the office would be double glazed aluminium framed window sections.
- the proposal is part of an initiative to improve the Council's service delivery to customers. The office would be a 'one-stop shop' and contact centre in an ideal location.

### d) Relevant History

None.

### e) Consultations

Access Officer: Advice is given on the need for the proposed reception area to be fully accessible in compliance with Part M of the Building Regulations 2004, BS8300; 2001 and on the legal obligations of service providers under Part III of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995.

**Advertisement:** Section 65 Notification Expiry  
05-JUL-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
4 0 05-JUL-05

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. The Effect on the Appearance and Character of the Building and of the Area**

The transparent, lightweight character of the proposed development would maintain the good balance between buildings and spaces that is a feature of the site and its setting. As such, the proposal complies with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for the siting and setting of development to respect the character of the area and to maintain the public realm. With regard to the latter, this is particularly important, as the Civic Centre is a prominent site and the Council's chief building and busiest point of contact with members of the public.

As the proposal is an infill scheme, no changes to existing building lines or off street parking facilities would occur. Pedestrian access to the courtyard at the rear of the site would be maintained because the area around the two columns that are referred to in the elevation drawings as J, H and G, are not included in the proposal.

### **2. Accessibility and Community Services**

Details of access to the unit for people with disabilities are to be submitted for approval under Part M of the Building Regulations.

### **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.

---

**ORMONT, 50 HARROW PARK, HARROW**

**2/24**

**P/762/05/DFU/KMS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

REPLACEMENT DWELLINGHOUSE AND  
DOUBLE GARAGE WITH ROOM OVER

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for MR KOCHHAR

---

**ORMONT, 50 HARROW PARK, HARROW**

**2/25**

**P/778/05/DCA/KMS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT:  
DEMOLITION OF HOUSE AND  
OUTBUILDINGS

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for MR KOCHHAR

---

P/762/05/DFU

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground surfacing
  - (c) the boundary treatmentThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 3 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of a privacy screen to be fitted to the north west edge of the first floor balcony have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screen shall be installed before the development is occupied and shall thereafter be permanently maintained.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 4 Levels to be Approved (REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the Conservation Area)
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
- 7 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 8 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 9 PD Restriction - Classes A to F

continued/

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 4 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
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - T13 Parking Standards
- 

P/778/05/DCA

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107

**GRANT** Conservation Area 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 Levels to be Approved
- 3 The demolition hereby permitted shall not be undertaken before a contract for the carrying out of the works of redevelopment of the site has been made, and planning permission has been granted for the development for which the contract provides.  
REASON: To protect the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 4 Demolition - Making Good

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 36 – Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 4 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:

- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
  - D14 Conservation Areas
- 

continued/

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Demolition of Existing Dwelling (SD2, D14)
  - 2) Impact of Proposed Dwelling on Character of Area (SD2, SD2, D4, D5, D15)
  - 3) Residential Amenity
  - 4) Protected Trees
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

Details of these applications are reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character:

Conservation Area: Harrow Park

TPO

Car Parking

Standard:	1.8 max.
Justified:	See report
Provided:	5

No. of Residential Units: Existing: 1 Proposed: 1

Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- detached single storey dwelling with extensive amenity area to front
- area behind dwelling is heavily wooded, as are boundaries, creating sense of seclusion
- neighbouring dwellings 'Pinewood House', 'Kennet End' and 'Julien Way' are also set in extensive plots
- site has two separate accesses: one from Harrow Park; and one from Julian Hill serving two detached garages
- levels fall towards north, east and south. 'Pinewood House' and 'Julian Way' are higher whilst 1-5 'Kennet House' and 'Kennet End' are lower
- site contains protected trees (TPO 796)

### c) Proposal Details

- it is proposed to demolish the existing single storey dwelling and construct a 2-storey dwelling on an extended footprint
  - both the existing detached garages would be demolished and replaced by a single detached garage
  - the principle outlook of the new dwelling would be to the south east across the extensive front garden, although all elevations would include windows to habitable rooms
  - the first floor windows would take the form of dormers with those to the south east and south west elevations featuring French windows giving access to balconies
  - the dwelling would feature three front gables and one rear gable
  - a raised terrace would be provided to the front of the dwelling
  - the access from Harrow Park would be widened with the driveway extending around the side and rear of the dwelling where a parking and turning area would be provided
- continued/

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections to removal of existing building which is of no particular interest. New house would not be that visible and likely to have little impact. Also high quality scheme.

