



# **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 7 SEPTEMBER 2005**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**7TH SEPTEMBER 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

7TH SEPTEMBER 2005

## INDEX

					Page No.
1/01	<b>BIRO HOUSE, TXU SITE &amp; ARCHES, STANLEY ROAD, SOUTH HARROW</b> REDEVELOPMENT: 1 BLOCK OF 3/5/6/7 STOREYS, 1 BLOCK OF 3/4-180 FLATS (51 AFFORDABLE); OFFICES; PARKING USE OF 11 ARCHES A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 USES (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	ROXBOURNE	<b>P/1233/05/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	1
1/02	<b>BROADFIELDS HOUSE, BROADFIELDS, HARROW</b> REDEVELOPMENT: TWO STOREY BLOCK WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF TO PROVIDE 12 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING	HEADSTONE NORTH	<b>P/1399/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	19
2/01	<b>THE FAT CONTROLLER, 362- 366 STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PERMISSION E/161/95/FUL TO PERMIT OPENING UNTIL 2.00A.M. ON THURSDAY, FRIDAY & SATURDAY NIGHT/FOLLOWING MORNING	GREENHILL	<b>P/1572/05/CVA/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	27
2/02	<b>73/75 WHITCHURCH LANE, EDGWARE, (1-2 PRETORIA VILLAS)</b> CONSTRUCTION OF 3 STOREY BLOCK OF 6 FLATS, CAR PARKING AND OUTBUILDING AT REAR (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	CANONS	<b>P/1700/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	30
2/03	<b>59 MOSS LANE, PINNER</b> CHANGE OF USE: NURSING HOME TO RESIDENTIAL (CLASS C2 TO C3)	PINNER	<b>P/1299/04/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	36

2/04	<b>PLOT 6, 25 KING HENRY MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: RAILINGS AND SCREEN TO ROOF TERRACE AT REAR	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/851/05/DLB/AB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	39
2/05	<b>PLOT 6, 25 KING HENRY MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> RAILINGS AND SCREEN TO ROOF TERRACE AT REAR	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/598/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	43
2/06	<b>4 KING HENRY MEWS, BYRON HILL ROAD, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/717/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	49
2/07	<b>FIRST FLOOR, PREMIER HOUSE, 38-40 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE</b> CHANGE OF USE OF 1ST FLOOR TO OFFICES (CLASS B1) AND/OR MEDICAL/ EDUCATIONAL SERVICES (CLASS D1)	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1264/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	56
2/08	<b>LAND AT THE R/O 1-3 CANADA PARK PARADE, COLUMBIA AVENUE, EDGWARE</b> REMOVAL OF CONDITION 13 OF PLANNING PERMISSION EAST/1277/01/FUL, SUBJECT TO PROVISION OF CAPITAL SUM FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING	EDGWARE	<b>P/1701/05/CVA/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	61
2/09	<b>269/271 STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 5 OF PERMISSION E/24/96/FUL TO ALLOW OPENING UNTIL MIDNIGHT SUNDAY TO WEDNESDAY AND 02:00 HOURS THURSDAY TO SATURDAY	GREENHILL	<b>P/1193/05/CVA/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	65
2/10	<b>HARROW SCHOOL, FOOTBALL LANE AND ADJOINING ACCESSWAYS, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> 4 AREAS OF ROAD WORKS INCLUDING BOLLARDS, BARRIERS AND CONTROL BOXES; HARDSURFACING & ALTERATIONS TO GARLANDS LANE (REVISED)	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/2942/04/DFU/OH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	68

2/11	<b>6 HAZELCROFT, PINNER</b> TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR; SINGLE STOREY FRONT, REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION (REVISED)	HATCH END	<b>P/1722/05/DFU/RM2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	75
2/12	<b>17 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE</b> SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/1801/05/CFU/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	80
2/13	<b>GREEN ISLAND LODGE, HILLSIDE RD, PINNER</b> PROVISION OF GATES AT ENTRANCES AND RESURFACING OF DRIVEWAY	PINNER	<b>P/1265/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	84
2/14	<b>18 BROOKSHILL AVENUE, HARROW</b> TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	HARROW WEALD	<b>P/1080/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	87
2/15	<b>46 STATION ROAD, NORTH HARROW</b> CHANGE OF USE AT GROUND FLOOR FROM ESTATE AGENTS (CLASS A2) TO RESTAURANT & CAFÉ (CLASS A3); CONVERSION OF FIRST & SECOND FLOOR OFFICES TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; EXTERNAL STAIRCASE AND ALTERATIONS AT REAR	HEADSTONE SOUTH	<b>P/1422/05/DFU/OH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	90
2/16	<b>LAND R/O 47-49 GAYTON RD, HARROW</b> TWO SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS, FORECOURT, PARKING AND ACCESS FROM NORTHWICK PARK ROAD (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	GREENHILL	<b>P/1591/05/DFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	96
2/17	<b>7 ABERDEEN ROAD, WEALDSTONE</b> CONVERSION OF HOUSE INTO 2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1283/05/DFU/JP2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	102

2/18	<b>HORSESHOE BAR, 326 EASTCOTE LANE, SOUTH HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION TO ALLOW OPENING MONDAY – THURSDAY 10:00 TO 01:00; FRIDAY & SATURDAY 10:00 TO 02:00; SUNDAY 11:00 TO 01:00	ROXBOURNE	<b>P/1702/05/CVA/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	106
2/19	<b>88-92 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE</b> CHANGE OF USE: ANCILLARY RETAIL TO RESIDENTIAL ON 1ST AND 2ND FLOORS TO FORM 7 FLATS, ALTERATIONS AND ENTRANCE AT GROUND FLOOR (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1036/05/CFU/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	109
2/20	<b>MARLBOROUGH SCHOOL, 81 MARLBOROUGH HILL, HARROW</b> SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO HALL, PROVISION OF NEW DOORS TO CLASSROOM BUILDING	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1784/05/CLA/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	114
2/21	<b>PLOTS 1, 2 &amp; 6, 88 HIGH STREET AND 19 &amp; 25 KING HENRY MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> ALTERATIONS AND CONVERSION OF THREE FLATS TO FORM ONE DWELLING	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1218/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	118
2/22	<b>49 BRANCKER ROAD, KENTON</b> TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR, SINGLE STOREY FRONT & REAR EXTENSIONS, REAR DORMER; CONVERSION TO 2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS	KENTON EAST	<b>P/774/05/DFU/AMH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	123
2/23	<b>FRESHFIELDS, 12 REENGLASS ROAD, STANMORE</b> 1ST FLOOR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE TWO STOREY HOUSE, SINGLE AND 2 STOREY REAR EXTENSION, FRONT PORCH, ALTERATIONS TO ELEVATIONS (REVISED)	CANONS	<b>P/1493/05/DFU/AMH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	126

2/24	<b>LAND AT 269 WATFORD ROAD, HARROW</b> DEMOLITION OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT DETACHED BUILDING TO ACCOMMODATE POOL AND GYM FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ADJACENT DWELLING HOUSE	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/136/05/CFU/RJS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	130
2/25	<b>REAR OF 7/9 VILLAGE WAY EAST, HARROW</b> SINGLE STOREY STORAGE BUILDING AND PARKING SPACES AT REAR	RAYNERS LANE	<b>P/1503/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	134
2/26	<b>CLOISTERS WOOD, WOOD LANE, STANMORE</b> PROVISION OF NEW GATES ACROSS ENTRANCE IN WOOD LANE	CANONS	<b>P/754/05/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	139
2/27	<b>120 OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE</b> REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY HOUSE WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF	BELMONT	<b>P/944/05/DFU/AMH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	145
2/28	<b>3 WELBECK ROAD, SOUTH HARROW</b> CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL TO HEALTHCARE SERVICES (GP DIRECT) WITH PLATFORM LIFT AT SIDE	WEST HARROW	<b>P/1055/05/DFU/OH</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	150
2/29	<b>99 ARUNDEL DRIVE, HARROW</b> CONVERSION OF DWELLING HOUSE TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS AND ONE HOUSE; PARKING AT FRONT AND REAR	ROXETH	<b>P/1475/05/DFU/KMS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	156
2/30	<b>258 TORBAY ROAD, HARROW</b> TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF EXTENDED BUILDING TO 3 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; PARKING AT REAR	RAYNERS LANE	<b>P/1126/05/DFU/KMS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	161
2/31	<b>44 COLLEGE HILL ROAD, HARROW WEALD</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PERMISSION E/254/02/FUL TO ALLOW NURSERY FOR 12 CHILDREN	HARROW WEALD	<b>P/1528/05/CVA/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	166



3/01	<b>246/248 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH END</b> REMOVAL OF CONDITION 5 OF PERMISSION W/8/02/FUL TO PERMIT USE OF OUTSIDE REAR AREA FOR DINING	HATCH END	<b>P/1234/05/CVA/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	170
3/02	<b>53-55 MOSS LANE, PINNER</b> CHANGE OF USE OF NO 55 FROM FLATS TO NURSING HOME (CLASS C3 TO C2) SINGLE/2 STOREY LINKED EXTENSION TO 53 & 55 FOR ADDIT BEDSPACES (REVISED)	PINNER	<b>P/874/04/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	174
3/03	<b>HIGHWAY LAND AT SUDBURY HILL, OPPOSITE SOUTH HILL AVENUE, HARROW</b> 8M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND EQUIPMENT CABINS	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1957/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	180
5/01	<b>LAND OUTSIDE 48 COURTENAY AVENUE, HARROW WEALD</b> DETERMINATION: 7.7M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS	HARROW WEALD	<b>P/1956/05/CDT/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	185
5/02	<b>JUNCTION OF SHAFTESBURY AVENUE/WELBECK ROAD, SOUTH HARROW</b> DETERMINATION: 8M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND 2 EQUIPMENT CABINETS	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/2021/05/CDT/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	188

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

1/01

**BIRO HOUSE, TXU SITE & ARCHES, STANLEY ROAD,  
SOUTH HARROW**

**P/1233/05/CFU/TEM**  
Ward: ROXBOURNE

REDEVELOPMENT: 1 BLOCK OF 3/5/6/7 STOREYS, 1  
BLOCK OF 3/4-180 FLATS (51 AFFORDABLE); OFFICES;  
PARKING USE OF 11 ARCHES A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2  
USES (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

REBEKHA JUBB for BARRATT HOMES LTD

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 04033/1, 12, 14, 35D, 36D, 37D, 38D, 39D, 40D, 41D, 42D, 43D, 44D, 48, 50A,  
51A, 52A, 53A, 54A, 55A, 57, 58, 59, 65, 66, 67, 70C, 71, 72C, BAR/40852/1A,  
2A

Inform the applicant that:

1. The proposal is acceptable subject to A) the direction of the Greater London Authority, and B) the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:-
  - i) developer shall fund all costs of public consultation, analysis, reporting and implementation of a possible extension to the local controlled parking zone, at any time within 3 years of 75% occupation of the development if, in the Council's opinion, a monitoring period shows unacceptable on-street parking, up to a maximum amount of £30,000 index linked.
  - ii) approval and implementation of a travel plan (to include an annual review) prior to occupation of the development.
  - iii) developer shall complete the approved conversion works to the arches and adjacent access way no later than the occupation of a maximum of 115 residential units on the site
  - iv) developer shall not commence the development or any part thereof unless and until:
    - a) details of off site foul and surface water drainage have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Sewerage Undertaker and
    - b) arrangements have been made to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Sewerage Undertaker for the provision of adequate foul and surface water drainage for the whole of the development. Such drainage should be secured where appropriate by means of a public sewer requisition pursuant to Sections 98 to 101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

continued/

- v) prior to the commencement of development, submission to and approval by the Local Planning Authority of a scheme which:-
  - a) provides a minimum of 51 units of affordable housing for rent in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (for future management by an RSL)
  - 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 in writing 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 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

2. A formal decision notice, subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued only upon the completion, by the applicant, 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 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 demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
  - (b) the boundaryof the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected 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.