EH: Do not wish to make any representations.

**Advertisement**

P/762/05/DFU	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 29-APR-05
P/778/05/DCA	Demolition in Conservation Area	Expiry 29-APR-05

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 12	Replies 4	Expiry 29-APR-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Response:** Loss of trees, overlooking/loss of privacy, demolition of existing bungalow, safety issues due to construction traffic, noise and disruption during construction, location of proposed steps

Harrow Hill Trust: Concerned with loss of tree cover to enable construction of turning circle.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Demolition of Existing Dwelling**

UDP policy D14 states that “the Council will seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas by seeking to retain buildings that are important to the character and appearance of the area” and that “there will be a presumption against the demolition of buildings which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. If a building makes a neutral contribution, its value will be assessed against any proposed redevelopment.”

The existing building comprises a single storey dwelling which according to map evidence, appears to date at least from 1864, and may have originally been an outbuilding to Julian Hill, which is now in separate ownership from this site. However, it appears to have undergone significant alteration in the 1920s and again in 1972. The dwelling’s present front elevation relates to the 1920s alterations. The result of the alterations is that the dwelling is considered to have little architectural merit and although it may once have reflected the form of development in the surrounding area (large houses in large plots with outbuildings) this is no longer the case, and it is not considered to have landmark quality. Consequently, the existing dwelling does not meet any of English Heritage’s eight criteria for assessing whether or not an unlisted building makes a positive contribution to the special architectural or historic interest of the Conservation Area.

continued/

**2) Impact of Proposed Dwelling on Character of Area**

The proposed dwelling would occupy an almost identical position within the extensive plot as the existing dwelling. It would include five main bedrooms (two at ground floor level and three at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level), three of which would have en-suite facilities, a combined family / sitting / dining area, and a separate breakfast room. In addition, housekeepers accommodation would be provided in a basement area beneath the north eastern portion of the dwelling. A detached garage would be built on the site of the existing garages, with access from Julian Hill. The proposed dwelling would have a footprint of c.390 sq. m which is considered to represent a modest increase compared with the c.358 sq. m footprint of the existing dwelling. Although the proposed dwelling would include windows in all four elevations with its main entrance in the north west elevation, the principle outlook from the living areas would be over the extensive amenity area to the south east. The proposed ground floor terrace and two of the three balconies at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level would also look out over this area.

Architecturally, the use of dormers for all of the first floor windows contributes significantly to the proposed dwellings relatively low overall form. It is considered that this combined with the positioning of the dwelling within the secluded site would enable the proposed dwelling to respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Whilst, the front and rear gables are clearly a modern interpretation of traditional building styles, it is considered that they would make a positive contribution to the overall development. Although the overall bulk of the detached garage would be significantly greater than the bulk of those it is to replace, due largely to the provision of gardeners accommodation in its roof., it would be well screened by the existing vegetation and would not therefore be unduly prominent.

In terms of parking provision, the recently adopted UDP sets a maximum of 1.8 parking spaces for dwellings of five or more habitable rooms. The proposals indicate provision for five spaces, one in the detached garage accessed from Julian Hill, and four on the parking and turning area accessed from Harrow Park. Whilst it is acknowledged that this level of provision exceeds the current maximum standards, it represents an increase of just one space over and above the existing provision, and is not therefore considered unacceptable. In addition, the proposed turning area would allow vehicles to enter and exit the site in forward gear, with consequent benefits for road safety.

**3) Residential Amenity**

In terms of residential amenity, the proposed dwelling would be sited no closer to the neighbouring properties than the existing dwelling and is not considered to have an overbearing impact in relation to those properties. Further, given that the nearest windows to the north eastern boundary, would be 17m away, and would face an area which is visible from the public domain, a refusal on grounds of overlooking in relation to Kennet End would not be justified. However, the provision of a 1<sup>st</sup> floor balcony on the south west elevation would allow some overlooking of the rear garden of Pinewood House. The impact of this overlooking would however be largely mitigated by the change of levels which occurs along the boundary between the application site and Pinewood House which is at a significantly higher level than the application site.

continued/

The remaining element of direct overlooking which would occur from the north western end of the balcony could be eliminated by the erection of a privacy screen, which if sympathetically designed, would not detract from the appearance of the proposed dwelling. A condition to this effect is suggested.

**4) Protected Trees**

The site is subject to TPO 796 and no protected trees are within the footprint of either the proposed dwelling, or the detached garage. However, the submitted plans show that a total of 11 protected trees would be within the footprint of either the new driveway and turning area, or the raised terrace to the south east of the proposed dwelling, and all these trees are shown for removal. However, a tree survey submitted by the applicant's arboriculturalist suggests that these trees are of low visual value. The Council's trees officer has been consulted and commented that the proposals to fell these trees are acceptable.

The submitted plans suggest that the proposed widening of the entrance from 3.5m to 4.8m could be achieved without impacting on the existing trees. However, conditions relating to the protection of these and other trees within the vicinity of the proposed works that are to be retained, are recommended.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Safety issues due to construction - not valid planning considerations  
traffic, noise and disruption during  
construction

Location of proposed steps - the submitted plans do not show any  
proposals for new steps from Harrow Park,  
although the existing steps in this location  
are shown as being retained

Other issues dealt with 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, these applications are recommended for grant.

## SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

---

**43 SOUTH PARADE, MOLLISON WAY, EDGWARE**

**3/01**

**P/834/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: EDGWARE

TWO ANTENNAE ON FRONT ELEVATION, ONE  
EQUIPMENT CABIN AND ANCILLARY  
DEVELOPMENT

STAPPARD HOWES for VODAFONE LTD

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 46996B/001; 002; 003 Rev.B; 004 Rev.B; 005 Rev.B; SK1

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance and prominent siting would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the streetscene.

#### INFORMATIVES

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
  - D24 Telecommunications Development
- 

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Telecommunications Development (D24)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (D24, SD1)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- three storey property in retail parade on Mollison Way with estate agents on ground floor and flats overhead
- flat roof on parade with chimneys, satellite dishes and TV masts
- balcony on front elevation at second floor level of neighbouring property No. 42
- parapet over No. 44 South Parade
- upper floors of properties on parades at both sides of Mollison Way similar with most original features except for windows

**c) Proposal Details**

- two antennae mounted on the face of the building, between the top of the highest windows and the coping at flat roof level

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/834/05/CFU continued.....

- the antennae would be painted to match the brickwork
- 1.3 x 0.9 x 1.92m equipment cabin, colour olive green, to be sited in rear yard between main building and storage building at ground floor level

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/361/02/FUL Conversion of 1st and 2nd floor to 2 self- GRANTED  
contained flats 03-MAY-02

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Proposal represents the minimum harm to the visual amenity of the area and there are no sites which can accommodate the equipment with less environmental impact; antennae would be painted to match the existing building; the equipment cabinets are to be located to the rear of the building for minimal visual impact; a certificate confirming the compliance of the design with ICNIRP standards accompanies the application; the applicant would be happy to discuss options for planting.

**f) Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
65 5 24-MAY-05

**Summary of Responses:** Dangerous, hazardous to environment; occupant of 43 South Parade is misleading other tenants by saying his telephone line is slow; should be away from residential areas; radiation and radio waves; spoil outlook.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Telecommunications Development**

Policy D24 of the Harrow UDP states that proposals for telecommunications development will be considered favourably provided that certain criteria can be fulfilled.

The first consideration is whether any satisfactory and less harmful alternative is available within the area of coverage deficiency as identified by the operator. It was concluded by the applicant that this site was most appropriate in terms of coverage and for reasons of environmental and visual acceptability, having assessed 5 other possible sites which were not chosen due to siting too far from the search area and as owners/occupiers were not willing to accommodate the equipment.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. The proposed antennae are to be mounted on an existing building.