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 8 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) 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.
- 9 Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 10 Before the development is commenced a detailed site investigation shall be carried out to establish if the site is contaminated, to assess the degree and nature of the contamination present, and to determine its potential for the pollution of the water environment. The method and extent of this site investigation shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) prior to commencement of the work. Details of appropriate measures to prevent pollution of groundwater and surface water, including provisions for monitoring, shall then be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before development commences. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved, and shall be fully implemented and completed before occupation of the development.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.
- 11 No soakaways shall be constructed in contaminated ground.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of groundwater.
- 12 The construction of the surface water drainage system shall be carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before the development commences.  
REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

continued/

- 13 Surface water 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 (in consultation with the Environment Agency) before development commences.  
REASON: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality.
- 14 Development shall not commence until details of on site drainage works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the sewerage undertaker. No works which result in the discharge of foul or surface water from the site shall be commenced until the on site drainage works referred to above have been completed.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory drainage facilities.
- 15 Water Storage Works
- 16 A schedule of improvement works to the appearance of the viaduct and spur, including a timetable for implementation of the works, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council before commencement of the development hereby approved. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved schedule.  
REASON: To improve the appearance of the development.
- 17 The development hereby approved shall not be commenced until details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory parking facilities.
- 18 The eleven units hereby permitted within the archways shall be restricted to occupation within the Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1, D1 and D2. Of the eleven units no more than 4 shall be operated as an A1 use and a total of no more than 2 as A3 or A4 uses without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure that there will be no detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of nearby A1, A3 and A4 uses within South Harrow Town Centre.
- 19 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of any external works required for ventilation and fume extraction have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use shall not commence until those external works have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. The works shall thereafter be retained in that form.  
REASON: To safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring residents and the appearance of the building.
- 20 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 21 Insulation of Buildings – 3
- 22 The development shall not commence until details of a communal and biomass heating system have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved system shall be installed in the development hereby approved and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.  
REASON: To ensure that the development minimises its carbon dioxide emissions and is compliant with London Plan policies 4A.7 and 4A.8.

continued/

INFORMATIVES:

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 4 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 5 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 6 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.  
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.
- 7 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.  
Contact Consents Department on 01707 632475 for further details.
- 8 Culverted watercourses should not be built over, but should ideally be opened up and a feature made of the site. The Agency should be consulted to discuss any such proposals. The applicant should note that under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act (1991) the prior written consent of the Agency is required for certain works which may affect the flow of an ordinary watercourse.  
Contact Development Control Officer, Lydia Bruce-Burgess on 01707 632402 for further details.
- 9 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approximately 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 10 Notwithstanding the granting of planning permission, the applicant is required to gain approval from the Council as Land Drainage Authority under Land Drainage By-laws for any development within 5m of the watercourse which crosses the site, and for any surface water discharges or indirectly into any watercourse in the Borough.
- 11 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:  
SEP1 Energy Use and Conservation  
SD1 Quality of Design

continued/

SD3	Mixed-Use Development
ST1	Land Uses and the Transport Network
SH1	Housing Provision and Housing Need
SH2	Housing Types and Mix
SC1	Provision of Community Services
SEM2	Hierarchy of Town Centres
EP7	Renewable Energy
EP8	Energy Conservation and Efficiency
EP12	Control of Surface Water Run-Off
EP14	Development within Areas at risk from Sewerage Flooding
EP22	Contaminated Land
EP25	Noise
EP48	Public Open Space
D4	Standard of Design and Layout
D5	New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
D6	Design in Employment Areas
T13	Parking Standards
T15	Servicing of New Developments
H4	Residential Density
H5	Affordable Housing
H6	Affordable Housing Target
H7	Dwelling Mix
EM5	New Large Scale Retail and Leisure and other Development
EM11	Regeneration Areas
EM12	Small Industrial Units and Workshops
EM14	Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Designated Areas
EM22	Environmental Impact of New Business Development
C2	Provision of Social and Community Facilities
Proposal Site 19	

---

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

- 1) Employment Issues (EM11, EM12, EM14, EM22, Proposal Site 19)
- 2) Retail/Town Centre/Community Policy Issues (SEM2, EM5, SD3, C2)
- 3) Affordable Housing (H5, H7)
- 4) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D6, SH1, H4)
- 5) Residential Amenity (SD1, SH1, D4, D5, EP25, EP48)
- 6) Access and Parking (ST1, T13, T15)
- 7) Drainage Issues (EP12, EP14, EP22)
- 8) Energy (SEP1, EP7, EP8)
- 9) Consultation Responses

---

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

This application was deferred from the meeting of 27th July 2005 for further discussions regarding issues raised by the GLA, and for a Members' Site Visit on 30th August 2005. The discussions have resulted in the following amendments to the proposals:- the provision of 51 units of affordable housing, all for rent; the deletion of a row of parking spaces behind houses in Stanley Road and the provision of amenity space in this area; the provision of some private gardens and a young children's play area at the eastern end of the site between Stanley Road and the Brember Road industrial estate; a reduction in the number of proposed parking spaces from 189 to 182. These amendments are detailed in the main body of the report.

In addition, a condition requiring a communal and biomass heating system is proposed at the suggestion of the GLA, which has confirmed that, at officer level, its previous concerns regarding the proposals have been allayed.

### **a) Summary**

Employment Area:	Industrial & Business Use		
Car Parking	Standard:	Residential:	242
		B1:	3 - 5
		A1-D2:	1-16
	Justified:	See Report	
	Provided:	Residential:	150
		B1:	10
		A1-D2:	22
Site Area:	1.1 ha		
Floorspace:	B1: 560m <sup>2</sup> : Biro House/TXU Site		
	A1-A4/B1/D1/D2: 509m <sup>2</sup> : Railway Arches		
Habitable Rooms:	489		
No. of Residential Units:	180		
Density:	163 dph 445 hrph		
Council Interest:	None		

### **b) Site Description**

- area of industrial land between Roxeth Green Avenue and Stanley Road within Brember Road B1, B2, B8 designated area, comprising:
  - Biro House, a vacant 2/3 storey high factory with ancillary offices at the southern end of the site, partly fronting onto Stanley Road and partly located at the rear of houses on the north side of Stanley Road, with access from Stanley Road
  - currently contains 372m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office accommodation plus 2137m<sup>2</sup> of B2 industrial accommodation
  - TXU site, an area of open undeveloped land to the north of Biro House, previously covered with trees and vegetation which have fairly recently been cleared
  - 11 railway arches beneath the elevated Piccadilly underground line with adjacent access and outbuildings, some in use for car related and storage businesses, others vacant, access from Stanley Road and Roxeth Green Avenue
  - truncated elevated railway spur from Piccadilly line which formerly provided rail access into TXU site projects partly over access land next to arches

continued/



Item 1/01 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

- site bounded by premises within the Brember Road Industrial Estate to the east; Roxeth Green Avenue, electricity sub-station and open land behind the Avenue to the north; housing beyond the railway viaduct to the west; and Stanley Road plus houses fronting onto Stanley Road to the south
- site located about 200m from South Harrow District Centre with access via footpath adjacent to railway line

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of all buildings on the site
- development of 180 flats, 560m<sup>2</sup> B1 office floorspace, and 509m<sup>2</sup> of optional A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 floorspace in following form:
  - 3/4 storey building rear of 94-108 Stanley Road containing 20 flats with roof terrace and play area
  - 3/5/6/7 main building on remainder of Biro House/TXU site to provide 180 flats plus 560m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office floorspace on ground, first and second floors, mostly in 3-storey arch block over access road into site
  - 5/6/7 storey elevation facing railway arches, roof terraces at fifth and sixth floor levels
  - 6/7 storey rear wing across centre of site linking into 5 and 6 storey component adjacent to industrial estate
  - brick and rendered elevations, membrane roof system
  - insertion of pod into each railway arch with glazed frontage to provide 509m<sup>2</sup> of optional A1/A2/A3/A4/B1/D1/D2 floorspace
  - improvement of access in front of arches to provide a new pedestrian thoroughfare between Stanley Road and Roxeth Green Avenue, while retailing elevated railway spur
  - 139 parking spaces in basement beneath main building, plus 21 spaces at ground level, all accessed from Stanley Road
  - 22 spaces in front of arches, 5 accessed from Stanley Road, 17 from Roxeth Green Avenue
  - 51 affordable housing units proposed, all for rent comprising 17 x 1 bed x 2 habitable rooms, 23 x 2 bed x 3 habitable rooms, 11 x 3 bed x 4 habitable rooms, including 6 wheelchair units
  - overall mix of units comprises 62 x 1 bed x 2 habitable rooms, 107 x 2 bed x 3 habitable rooms, and 11 x 3 bed x 4 habitable rooms
  - 1280m<sup>2</sup> amenity space in centre of main building, plus 360m<sup>2</sup> behind Stanley Road
  - most flats with patios/balconies plus additional roof terraces, 4 private amenity areas behind 3-storey building adjacent to Brember Road industrial estate
  - scheme 'Resident Permit Restricted'

**d) Relevant History**

Biro House

WEST/557/99/FUL	Two detached 3 storey blocks to provide 24 x 2 bed flats with access and parking	APPEAL LODGED AGAINST NON-DETERMINATION
-----------------	--	---

APPEAL DISMISSED

10-JAN-2000

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

WEST/743/99/FUL	Two detached 3 storey blocks to provide 24 x 2 bed flats with access and parking	REFUSED 17-DEC-99
-----------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal would result in the loss of land for employment use contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.
2. The development, by reason of size, siting and bulk of buildings, and siting of the car park represents overdevelopment of the site which would have a prejudicial effect on the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3. The proposal fails to make provision for affordable housing, contrary to the Council's revised policy in this regard.
4. The proposals would be premature in advance of the findings of the South Harrow Study.
5. The proposals would result in an unsatisfactory relationship to the adjoining commercial development which would be detrimental to the amenities of the future residents.
6. The proposals would represent overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality.”