The site is not located in a Conservation Area nor is it a Listed Building and would not impinge on local views, landmarks or other structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

continued/

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves the mounting of two antennae on the face of the building. The antennae would be painted to match the brickwork in order to minimise visual impact. Nonetheless, it is considered that the proposal would be unduly obtrusive in terms of its impact on the streetscene given the prominent siting at third storey level. While many of the buildings on the North and South Parades at Mollison Way have aerials and chimneys on the roof, as well as a variety of signage and advertisements at ground floor level, the upper floors of these parades have remained largely as originally built. Although the windows have been replaced on most of the flats and some owners have painted the render around the French windows and the decorative panels between first and second floor, the general pattern of the parades upper floors has been retained. At regular intervals on both sides, a parapet wall and cornice feature spans across the top of a series of properties, one of these features is evident at the adjacent property No. 44. By introducing a new and alien feature, the proposed antennae would detract from the character and appearance of the shopping parade, and would appear cramped when viewed in conjunction with the surrounding architectural features in the short space between the windows and roof level. Indeed, the antennae would be all the more visible as there are no eaves to overhang and mask the structures.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. Although the proposal does not involve mobile phone antennae, the same ICNIRP considerations would apply. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the LPA should not consider the health aspects further.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed antennae would be unduly obtrusive in the streetscene due to the height above ground level and would result in a cramped appearance when viewed in conjunction with the architectural features of the upper floors of the shopping parade.

## **2) Residential Amenity**

The proposal would not impact on the amenity of residents in the area, given the height of siting above ground level. As the antennae would be sited above the windows for the flats at 43A and 43B South Parade, they would not result in loss of light or outlook to those properties. The distance of 36m to the facades of the flats at North Parade opposite would also be adequate in terms of separation and no undue impact would result.

Similarly, the new equipment cabin would be sited in the rear yard, between the main building and the rear storage building. Thus it would not be visible from the nearby properties at Lawrence Crescent and would blend in with the mixed pattern of extensions and other structures associated with the rear of the commercial properties in terms of outlook from the rear facing windows of the flats at South Parade. It is considered that the equipment cabin would be sited an adequate distance from the nearest residential properties in order to prevent noise disturbance, however were the full merits of the proposal considered to be acceptable this could also be ensured by condition.

continued/

Item 3/01 – P/834/05/CFU continued.....

Thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of safeguarding the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

**3) Consultation Responses**

See 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.

---

**3 BROADWAY PARADE, PINNER ROAD, NORTH HARROW**

**3/02**  
**P/1067/05/DVA/OH**  
Ward: HEADSTONE NORTH

VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF PLANNING  
PERMISSION WEST/521/93/FUL TO ALLOW  
RESTAURANT/TAKE-AWAY USE UNTIL 2.00AM  
(MONDAY-SUNDAY)

ANJUM NADEEM RAJA

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Site/Location Plan

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

- 1 The proposed variation of Condition 2 (WEST/521/93/FUL) to allow opening hours (until 2am) each day would result in increased disturbance and general activity at unsocial hours to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring residents.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

EP25 Noise

EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

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

- 1) Residential Amenity (EP25, EM25)
  - 2) Parking (T13)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee in accordance with Category 14 of the scheme of delegation agreed 7-9-2004

### **a) Summary**

Town Centre North Harrow  
Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- three storey mid-terraced building located on the western side of Pinner Road, close to the junction with Station Road
- located within North Harrow District Centre, within parade designated as primary shopping frontage

continued/

Item 3/02 – P/1067/05/DVA continued.....

- ground floor in use as a restaurant/takeaway, the remaining upper floors are residential
- on-street parking restricted (pay and display), public car park at the rear of the site

**c) Proposal Details**

- the application proposes a variation of condition 2 of planning permission WEST/521/93/FUL to allow opening of the premises to 2am each day compared to the current closing time of 11pm Monday to Saturday and 10.30pm on Sundays.