TXU & Biro House

P/978/03/COU	Outline: redevelopment to provide units for B1 (business) use and 55 live/work units with parking	GRANTED 11-JUL-03
P2519/03/COU	Outline: 190 residential units in 3-8 storey blocks, commercial units and community facilities (Revised)	CURRENT
P/327/04/COU	Outline: Redevelopment for 2808m <sup>2</sup> B1 (business use) and 100 live/work units (8072m <sup>2</sup> ) with parking (Revised)	REFUSED 26-APR-04

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent an overintensive use of the site detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

APPEAL ALLOWED: 30- NOV-04

Application Site

P/3337/04/CFU	Redevelopment: 1 block of 6/7 storeys, 1 block of 3/4/5 storeys to provide to provide 183 flats (53 affordable) offices and car parking, use of 11 arches for A1/A2/A3/D1 use	WITHDRAWN 07-MAR-05
---------------	---	------------------------

continued/

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Conclusions of Planning Support Statement
  - proposals represent comprehensive redevelopment of site to provide a sustainable mixed use development offering significant benefits for site and surrounding area
  - site in a highly sustainable location and an appropriate high density use for the site must be found. Proposal satisfies all policy objectives of The London Plan and the Harrow UDP. Principle of it being lost from industrial use is already established by previous consents for the site.
- in considering these proposals request that the Council recognise the full extent of benefits offered:
  - existing application site contains buildings that are unsightly and detract from visual amenity of the area;
  - buildings have been largely vacant for some years and a viable alternative use must be found;
  - proposals involve provision of much needed housing development including mix of affordable housing including low cost market housing and six very generous 3 bed flats, which constitutes 30% of the total units;
  - provision is made for replacement office floorspace to compensate for loss of the existing employment uses on the site;
  - change of use of the arches from uses inappropriate for a residential area to attractive mixed retail uses will provide vibrancy to the area;
  - proposals are at a high density, which is entirely appropriate for the area and makes efficient use of this previously developed site in a sustainable location;
  - opening up of a new wider and well lit walkway from Stanley Road to Roxeth Green Avenue will have numerous benefits for the permeability, safety and sustainability of the and the wider area
- conclusions of Transport Assessment
  - Transport Assessment has demonstrated that development proposals for the Biro House Site are acceptable when considering matters of transportation and accessibility
  - It has been demonstrated that proposals include suitable means of vehicular access to and from public highway while also providing appropriate facilities for access by non-car modes.
  - Development site layout has been designed to reduce car dominance and provide effective pedestrian linkage throughout the site, including the enhanced pedestrian/cycle route along the Railway Arches retail frontage.
  - Car parking on site provided for all land uses in accordance with appropriate standards as set out in the LBH UDP. Suitable provision made for car parking for disabled persons and these are located strategically on the site.
  - Appropriate consideration has been given to servicing needs of the development including access by refuse collection vehicles.
  - It has been demonstrated that while the development will increase traffic movements on Stanley Road, this will be from a very low base level. A series of junction analyses has been undertaken and it was confirmed that additional traffic could be accommodated within the capacity of the surrounding highway network and would not materially impact upon operation of the wider network.

continued/

- Report has demonstrated that predicted increases in traffic resulting from proposed mixed use development is not so significant when compared against potential industrial development on Biro House. Furthermore, such development would generate HGV traffic that would cause blocking which in turn would raise safety concerns regarding reversing of HGVs. Proposed mixed use development would generate very few HGV movements in Stanley Road and therefore would not create such problems.
- Report has reviewed the site existing accessibility to sustainable modes of travel. It has been determined that availability of London Underground services and a range of bus routes will promote and sustain the use of non-car modes. Further, it has been shown that proposals are in accordance with national and local sustainable transport policy guidance.
- application also accompanied by Ecological Appraisal including Bat Survey, Environmental Noise Survey, Design Statement, Landscape Design Statement, B2/B8 Business/General Industrial Market Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, Access Statement, Statement of Community Policy, Energy Report

**f) Consultations**

L.B. Hillingdon	No objections
L.B. Brent	Supports subject to concerns re affordable housing and design
Transport for London:	No objection
BAA:	No objection
EA:	Conditions suggested
TWU:	Conditions suggested
GLA:	See "INFORMATION"

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 30-JUN-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 1302	Replies 606 Expiry 16-JUN-05

**Summary of Responses:** Traffic problems and congestion; inadequate local road system; unsightly; eyesore; inadequate local infrastructure and services; increase in litter; traffic vibration and pollution; inadequate on-site parking; on-street parking; harm to character of area; excessive height; loss of light; overshadowing; overlooking, loss of privacy; overdevelopment; inadequate access; unsatisfactory access for emergency vehicles; based on experience would bring social problems; noise, disruption and congestion during construction; loss of industrial land; would increase rat-running traffic; population density already too high; should be limited to 3/4 storeys; light pollution; conflict with UDP; too much redevelopment in area; precedent; noise and disturbance; loss of trees and open space; unacceptable access from Stanley Road; new office space not required; would create inner city feel to area; road rage; support proposals; traffic impact on Roxeth Green Avenue; skyline would be changed; does not utilise modern technology to make development environment friendly; site not suitable or appropriate for proposed development.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Employment Issues**

The application site is identified for employment purposes in the UDP in the following ways.

It is shown as an Industrial and Business Use Area of the Proposals Map and Policy EM14 confirms that its loss from B1, B2 or B8 uses will be resisted.

The land falls within a Regeneration Area under Policy EM11 where comprehensive regeneration will be pursued and proposals creating new jobs will be encouraged.

Proposal Site 19 covers the Biro House and TXU elements of the site and proposes industrial redevelopment in conjunction with the neighbouring Brember Centre which is in Council ownership. Such redevelopment should not take place until a new access road linking the Brember Road Estate with Northolt Road had been provided (as shown on the Proposals Map) in order to remove industrial traffic from Stanley Road.

The Inspector in dismissing the appeal in 2000 in relation to application WEST/557/99/FUL for the residential redevelopment of Biro House considered the employment status of the land. He acknowledged that the buildings were last occupied in 1996 and there had been problems in letting the premises since 1994. He considered that the condition of the premises and the potential cost of refurbishment indicated that economic re-use of the buildings was unlikely. Notwithstanding these points, however, he considered 'that both visually and physically, the site forms an integral part of the Brember Road Industrial Estate.'

He concluded that, 'while the Brember Road Estate may not be a prime industrial site ... it has an important role to play in the overall economic health of the borough. In addition, approval of the appeal proposal would seriously hinder the Council's ability to revitalise the Estate... As such, the proposal would conflict with the UDP aims of safeguarding industrial and maintaining a range of employment opportunities.'

Although residential accommodation has been permitted on this site by virtue of permissions P/978/03/CFU and P/327/04/COU, it would be provided in the form of live/work units which would contain B1 floorspace.

In the case of P/978/03, 6,072m<sup>2</sup> of B1/C3 floorspace would be provided together with 2,808m<sup>2</sup> of B1 floorspace.

In the case of P/327/04, 8072m<sup>2</sup> of B1/C3 accommodation would be accompanied by 2,808m<sup>2</sup> of B1 floor area. The Inspector who granted this permission in November 2004 concluded that 'the proposed development would result in new job opportunities and help to regenerate the area, in accordance with strategic London policies and with Policies EM11 and EM12 of the Replacement UDP...'

These decisions support the employment allocation of the land.

continued/

Item 1/01 – P/1233/05/CFU continued.....

In order to obtain a commercial view the applicant has provided an assessment of the employment potential of the site, carried out by a local Estate Agent and Surveyor.

The report states that the demand for B2/B8 accommodation is driven by 3 main factors; accessibility, situation and suitability for purpose. There is demand for sites with good access to the road transport system with easy local access for HGVs, a lack of restrictions in terms of working hours or access resulting from proximity to a residential area, and buildings which are suitable for the purpose.

It states that there are current limitations in the demand for premises within the Borough due to poor local infrastructure.

By way of illustration it confirms that in May 2005 there were 55 vacant B2/B8 units in the Borough totalling 10,200m<sup>2</sup> accommodation. The report compares this figure with 7,762m<sup>2</sup> of vacant floorspace in 2002 as shown in the Employment Land Study carried out for the Council by Chestertons. There has therefore been an increase in vacant accommodation of 30% within the last 3 years.

The report further states that the lack of speculative development within the Borough in the last 5 year period reflects the lack of demand due to locational factors – largely infrastructure.

With regard to the application site the report concludes that the Council's proposal for speculative industrial redevelopment is unlikely to come forward given the poor immediate access and generally poor infrastructure in the Borough as a whole, and current availability of superior sites elsewhere in northwest/west London. Because of this it is likely that the accommodation on the site would remain redundant for a significant length of time with redevelopment for an industrial use unlikely, should it remain a designated industrial site.

In terms of the use of the site for B1 offices, the report states that South Harrow is very much a secondary/tertiary location for such use. Of the 361,000m<sup>2</sup> office stock within the Borough, 20,500m<sup>2</sup> (5.7%) is currently vacant, 4,000m<sup>2</sup> of which is in South Harrow.

The lack of demand for offices in South Harrow is reflected by Raebarn House being vacant and Templar House being converted to residential. The report concludes that 'as Harrow benefits from a strong supply pipeline of vacant office buildings and sites, it is unlikely that a developer would consider further speculative B1 office development as it is unlikely that such development would be easily occupied in whole or in part, in either the short or longer term or at an economically viable rent.'

Notwithstanding the above the current application seeks to respect the employment allocation of the Biro House/TXU site by proposing 560m<sup>2</sup> of B1 office floorspace, which the applicant states has a confirmed occupier. Assuming an area per employee of 15.1m<sup>2</sup> (Gerald Eve report 'overcrowded, under-utilised or just right?') some 37 jobs would be created, equating to the applicant's estimate of 35 jobs.

continued/

This provision would respect the employment allocation of the site. In addition, broad encouragement to the use of industrial land for housing development is given in a January 2005 addition to PPG3. The provision also within this mixed use scheme of housing accommodation would comply with this guidance and sustainable development principles as set down in policies S1 and SD3.

In the light of these considerations the employment component of the application is supported as part of a mixed use residential/employment development on the Biro House/TXU site.

In terms of the Arches, the proposals would create employment uses on this part of the site albeit that they would be different from the existing activities. The applicant estimates that up to 32 jobs could be provided compared with 10 at the moment. Given also that a major improvement in townscape terms would be provided which would benefit the setting of the development it is suggested that the employment implications for this area of the site be accepted.

**2) Retail/Town Centre/Community Policy Issues**

These issues relate to the various proposed uses for the railway arches which are intended to support the adjacent development as part of a comprehensive and sustainable scheme for this site.

In retail terms the proposals can be accepted provided that they would not harm the retail integrity of nearby South Harrow District Centre. A condition is therefore suggested to limit the number of arches in A1 use to a maximum of 4 and in A3/A4 uses to a maximum of 2, leaving 5 units available for other community/leisure/employment uses. The proposed community uses can be supported in principle in accordance with Policy C2.

**3) Affordable Housing**

The current proposal offers 51 units of affordable housing, which is 28% of total units and 30% of the total proposed habitable rooms.

The proposals offer the minimum percentage of affordable housing as required by Policy H5. The applicants have presented information to justify this on financial and viability grounds. This has been assessed by the Council and accepted as the maximum viable proportion of affordable housing to be provided taking into account the other significant regeneration contributions the proposal will make to the local area, including the regeneration of the railway arches and the creation of a public thoroughfare adjacent to the arches.

The affordable housing is to be provided for social rent and will therefore meet the highest priority housing needs in Harrow. The proposed mix allows for the provision of a significant number of large family flats, which meet the minimum (and in some cases exceed) space standards required by the Council. 10% of the flats will be to full wheelchair standard. No intermediate housing will be provided on this site as there are already schemes already completed or in the pipeline to provide intermediate housing opportunities for key workers and others in the local area.

continued/

The affordable housing units will be offered for ownership and management by an RSL approved by the Council.

The application has been reviewed by planning officers at the GLA who have now accepted the affordable housing proposals for the site.

**4) Appearance and Character of Area**

The site is within an area of mixed housing and commercial development. The majority of surrounding development is generally 2-storeys in height, although there is a 3-storey office block on the site, and higher buildings within 300m in Northolt Road. In addition, the railway viaduct is some 3 storeys in height. In the light of this, the Inspector who allowed the appeal in relation to P/327/04/COU concluded that blocks of 3, 4 and 6 storeys as shown on an illustrative drawing for mixed uses would not be out of scale or character with the area.

In terms of overall scale, this currently approved scheme allows for a total of 10880m<sup>2</sup> floor gross floorspace for the B1 and live/work units, only 2% less than the 11083m<sup>2</sup> area for the equivalent site proposed in this application.

In terms of density, the Inspector supported the provision of 100 live/work units on the land, within the density range in the London Plan for a suburban site within 10 minutes walking distance of a town centre. That range suggests that upper limits of 120 units per hectare and 350 habitable rooms per hectare would be appropriate. These limits are exceeded by these proposals which comprise 163 units per hectare and 445 habitable rooms per hectare.

Unlike the London Plan, however, UDP Policy H4 does not have a maximum density level but relies on other considerations such as design, character and amenity to ensure that an acceptable form of development is proposed while ensuring that the maximum contribution is made by each site to overall housing provision.

In terms of appearance, on the illustrative drawing which accompanied application P/327/04/COU the 6-storey elements were located some 30m from the Stanley Road frontage, with a 4-storey building in between.

In this application a 7-storey element is shown about 30m from Stanley Road, stepping down to 5 and then 3-storeys where it fronts onto the street.

This is considered to provide a satisfactory transition between the domestic scale of the immediate area and the provision of a higher rise form of development on the site as found acceptable by the Inspector. In addition, the sixth floor element is confined to the central part of the elevation facing the viaduct plus a slight return and has less direct impact on the streetscene. The provision of varied building heights as shown would give rise to a building of more interest and variety.

The 6-storey flank wall of the building would be sited over 40m from Roxeth Green Avenue providing sufficient separation distance to impact satisfactorily on the streetscene.

continued/



Views into the site would be largely screened by the arch block which, with frontage planting, would provide a distinctive entrance feature. The proposed pedestrian thoroughfare alongside the railway arches, together with the proposed improvement of the arch units, would significantly improve the appearance of the area, introduce activity and interest and complement the new residential development.

It is suggested therefore that overall an acceptable impact would be provided on the appearance and character of the area.

**5) Residential Amenity**

The Inspector who allowed appeal P/327/04/CFU considered that 3-storey dwellings within 23m of the rear walls of houses at 92-108 Stanley Road would not result in significant overlooking or loss of privacy, while the new development would almost certainly lead to an improved outlook for residents compared to the present run-down buildings.

In this application, the element behind these houses is confined to 3-storeys at a greater front to back separation distance than shown in the appeal application, some 26-32m.

An originally proposed car park containing some 31 spaces behind the houses in Stanley Road has been amended to provide 12 spaces, with amenity space and a play area immediately adjacent to the residential boundary. This represents an improvement to neighbouring amenity. An existing high brick wall along the residential boundary would provide privacy and help to screen any noise generation.

The 6/7 storey rear wing would be located between 60 and 70m from the rear boundaries of houses in Roxeth Green Avenue, sufficient to obviate overlooking and preserve outlook.

The linked component which would be adjacent to the industrial estate would screen the adjacent development and thereby benefit the outlook from the main area of amenity space towards the rear of the site.

Amenity levels within the site would also be aided by the provision of roof terraces and balconies, and the provision of a play area and some private gardens.

The outlook from houses on the south side of Stanley Road, although changed, would not be unacceptably harmed by virtue of the provision of a new modern building in contrast to the existing industrial structure, and the gradual increase in storey heights.

Dwellings backing onto the industrial estate would be single aspect, thereby preserving outlook. Noise insulation would be required to protect amenity from adjacent noise generation and appropriate conditions are suggested.

**6) Access and Parking**

This site has good accessibility to public transport in South Harrow District Centre where there are bus and underground services.

continued/

In terms of parking, by virtue of the site's location within a Controlled Parking Zone the scheme can be designated 'Resident Permit Restricted'. In these circumstances no objection is raised to the level of parking provision for the residential component of the scheme subject to a contribution of £30,000 for a possible CPZ extension into Roxeth Green Avenue should overspill parking occur in that and neighbouring streets, and the provision of a Travel Plan, both to be secured as part of a S106 agreement.

Parking provision for the commercial elements of the proposals, although slightly in excess of the standards, is supported.

In terms of access, Proposal Site 19 confirms that redevelopment of the site should not take place until a new access road between the Brember Road Industrial Estate and Northolt Road has been provided. This road is proposed primarily to accommodate industrial/warehousing traffic accessing the Estate. However, the land required for it is in third party ownership and a timescale for its implementation cannot be given, potentially giving rise to a sterilisation of the application site for redevelopment.

The application proposes primarily residential and B1 office development which would generate significantly lower levels of HGV movements than industrial or warehousing uses. In these circumstances and in order to bring the site forward for redevelopment the use of Stanley Road for vehicular access can be accepted in principle. Access by way of a new link across the Brember Centre as proposed in Proposal Site 19 is not considered necessary or appropriate for the proposed form of development.

In detailed terms the submitted Transport Assessment estimates that the development would give rise to the following increases in traffic movements in Stanley Road between the application site and Sherwood Road, from 85 as existing to 183 in the morning peak hour (08.00-09.00), and from 82 as existing to 162 in the evening peak (17.00-18.00).

It should be borne in mind however that usage of the site has virtually ceased and as a consequence current traffic levels are below their historic levels or what they would be if full usage of the site recommenced. When fully operational the site would generate a modest volume of traffic in the peak hours, including potentially a significant proportion of goods vehicles, so that the existing levels are artificially low.

Because of the residents parking bays on each side, Stanley Road has an effective 'running' road width of approximately 4.1m. DB 32 indicates that this is just adequate for 2 private vehicles to pass each other, although it is accepted that some congestion may result.

However, this and the impact of the additional traffic on residential amenity, are not considered sufficient to justify recommending the application for refusal.

## **7) Drainage Issues**

The recommendation includes a head of agreement, conditions and informatives suggested by the Environment Agency, Thames Water and the Council's Drainage Services Division.

continued/

**8) Energy**

The GLA in its initial consultation response to the submitted energy report commented that 'the applicant needs to address The London Plan energy policies more satisfactorily, and increase the contribution of renewable energy technologies to meeting energy demand and reducing associated carbon dioxide emissions.' Discussions since then with the applicant have resulted in a revised energy report which the GLA has confirmed commits to the provision of communal heating with a biomass boiler. A condition to secure the necessary system is proposed at the suggestion of the GLA.

**9) Consultation Responses**

Inadequate local infrastructure and services	-	no objection have been received from appropriate statutory and non-statutory consultees
Increase in litter	-	covered by other legislation
Based on experience would bring social problems, road rage	-	would not necessarily result from proposals
Noise, disruption and congestion during construction, precedent	-	not material planning considerations
Does not utilise modern technology to make development environment friendly	-	

**CONCLUSION**

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

REDEVELOPMENT: TWO STOREY BLOCK WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF TO PROVIDE 12 FLATS, ACCESS AND PARKING

TURLEY ASSOCIATES for MERLIAN ESTATES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: PL11, PL12, PL13, PL14, PL15, PL16, PL17, PL18, PL19, PL20.

**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 Landscaping to be Approved
- 3 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 No development shall take place until a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.  
The boundary treatment shall be completed:  
b: before the building(s) is/are occupied  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 5 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-  
(a) the frontage.  
(b) the boundary.  
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 6 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.
- 7 Water Storage Works
- 8 The development hereby approved shall not commence until full details of cycle parking facilities have been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided as approved before occupation of the development.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory parking facilities.

Cont...