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/521/93/FUL	Change of use: Class A1 to A3 (retail to tea room/restaurant)	REFUSED 08-NOV-93 ALLOWED ON APPEAL
-----------------	---	--

Condition 2 of the Appeal Decision Notice states:

“The premises shall not be used other than between 0900 hours and 2300 hours, Mondays to Saturdays inclusive, and between 1030 hours and 2230 hours on Sundays, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.”

WEST/628/99/VAR	Variation of Condition 6 of planning permission WEST/521/93/FUL to allow opening up to 01.00hrs (Mon-Thu) and 02.00hrs (Fri, Sat & Sun)	REFUSED 21-SEP-99
-----------------	--	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed opening hours would give rise to additional activity, noise and disturbance at unsocial hours and would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties.”

**e) Applicants Statement**

- increasing customer demand for longer opening hours
- I understand there are other food shops open for long within the vicinity

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 11	Replies Awaited	Expiry 02-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Amenity**

It is proposed to change the opening hours of the “Chicken Cottage” restaurant/takeaway from the current 9-23.00 (Mondays to Saturdays), 10.30-22.30 (Sundays) to a closing time of 2am (Monday to Sunday).

continued/

The variation of this condition is considered to be unacceptable in relation to the amenity of neighbouring residents. It is considered that extending the opening hours of the restaurant/takeaway would be likely to cause unreasonable disturbance to the nearby residents, especially the occupiers of the flats above. It is considered that extending the hours three hours past the closing time of local public houses (11pm), compared to the current closing time would inevitably attract more patrons of the surrounding public houses to the “Chicken Cottage” restaurant, causing undue disturbance to the residents above at an unsocial hour. This is supported by policy EM25 whereby it states “Applications will be assessed on their merits, but where premises are close to residential properties... they will be particularly scrutinised... Where it is probable that unreasonable residential disturbance will occur from pedestrian or vehicular activity as a result of the use, either inside or outside the building, permission is unlikely to be granted.” There are no other examples of restaurants/takeaways within the vicinity of the site with late opening hours to the extent proposed.

**2) Parking**

There are ample parking spaces at the rear of the site within North Harrow public car park. Therefore there is no objection with regards to traffic or highway safety implications. However, additional activity in this car park as a result of the extended opening hours at this unsocial hour is considered to be unreasonable and would be inconsiderate to the residential neighbouring occupiers (in Cambridge Road and the flats above the shops on Broadway Parade).

**2) 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.

---

**NORTHWICK PARK HOSPITAL, WATFORD ROAD,  
HARROW, MIDDX, HA1 3UJ**

**4/01  
P/954/05/CNA/RJS**

Ward: Adj Auth - Area 1 (E)

CONSULTATION: ROOF EXTENSION TO OUTPATIENTS BUILDING

BRENT HOUSE for NWLH NHS TRUST FAO: GARY MUNN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 00\_001 rev-, 20\_201 rev-, 20\_202 rev-, 20\_203 rev-, 20\_204 rev-, 20\_210 rev- & 20\_211 rev-.

**RAISES NO OBJECTIONS** to the development set out in the application.

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Listed Building:	Not Listed
Conservation Area:	None
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- Northwick Park Hospital is located to the east side of Watford Road.
- The Hospital is bordered by the University of Westminster along its northern boundary.
- Watford Road forms the boundary between the Boroughs.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Construct an upper floor roof extension to the existing outpatients building.
- The upper floor extension would be attached to the building that is sited away from Watford Road
- The extension would be predominantly screened from Watford Road by a car parking building sited towards to the frontage of the site.

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

None.

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
1

Replies  
0

Expiry  
16-MAY-2005

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Visual Amenity**

It is highlighted that the proposed building extension is located well within the Hospital site and would not have any physical relationship or significant visual linkage with properties with the Borough of Harrow. The upper floor extension is proposed on a building that is sited well within the site and would be predominantly screened from view from Watford Road by virtue of buildings sited between it and the road frontage.

**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 raises no objection.