## 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:  
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  
EP20 Use of Previously-Developed Land  
EP25 Noise  
EP43 Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land Fringes  
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  
H4 Residential Density  
D19 Ancient Monuments  
T13 Parking Standards  
EM15 Land and Buildings in Business, Industrial and Warehousing Use - Outside Designated Areas

---

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Residential Character (EP20, D4)
  2. Residential Amenity (SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H4)
  3. Loss of Employment (EM15)
  4. Greenbelt Fringe, Site of Nature Conservation & Scheduled Ancient Monument (SD2, SEP5, SEP6, EP43, D10, D19)
  5. Parking & Highway Considerations (T13)
  6. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Conservation Area:	None	
Car Parking	Standard:	
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	
Site Area:	0.126ha	
No. of Residential Units:	12	
Floorspace:	910sqm	
Habitable Rooms:	36	
Density	285 hrh	95 dph
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Site is a two storey red brick flat roofed office building on the west side of Broadfields. It is at the rear of Altham Court, a two-storey block of sheltered housing for the elderly. Site has a trapezoidal configuration. It dates from the early 1900's.
- Access to the site is by a residential grade road that also serves the adjoining block of flats on the northern boundary at Parkfield House. Off street parking is on the western side of the site.
- To the south of the site and on the opposite side of the road to the east of the site, are sequences of semi detached houses and bungalows.
- Pinner Park extends to the west of the site. It is designated Green Belt, an important nature conservation site and parts of it form a Scheduled Ancient Monument, National monument No. 29448.
- The site is currently overgrown and vandalism has occurred to the building. There are a number of mature trees on site including two mature Oak trees on the southwest boundary of the site.
- The site is a few minutes walk from Headstone Lane train station, to the north of the site at the junction with Broadfields.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Demolition of all buildings on the site
- Development of a detached two-storey block of 12 x 2 bedroom flats, 4 at ground level, six at first floor level and two with rooms in the roof space.
- Communal amenity space with an area of 610 square metres sqm along with balconies at ground and first floor level.
- Provision of 12 parking spaces including one disabled space at the northern end of the site.
- Existing vehicular access shared with Parkfield House
- Stairwell and lift with common circulation space at main entrance on eastern elevation

Cont...

- Provision of cycle storage bay with space for 12 bicycles.
- Provision of hard and soft landscaping.
- Provision of bin stores
- Retention of existing trees on site.

**d) Relevant History**

P/2031/04/CFU	Redevelopment: 3 storey staggered block to provide 2 houses and 12 flats with forecourt parking	WITHDRAWN 20-SEP-04
P/3164/04/CFU	Redevelopment: two storey detached block with accommodation in roof to provide 14 flats, car parking and access	WITHDRAWN 08-FEB-05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- New scheme involves a reduction of volume and reconfiguration of space in relation to previous schemes
- Proposal addresses previous concerns raised by LPA, namely:
- Proximity of development to the more visible northern end of the site
- The scale of the development and the perception of the number of visible storeys
- The footprint of the proposal in relation to site boundaries
- Reconfiguration of the position and height of principal windows and their relationship with site boundaries and neighbouring residential amenity so that they are mostly west facing, towards the Park.
- Revised car parking arrangements

**f) Consultations**

Drainage Engineers:	The development must not commence until surface water attenuation/storage works details have been approved in writing by the LPA.
Thames Water:	Advice is given on the need for proper drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewers, and for the applicants to adhere to the DETR guidelines on new connections that can achieve disposal on site without recourse to the public sewerage system.
English Heritage:	No response is necessary. The application can be delegated to the Local Planning Authority

Cont...

Environment Agency: No objections are made. The applicants are advised that the proposed planting along the western side of the site, adjacent to the Harrow Weald Park and the Hermitage should comprise of native species. In this way local wildlife will benefit and the region's natural balance of flora will be maintained. This will also help to prevent the spread of invasive, alien species.

**Advertisement:** Major Development Expiry  
21-JUL-05

**Notifications** Sent Replies Expiry  
61 5 11-JUL-05

**Summary of Responses:** Shared access to proposed development would disrupt servicing of Altham Court, which is a sheltered housing development for elderly people, including emergency services such as ambulances, dial a ride and visits from carers. The increase in the use of the shared access would also lead to more traffic congestion and the likelihood of more road accidents at the Headstone Lane junction, which is a traffic blind spot. Residents have been lobbying the Council for eight years to have traffic lights installed in front of the Station, without success. Overlooking and loss of privacy would still result for residents of Parkfield House, despite repositioning of windows in proposed development, in the light of objections to previous schemes. Increased noise, disturbance and general loss of amenity would also result for those residents.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Residential Character**

The site is surrounded by residential properties on three sides and adjoins Pinner Park (Green Belt land) to the west. The character of the area is predominantly residential. The property is a previously developed brownfield site and is not located in an area specifically designated for business, industrial or warehousing use. Council Policy EM15 would normally resist the loss of land or buildings from such uses unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable or required for employment use. Given that the site has been vacant since April 2002 and despite marketing, which has failed to attract tenants, the loss of the existing use for residential purposes is not considered to merit an objection.

#### **a) Siting and setting**

The proposed development would have a footprint of 418 sqm, occupying a larger footprint than the existing building, which has a footprint of 338sqm. It would also be a taller building, having a steeply pitched roof to accommodate habitable rooms in the roof space.

Cont...



The current proposal has sought to overcome several shortcomings. These were the closeness of the proposed development to No10 Broadfields, the house on the southern boundary of the site. This property would have been within 5m of first floor windows to habitable rooms in proposed flats. Consequently, that property would have suffered overlooking and loss of privacy. Similarly, oblique overlooking of rear gardens of flats in Parkfield House to the north of the application site would have resulted. These flats are approximately 10m from the northern boundary of the site.

In the light of these criticisms, the number of units has been reduced from fourteen to twelve and the orientation of the buildings has been shifted. The buildings now have a north-south axis. At the northern end of the site the proposed flats have been set further back from the boundary, enabling the off street parking to be provided there. The existing vehicular access to Parkfield House could then be shared. It is not anticipated that the increase in vehicular movement would be significant.

This rearrangement was in response to concerns in the previous proposal that most of the parking was on the eastern boundary and that, notwithstanding the erection of a 1.8m high timber fence, the proximity of six parking spaces and a vehicular access path so close to residents at Altham Court would not be neighbourly. Residents would suffer undue noise and disturbance from vehicular activity. The development now has a more compact layout because the buildings have been drawn in nearer to the centre of the site. This also means that more amenity space can be provided, which has resulted in a more proportionate relationship between buildings and spaces and also means that more screening can be provided along the eastern boundary of the application site and Altham Court.

It is considered that the revised proposal now complies with the advice in Policy D4 on the need for the siting and setting of development to take account of the character and landscape of the locality and to have a satisfactory relationship with adjoining buildings and spaces.

b) Design and external appearance

In response to objections to the two previous schemes that were withdrawn, the applicants have redesigned the building so that the pitched roofs are hipped sharply back from the site boundaries the main roof ridge of the building, removing the overbearing effects that would otherwise have resulted for neighbouring properties.

Furthermore, again in response to concerns relating to the previous schemes, the bulk, scale and massing of the proposal is smaller. The width of the building on the eastern elevation is 33.5m, whereas in the previous scheme it was 38.5m. The height of the building is slightly higher than in the previous scheme, at 11.5m to the roof ridge. As such, it is comparable in scale to other purpose built blocks of flats in the locality, notably the two neighbouring buildings, Parkfield House and Altham Court.

Cont...

The reduction in the number of principal windows and the general ratio of glazing to solid form has also been reduced on the key eastern elevation to overcome loss of outlook to habitable rooms in the rear elevation of Altham Court, which are approximately 15m from the eastern boundary of the application site. Consequently, more fenestration and balconies are provided on the western elevation, which has the attractive prospect of Pinner Park as its main outlook.

The building materials that have been chosen and their texture and colour palette are considered to be acceptable. The London Stock facing brickwork, timber siding and Grey/Blue concrete roof tiles would have a muted appearance that complements the surrounding parkland and the greenery of the amenity space of the site itself.

It is concluded that the design and appearance of the revised proposal is acceptable and is consonant with the advice in Policy D4. It says that development should respect the “urban grain” of the locality, meaning the form, massing, composition, proportion and materials of the surrounding townscape.

## **2. Residential Amenity**

The reorientation of the building on a north-south axis and the reconfiguration of principal windows to habitable rooms means that the rear gardens of Parkfield House to the north, Altham Court to the east and No 10 Broadfields to the south of the site would not suffer from overlooking and loss of privacy, whereas in the two previous schemes they would have suffered in this respect.

Along with the improved relationship that has been provided with regard to Altham Court, the overall revisions that have produced this scheme are considered to have overcome the shortcomings of the two previous proposals for the site. As such, it is concluded that the proposal is consonant with the advice in Policy D5 on the importance of development ensuring that there is adequate separation between buildings and distances to site boundaries, in order to protect the amenity and privacy of occupiers of new and existing properties.

In addition, the overall amount of amenity space that the applicants propose to provide of 610sqm is generous in relation to the footprint of the building and the hard surfaced areas for access and parking that are provided.

## **3. Green Belt Fringe, Site of Nature Conservation and Scheduled Ancient Monument**

The existing building has no particular architectural merit; it is a squat, flat roofed building with a height of 6.5m. At its closest point it is 6.5m from the boundary with Pinner Park Greenbelt. The proposed building is quite different in design, having more sophisticated articulation than the existing building with its standard office design.

Cont...

The siting of the proposed building is also acceptable in terms of its siting in relation to the adjoining Greenbelt. It would be a distance of 5.5m at its closest point to the Greenbelt boundary at the south west corner of the footprint. It would have a maximum height of 11.5m. In the previous proposal, the closest point of the building to the greenbelt boundary was 3.5m. The footprint of the proposed building parallel to the western boundary with Pinner Park extends a distance of 28.4m, whereas in the previous proposal it was 33.4m.

It is concluded that In terms of its bulk, scale and massing, siting and area of footprint, the proposed building would not have a harmful effect on the open character of the adjoining Greenbelt. Moreover, existing trees, in particular the large Oak trees near the western boundary of the site, would remain and would continue to provide effective screening of any development. As such, the proposal complies with the advice in Policy EP43.

In the previous scheme the applicants submitted an Archaeological Impact Assessment as the site adjoins Pinner Deer Park, parts of the pale of which form a Scheduled Ancient Monument No 29448. The assessment, conducted by members of the Museum of London Archaeology Service, concluded that the impact caused by the proposed development would be likely to be limited to the area occupied by the existing building. The construction of that building is likely to have destroyed any archaeological deposits that may have been present. Any evidence relating to the medieval deer park is likely to be beyond the boundary of the site. No further archaeological work is thought to be necessary. However, the decision on an appropriate mitigation strategy rests with the local planning authority. This advice still holds good.

#### **4. Parking and Highway Considerations**

The relocation of the off street parking area to the northern boundary of the site and the use of the existing access are considered to be satisfactory and preferable to the car parking layout in the previous schemes. The number of parking spaces is considered to be adequate, given the proximity of the site to public transport. The proposed parking and access arrangements are in line with the advice in Policy T13.

#### **5. Consultation Responses**

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 grant.

## SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**THE FAT CONTROLLER, 362-366 STATION ROAD,  
HARROW**

**2/01**  
**P/1572/05/CVA/SC2**  
Ward: GREENHILL

VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PERMISSION  
E/161/95/FUL TO PERMIT OPENING UNTIL 2.00 A.M ON  
THURSDAY, FRIDAY & SATURDAY NIGHT/FOLLOWING  
MORNING

BROWN ASSOCIATES for BROKEN FOOT INNS LTD

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: OS

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

1 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:-

- (a) 10:30 hours to 24:00 hours, Sunday to Wednesday,
- (b) 10:30 hours to 02:00 hours, Thursday to Saturday,

without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

2 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound

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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

EP25 Noise

EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Residential Amenity (EP25)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Town Centre	Harrow
Council Interest:	None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- east side of Station Road south of its junction with College Road and north of Station Road junction with Gayton Road
- two storey property all of which is currently used as a public bar (Class A4)
- situated within a predominantly commercial area
- supermarket (Iceland) with car park above adjoins the application site to the south
- an existing alleyway separates the application site from existing restaurant with offices above to the north
- a number of ground floor retail and services with offices above are located opposite the premise
- office block located to rear of the property

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition2 of Planning Permission EAST/161/95/FUL to permit opening until 2.00am on Thursday, Friday and Saturday night/following morning

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/161/95/FUL	Change of use: financial and professional - food and drink (Class A2 - A3), shop front, ancillary accommodation, plant	GRANTED 07-NOV-95
-----------------	--	----------------------

Condition 5 states:

"The premises shall not be used except between 10.30hrs. and 23.00hrs. Monday to Saturday inclusive and between 10.30hrs.and 22.30hrs. on Sundays, without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority."

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The applicant has already satisfied the Licensing Justices sufficiently to obtain a licence to midnight on Thursday, Friday and Saturday
- CCTV cameras are in place both inside and outside the premises with continuous monitoring. There are experienced licensed door staff during evening opening hours as required by the Justices' licence. The premises have a good security record.
- No residential accommodation in close proximity to the applicant property.
- Premises located within the established town centre of Harrow where a number of other licensed premises have late night opening hours
- PPS6 sets out the Governments key objective to promote the vitality and viability of town centres. Account should be taken of the need to enhance consumer choice and support efficient, competitive and innovative leisure sectors with improving productivity.
- Leisure uses are specifically identified as a main town centre use.
- Harrow town centre is suited for intensive and competitive leisure uses as it's a thriving urban centre with a large surrounding population and good public transport services.
- There are no nearby residential properties and residential amenity is well protected.
- The applicant is willing to discuss a financial contribution towards Town centre initiatives (approximately £1,000).

continued/

e)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 69	Replies 2	Expiry 26-JUL-05
----	----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Security concerns raised

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Amenity**

The application property is situated along a designated secondary shopping frontage to the south of the established Harrow town centre, within a predominantly commercial area. No residential accommodation currently exists within close proximity to the application site.

The presence of other nearby public bars, such as O'Neills on Station Road with late night facilities, highlights the fact that this area of Harrow is suitable for such uses.

An objection has been received from the Management Agency Company of Signal House, an office block to the rear of the application site, raising concerns about the potential damage that customers may cause resulting from an extension of opening hours. The objector cites previous cases where this has happened. Any approval therefore will strongly recommend, by way of an informative, that closer monitoring of the car park to the rear of the premise be undertaken once the premise has closed.

The Government currently favours a relaxation of licensing laws. The proposed extension of 2 hours between Thursday and Saturday nights appears therefore, to comply with Government policy. This, coupled with the lack of any nearby residential units means that the proposal will not have a negative impact on local residential amenity levels. The application is therefore, recommended for approval.

The Committee will be aware that the extended hours sought in this application have also to be agreed by the Licensing Panel. Should subsequent nuisance result to neighbouring residents then any responsible authority may call for a review of the license at which time the terms of the license can be reconsidered.

**2) Consultation Responses**

Addressed in Report.

**CONCLUSION**

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

73/75 WHITCHURCH LANE, EDGWARE, (1-2 PRETORIA P/1700/05/CFU/RJS  
VILLAS)

Ward: CANONS

CONSTRUCTION OF 3 STOREY BLOCK OF 6 FLATS, CAR PARKING AND OUTBUILDING  
AT REAR (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

MAHMUT HILMI - ARCHITECTS for MR D BHANDARI & MR H ESHGHI

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 134/10, 134/11, 134/12D, 134/13C, 134/17A & 134/18A.

**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 shall not commence until elevation plans, including design details and materials of construction of the gazebo, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development of the canopy shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
- 4 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 5 Levels to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Approved
- 7 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 8 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 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:
  - 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.

Cont...

- 10 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-  
(a) the frontage.  
(b) the boundary.  
of the site is enclosed by a close boarded fence to a minimum height of 2 metres. Such fencing shall remain until works and clearance have been completed, and the development is ready for occupation.  
REASON: In the interests of amenity and highway safety.
- 11 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-  
(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste  
(b) and vehicular access thereto  
has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied or used until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 12 Water - Disposal of Sewage
- 13 Water Storage Works

#### INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 - Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 33 - Resident Parking Permits
- 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:  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
SD1 Quality of Design  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Residential Character and Modifications to Outline Scheme (SH1, SD1, D4)
  2. Neighbouring and Residential Amenity (SD1, D5)
  3. Parking/Highway Safety (T13)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...



## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	8
	Provided:	3
Site Area:	421m <sup>2</sup>	
Floorspace:	458m <sup>2</sup>	
Habitable Rooms:	18	
No. of Residential Units:	6	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- a small 2 storey terrace comprising 2 houses and 2 flats, located on northern side of Whitchurch Lane at junction with Mead Road. The existing building accommodates a maximum overall height of 8.7 metres to the main ridge, with gable ends to both side flank elevations;
- the rear half of site is fenced off and comprises an area of hardsurfacing that is used for parking. This area is accessed from Mead Road;
- nos. 69 & 71 Whitchurch Lane to east accommodates a 2 storey building with flat façade with parapet. The parapet has an overall height ranging from 7.2 to 7.8 metres. These premises area occupied with shops on the ground floor and commercial use above. The rear service yard of 69 Whitchurch Lane abuts the rear area of the subject site;
- nos. 1 & 2 Mafeking Villas are located on opposite side of Mead road and accommodate 2 storey semi-detached houses;
- Phillips Court (adjacent to western side of Mafeking Villas) accommodates 2 and 3 storey blocks of flats, with the buildings having a mansard style roof design;
- The properties within Mead Road (including the adjoining 1 Mead Road) are 2 storey attached trances. The exception to this is a garage/ workshop building that is located directly opposite the rear area of the site;
- Chichester Court that fronts Whitchurch Lane partially overlooks the rear of the subject site. This adjoining building is 3 and 4 storey in scale;
- The commercial properties located opposite the subject site are located in a parade known as Whitchurch Parade. These are all single storey in scale, however have a steep pitched roof/ ridgeline result in a building height similar to a 2 storey scale;

### **c) Proposal Details**

- This application is predominantly the same that has already been given approval at the outline stage (P/1914/04/COU), however during the continued evolution of the proposal, slight modifications have been made, including:
  - Increase in the height of the building by 400 mm to allow for adequate insulation and internal ceiling height across the three levels;

Cont...

- Increase in the height of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor parapet wall to offset the visual increase height of the building and to reduce the visual prominence of the mansard roof;
- Installation of a small bay window to the north east corner of the building;
- Cosmetic modifications to the design of the pedestrian access off Mead Road;
- Cosmetic modifications to the design the stairwell attached to the rear elevation;

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/12333	Erect 2 storey side and single storey rear extensions to dwellinghouse (no. 1 Pretoria Villas)	GRANTED 21-JAN-77
LBH/12333/1	Erection of single storey garage extension to rear of dwellinghouse (no. 1 Pretoria Villas)	GRANTED 21-JUL-77
EAST/544/94/FUL	Alterations and change of use from garage to granny annexe with parking off mead road	GRANTED 25-OCT-94
P/2927/03/COU	Outline: redevelopment in form of 3 storey detached building to provide 9 flats	REFUSED 05-MAR-04

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site, by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality.
2. Car Parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council's 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).
3. The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size and bulk, would be visually obtrusive, would be out of character with neighbouring properties on Whitchurch Lane and Mead Road and would not respect their scale and massing, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
4. The proposed development would give rise to overlooking and a loss of privacy for neighbouring residents and would itself be overlooking from adjoining properties with a resultant poor level of amenity for future occupiers.

Cont...

P/1914/04/COU	Outline: redevelopment in form of 3 storey building to provide 6 flats (resident permit restricted)	GRANTED 14-OCT-04
P/710/05/CFU	Redevelopment: 3-storey building to provide 6 flats with parking	WITHDRAWN 11-MAY-05

**e) Consultations**

TWU: No objections  
EA: No objections

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 27	Replies 5	Expiry 05-AUG-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** overdevelopment, traffic and parking problems, site is in an untidy state, owners do not live in current building, loss of light, congestion, drainage problems, loss of privacy.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Residential Character and Modifications to Approved Outline Scheme**

The current application seeks approval for a similar form of development to that approved in outline application P/1914/04/COU for *“outline: redevelopment in form of 3 storey building to provide 6 flats (resident permit restricted)”*.

In addition, a number of minor amendments have been made to the scheme. However such amendments are essentially minor cosmetic modifications that would not cause an increase in detriment to any person or property.

The plans detail that the approved building would be finished with a suitable appearance, whilst providing ample room for aesthetic landscaping. Nevertheless conditions of approval will require material samples to be submitted to Council for consideration and approval, along with a detailed landscaping plan.

**2. Neighbouring and Residential Amenity**

As stated above, the amendments between the approved outline scheme and this application are minor cosmetic modifications that would not cause an increase in detriment to any person or property.

Cont...

**3. Parking/ Highway Safety**

The approved parking layout of the outline scheme is to be retained unaltered with respect of this application. The development will likewise be nominated as a 'Resident Permit Restricted' development to ensure future occupants are ineligible for residential parking permits.

**4. Consultation Responses**

Drainage - Not a planning issue.  
Others - 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.

CHANGE OF USE: NURSING HOME TO RESIDENTIAL (CLASS C2 TO C3)

PAUL SAMSON for MR & MRS SPANSWICK SMITH

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1:1250 Site 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 Landscaping to be Approved (Insert...‘for the front garden’... between ‘works’ and ‘which’)
- 3 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:

1994 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- E6 High Standard of Design
- E38 Conservation Areas – Character
- E45 Quality of Development - Design and Layout of Residential Development
- C9 Health Care and Social Services

2002 Revised Deposit Draft Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D16 Conservation Areas
- D17 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
- C12 Health Care and Social Services

Cont...

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D14 Conservation Areas

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

C8 Health Care and Social Services

---

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

1. Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (E6, E38, E45) (SD1, D4, D16, D17) (SD1, D4, D14, D15)
  2. Loss of Care Facilities (C9) (C12) (C8)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Conservation Area:	Pinner Moss Lane	
Archaeolog. Area/TPO:	Tree Preservation Order	
Car Parking	Standard:	}
	Justified:	} See Report
	Provided:	}
No. of Residential Units:	1	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- east side of Moss Lane within Moss Lane Conservation Area.
- occupied by detached former single-family dwellinghouse currently in use as a Nursing Home.

**c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of premises from Nursing Home to single-family dwellinghouse (Class C2 to C3).
- proposals are complemented by application P/874/04/CFU which proposes to change the use of no. 55 from flats to Nursing Home (with extensions) for use with an existing Nursing Home at no. 53 (see Agenda Item 3/02).

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

Various permissions granted for extensions to Nursing Home.

<b>e) Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	5	0	23-JUN-2004

**APPRAISAL**

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

The proposed change of use would bring the property into a single family dwelling house use which would conform to the general character of the Conservation Area. Conditions are suggested regarding planting in the front garden to bring about a reduction of hardsurfacing to benefit the appearance of the premises and the area.

**2. Loss of Care Facilities**

This proposal accompanies the application for 53/55 Moss Lane, and is intended to ensure that the conversion of no. 55 to a Nursing Home would not result in 3 Nursing Home uses in this part of Moss Lane compared with the existing 2.

Although policy is generally protective of Care Facilities, given the intention behind the application and the benefits to the character of the Conservation Area which would result in terms of appearance and activity this application is recommended favourably.

**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.

---

**PLOT 6, 25 KING HENRY MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/04**

**P/851/05/DLB/AB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: RAILINGS AND SCREEN TO ROOF TERRACE AT REAR  
MACLEOD & FAIRBRIAR

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: C99C.

**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

## **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 LISTED BUILDING CONSENT OR CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT:**

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

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

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

EP25 Noise

EP31 Areas of Special Character

---

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

1. Character and Appearance of Listed Building
  2. Consultation responses
- 

Cont...



## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to the Committee because the related planning application was, at the request of a Nominated member.

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Listed Building:	Grade II
Conservation Area:	Harrow:Village
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- site to rear of former King's Head Hotel building adjacent to boundary with no. 86.
- approved conversion of former hotel building to comprise two ground and first floor maisonettes (plots 1 & 2), one ground floor flat (plot 3), two first floor flats (plots 4 & 5) and three second floor flats (plots 6, 7 & 8); main room windows predominantly face front (south-east) and rear (north-west).
- plot 6 has approved fire escape route over roof of two storey projection (above plot 2) at rear.
- approved two storey dwelling projects beyond former hotel building at rear (plot 14) with main windows and entrance facing south-west (into site) but with single storey (glazed roof) projection to north-east side; two-and-a-half storey terraced dwellings beyond

### **bb) Listed Building Description**

- The oldest part of the building dates from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is of three-storeys with later stucco rendering. The building has a central columned porch with later glazed sides and front. It has a parapet in front of a slate roof with end chimney stacks. The central section of the front part of the building is Edwardian and the Assembly Rooms are late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Behind the frontage buildings are various later accretions built in connection with the hotel/pub use.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- 1.1m high railings to enclose terrace and privacy screen to north-east side (adjacent to 86)

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/143/02/FUL	Change of Use: hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking	NON- DETERMINATION 06/06/2003
WEST/144/02/LBC	Listed Building Consent: part demolition and works associated with conversion to residential and A3 use	NON- DETERMINATION 06-JUN-03

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The flat roof area has been identified as a 'means of escape' and 'place of refuge in the event of fire'. The area for escape will be clearly defined as required by the building regulations; it will be lit, paved and appropriate balustrade will be provided in keeping with the design of the building. This application is for the use of the whole area as a terrace.

Although we appreciate the concerns that terraces can cause we feel that this location is suitably screened by the structure such that there is very little overlooking and specifically as it is already established for a means of escape. The boundary to the adjoining property will be constructed so that there is no overlooking and as such will make this solid construction 1.8m high. In addition, because there needs to be a balcony for escape reasons, human nature dictates that residents will try to sit out on it, so it is better to acknowledge this and design in appropriate screening, rather than people just using it without any proper screens.

<b>f) Advertisement:</b>	Character/Appearance of a Conservation Area, Alt/Ext of Listed Building	Expiry 11-AUG-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0
		Expiry 03-AUG-05

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Character and Appearance of Listed Building**

Concerns raised by the officers and the conservation areas advisory committee about the impact of the privacy screen are reflected in the amended proposal, which simplifies the design of the screen and reduces its depth such that it would not project beyond the rear main wall of the former hotel building. As amended it is considered that views of the screen from within the King's Head site would be limited to glimpses and, together with the improved appearance, would not be detrimental to the character of the listed building. When viewed from no. 86 and further vantage points to the north/north-east the screen would be read in the context of the redevelopment and would have minimal additional impact upon the setting of the listed building.

The railings would be of simple design and similar to those that will enclose the ground floor terrace to plot 2 and other metalwork throughout the development, such as the main entrance gates. It is not considered that these would detract from the setting, appearance or integrity of the listed building.

As amended the proposal would, it is considered, preserve the character and appearance of the Harrow-on-the-Hill Village 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.

### **2. Consultation Responses**

None

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**PLOT 6, 25 KING HENRY MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/05**

**P/598/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS AND REVISED BOUNDARY  
TREATMENT TO FLAT ROOF ADJOINING FLAT 6 TO  
PROVIDE TERRACE WITH RAILINGS

MACLEOD & FAIRBRIAR

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: C99 Rev.C, 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 approved shall not commence until details, samples and/or specifications of the railings and privacy screen have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The balcony shall not be first used until the railings and screen have been installed in accordance with the details so approved and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of the surrounding occupiers, the setting of the Listed Buildings and the character of the Conservation Area.

**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:

- 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
  - D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - EP25 Noise
  - EP31 Areas of Special Character
- 

continued/

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

- 1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers (SD1, D4, D5, EP25)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area, Setting of Listed Buildings, Area of Special Character (SD2, EP31, D11, D15)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to Committee on 6th July at the request of a Nominated Member. The application was deferred for a Members' site visit, this took place on Tuesday 30th August 2005.

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area:

Harrow on the Hill Village

Council Interest:

None

### **b) Site Description**

- site to rear of former King's Head Hotel building adjacent to boundary with no. 86
- approved conversion of former hotel building to comprise two ground and first floor maisonettes (plots 1 & 2), one ground floor flat (plot 3), two first floor flats (plots 4 & 5) and three second floor flats (plots 6, 7 & 8); main room windows predominantly face front (south-east) and rear (north-west)
- plot 6 has approved fire escape route over roof of two storey projection (above plot 2) at rear
- approved two storey dwelling projects beyond former hotel building at rear (plot 14) with main windows and entrance facing south-west (into site) but with single storey (glazed roof) projection to north-east side; two-and-a-half storey terraced dwellings beyond
- adjoining property no. 86 used as restaurant on ground floor with basement kitchen and rooms above; adjacent upper room has windows to front and rear; owner has advised that upper rooms form a manager's flat (no kitchen or independent access) but currently used as ancillary office' listed building consent granted and renewal planning permission sought for rear conservatory extension to restaurant
- site within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; nos. 82-86 and former King's Head Hotel listed (grade II)

### **c) Proposal Details**

- use of roof over two storey projection at rear, above plot 2 and adjacent plot 14/86 High Street as terrace
- 1.1m high railings to enclose terrace and a privacy screen to north-east side (adjacent to 86)

continued/

Item 2/05 – P/598/05/DFU continued.....

**d) Relevant History**

86 High Street

WEST/223/99/FUL      Conservatory at rear

REFUSED  
12-MAY-99  
APPEAL ALLOWED

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).

P/951/03/CLB      Listed Building Consent: Conservatory  
and stairs at rear, internal alterations

GRANTED  
24-MAY-04

P/2727/04/DFU      Conservatory at rear

(DECISION  
AWAITED  
COM. 15-JUN-05)

Kingsgate, former King's Head Hotel

WEST/143/02/FUL      Change of use: Hotel to residential and  
part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3  
storey extension to hotel with  
accommodation in roofspace and  
conversion to provide 16 flats and  
detached 2 storey blocks with  
accommodation in roofspace to provide 3  
bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi  
detached properties with access and  
parking

APPEAL AGAINST  
NON  
DETERMINATION  
ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

WEST/144/02/LBC      Listed Building Consent: Part demolition  
and works associated with conversion to  
residential and A3 use

APPEAL AGAINST  
NON  
DETERMINATION  
ALLOWED  
12-FEB-03

A condition on the Appeal Decision removed Permitted Development Rights.

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

The flat roof area has been identified as a ‘means of escape’ and ‘place of refuge in the event of fire’. The area for escape will be clearly defined as required by the building regulations; it will be lit, paved and appropriate balustrade will be provided in keeping with the design of the building. This application is for the use of the whole area as a terrace.

continued/

Although we appreciate the concerns that terraces can cause we feel that this location is suitably screened by the structure such that there is very little overlooking and specifically as it is already established for a means of escape. The boundary to the adjoining property will be constructed so that there is no overlooking and as such will make this solid construction 1.8m high.

**f) Consultations**

CAAC: Objection to the glazed privacy screen. The development should be restricted to its previous extent.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 26-MAY-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 5	Replies 0	Expiry 20-MAY-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

The privacy screens would add 1.8m, and the railings 1.1m, to the height of the flank wall of the development adjacent to the boundary with no. 86. This would increase the height of the development, taken from the external ground level at the rear of no. 86, from 6.9m to 8.7m/8m respectively. As the rear yard to a commercially used property it is not considered that the increased height created by the screen/railings would be detrimental to the setting or conditions of the rear of no. 86. The approved conservatory to the rear of no. 86 would not rise above the parapet upon which the screen/railings would be sited and it is not considered that the terrace would lead to any unacceptable relationship in the event of the implementation of that extension.

In relation to no. 86 it remains, therefore, to consider the impact on the rear upper level window. The rearward extent of the privacy screen has been amended, at officers' request, to reduce its depth from 6m to 2.8m in the interests of the setting/appearance of the listed building (see below). It is calculated that the window is 1.4m from the balcony edge and, as noted above, it serves a room currently used as an ancillary office that is also served by a window to the front. Taking all of these matters into account and subject to the use of a translucent material, it is not considered that the privacy screen would curtail light to, or outlook from, the window to an extent that would be unacceptable in the event of its re-use as a manager's flat. The depth of the terrace adjacent to no. 86 has been limited to 2.8m; this is considered to be sufficient to prevent an unacceptable degree of overlooking of the adjoining property, taking into account prevailing privacy levels in this locality.

continued/

It is considered that overlooking of other surrounding property from this side of the balcony, including the ground floor glazed roof to the rear of plot 14, garden spaces and Waldron Cottage would be at sufficient distances and/or oblique angles, notwithstanding falling levels, as to be of no significant detriment to privacy amenity. In relation to flats and dwellings within the development site, overlooking from the south-west facing side of the balcony would be confined at closest vantage points to the rear living room windows of plot 6 itself and no worse than the fire escape route already approved (by reason of amendment). Standing at the edge of the terrace on this side, users could look down to the ground/first floor rear windows and outdoor terrace of plot 2, and over the forecourt of plot 14. In these regards it is considered that the angle of view and likelihood of users spending prolonged periods at the balcony edge are such as to cause no significant actual or perceived overlooking problems to these, whilst plot 2's terrace and plot 14's forecourt are already open to view from the surrounding King's Head redevelopment.

The balcony would permit external domestic activity not otherwise associated with the use of the roof as an emergency escape/refuge. However replacement UDP Policy D5 acknowledges that balconies and roof gardens can provide an acceptable alternative source external amenity provision to conventional gardens and, in this regard, it is considered that there is tacit acceptance of the potential for elevated noise and disturbance. In the subject instance much of the balcony would be enclosed between a flank wall and the privacy screen and the impact of the balcony's use would therefore be largely contained.

In relation to the privacy and amenity impact, it can also be noted that the applicant seeks permission, separately, for the formation of a single unit from plots 1, 2 and 6.

## **2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area, Setting of Listed Buildings**

### **Area of Special Character**

Concerns raised by the officers and the conservation areas advisory committee about the impact of the privacy screen are reflected in the amended proposal, which simplifies the design of the screen and reduces its depth such that it would not project beyond the rear main wall of the former hotel building. As amended it is considered that views of the screen from within the King's Head site would be limited to glimpses and, together with the improved appearance, would not be detrimental to the setting of the listed building. When viewed from no. 86 and further vantage points to the north/north-east the screen would be read in the context of the redevelopment and would have minimal additional impact upon the setting of the listed building.

The railings would be of simple design and similar to those that will enclose the ground floor terrace to plot 2. It is not considered that these would detract from the setting, appearance or integrity of the listed building.

Taking into account all of the above and the potential development of the approved conservatory, neither is it considered that the screen and railings would harm the setting or character of no. 86, which is also listed.

continued/



Item 2/05 – P/598/05/DFU continued.....

As amended the proposal would, it is considered, preserve the character and appearance of the Harrow on the Hill Village 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.

**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.

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

MR G ARDEN

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 62.16.02 Rev.D rec'd 29-JUN-05; AMH62/15.11F Rev.C; 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)  
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 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 east 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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
- D12 Locally Listed Buildings
- D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Area
- D20 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- EP25 Noise
- EP31 Areas of Special Character

---

continued/

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

- 1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers (SD1, D4, D5, EP25)
  - 2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area; Setting of Locally Listed Buildings; Area of Special Character, Archaeology (SD2, EP31, D12, D15, D20)
  - 3) Effect on Television Reception
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application were reported to Committee on 6th July at the request of a Nominated Member. The application was deferred for a Members site visit; this took place on Tuesday 30th August.

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Grade II Listed Building

Conservation Area:

Harrow on the Hill Village

Council Interest:

None

### **b) Site Description**

- new end-of-terrace dwelling part of former King's Head Hotel redevelopment; part of two storey terrace of three with front dormers
- plot 27 located to south western corner of site with access from Byron Hill Road via King Henry Mews
- attached mid-terrace dwelling, plot 28, on same level and unextended at rear
- adjoining site to north-west occupied by Leigh Court; three storey block of terraced flats on lower site level (-4m approx.) with rear elevation facing common (flank) boundary at 15m distance
- adjoining site to south-west occupied by two storey terrace 12-22 (evens) Byron Hill Road also on lower site level with rear elevations facing common (rear) boundary at 10-12m distance
- outer flank and rear boundaries of site delineated by 1.8m high close-boarded timber fence; common boundary with plot 28 delineated by 1.5m fence and trellis; two newly painted trees at rear of site
- site within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; nos. 12-22 (evens) Byron Hill Road locally listed
- site within archaeological priority area

### **c) Proposal Details**

- rear conservatory
- as amended, 2.4m deep across half the width of the dwelling

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

2A & 2B Byron Hill Road

WEST/858/98/FUL	Conservatory at rear	REFUSED 29-JAN-99
-----------------	----------------------	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of inadequate rear garden depth and amenity space, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality and the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/41/99/FUL	Conservatory at rear	REFUSED 15-MAR-99
----------------	----------------------	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site by reason of inadequate rear garden depth, amenity space and would be unduly obtrusive in relation to the rear garden of No. 4 Byron Hill Road by reason of its height and bulk, contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and detrimental to the character of the locality and the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.”

WEST/143/02/FUL	Change of use: Hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 to C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking	APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED 12-FEB-03
-----------------	---	---

WEST/144/02/LBC	Listed Building Consent: Part demolition and works associated with conversion to residential and A3 use	APPEAL AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED 12-FEB-03
-----------------	---	---

A condition on the appeal decision removed Permitted Development Rights

**e) Applicant's Statement**

I am interested in purchasing the property but would like to erect a conservatory; the purchase is dependant upon permission being granted. It is understood that there are no permitted development rights. The application is made on the basis that similar conservatories have already been consented on the development. In order to simplify this application and to avoid any contentious or policy issues we have based the design on the already approved conservatories to other properties.

continued/

**f) Consultations**

CAAC: Objection: Too little garden left. It would be unneighbourly.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 26-MAY-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 12	Replies 6	Expiry 20-MAY-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** On-going dispute about loss of TV reception, proposal would exacerbate unresolved problem; at appeal developer emphasised no flank windows, glazed structure now proposed will directly overlook causing loss of privacy; Inspector allowed development below garden depth/area standards, no further concession should be granted; would set a precedent at odds with development allowed by Inspector; garden on lower levels, new houses large and already close to boundary; permission sought to increase beyond what is normally permissible; applicant not a real person; detract from character and appearance of Byron Hill Road terrace; loss of garden space will increase noise/loss of peaceful enjoyment; site over-developed; will increase house size - appealing to families - creating further parking problems and noise; the Inspector should be informed of modified plans

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Privacy and Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

As amended, to a depth of 2.4m with solid panels adjacent to the boundary and with a height of 3m to the mid-point of the pitch, the proposal would accord in its relationship with the adjoining mid-terrace dwelling (plot 28) with the Council's supplementary planning guidelines for such developments. It can be noted that plot 28 is on the same level and is sited to the south-east of the application property. In all of these circumstances it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the amenity of the occupiers of plot 28 in terms of light, outlook, overlooking and visual impact.

A distance of 5.5m would be maintained between the outer-flank elevation and the common boundary with Leigh Court. This exceeds the 3m distance set down in the Council's supplementary planning guidelines and is acceptable having regard to the circumstances of the site. as the acceptable distance between large side windows and residential boundaries.

continued/

Item 2/06 – P/717/05/DFU continued.....

A distance of some 20-21m would be maintained between the flank elevation of the conservatory and the rear elevation of Leigh Court. The difference in levels between the application site and Leigh Court is such that the level of the conservatory is akin to the level of second floor flats in that block; consequently the top floor flats in the nearest adjacent block – nos. 4 & 5 – would have a direct line of view, where vegetation thins and particularly during the winter months of the conservatory. At the distance involved it is not considered that there would be any overshadowing, loss of light or material loss of outlook to these and other flats in the block. It is acknowledged that the degree of direct view between the conservatory and the adjacent second floor flats would result in a privacy relationship that did not exist prior to the King's Head Hotel redevelopment and, as noted by some objectors, which was not put before the original inquiry Inspector. However the proposal has to be considered on its own merits and a determination made on the basis of replacement UDP policies that have been adopted subsequent to the original inquiry and appeal decision. Policy D5 requires adequate separation between buildings, inter alia, to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers; using existing development on the slopes of Harrow Hill as a reference point it is considered that the distance of 17-18m between the conservatory and the rear elevation of Leigh Court would be adequate to reasonably protect the privacy amenity of the occupiers.

A distance of 6.5m would be maintained between the rear of the conservatory and the boundary with property in Byron Hill Road. Again there is a close-boarded fence to the rear boundary and levels fall beyond; the adjacent terrace is only two storey and there is also some planting at the rear. A back-to-back distance of some 19m would be maintained between the conservatory and the (lower) main rear elevation of nos. 18 & 20 Byron Hill Road – the nearest adjacent dwellings at the rear. This distance is also considered to be adequate, in the circumstances described and in the context of surrounding development, to reasonably protect the privacy amenity of the occupiers at the rear.

Some objectors have opined that the conservatory would concentrate outdoor activity associated with this dwelling into a smaller, remaining area. It is calculated that an area of some 75m<sup>2</sup> useable amenity space would be maintained to the rear and side of the dwelling. This is considered to be adequate without concentrating outdoor activity associated with this four habitable room dwelling to a degree that would materially increase noise and disturbance.

The proposal has been further amended to reduce its width

continued/

**2) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area; Setting of Listed Buildings**

**Area of Special Character**

The proposed conservatory has a simple, lean-to design that is considered to be appropriate to this Conservation Area and is consistent with others approved, as part of the original redevelopment scheme, at plots 15, 18 and 19. Whilst the remaining garden areas of these plots are larger than that of the proposal, the retention of 75m<sup>2</sup> around the rear and side of the dwelling together with the reduction in the width of the conservatory by amendment is considered to amount to a sufficient spatial setting for the building having regard to the generally constrained spatial setting of buildings throughout this and surrounding conservation areas on Harrow Hill. The refusal decisions in respect of conservatories at 2A and 2B Byron Hill Road pre-date the adoption of the replacement UDP and are not considered to set a precedent for the site.

Subject to the use of timber it is therefore concluded that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

It is not considered that the conservatory would adversely affect the setting of the locally listed terrace of dwellings in Byron Hill Road at the rear nor that there would be any affect on archaeology beyond that dealt with as part of the original redevelopment of the site.

Glimpses of the conservatory may be visible from the junction of Byron Hill Road with Leigh Court, but these are unlikely to be significant and not unacceptable. In all other respects it is not considered that the development would have any adverse effect on any feature that contributes to this part of the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character.

**3) Effect upon Television Reception**

Some occupiers from Leigh Court have raised concern about the potential impact of the conservatory on television reception, claiming to have already been affected by the redevelopment of the King's Head Hotel site.

Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (Telecommunications) provides some advice on interference from proposed developments. It recognises that large prominent structure can cause widespread disruption to analogue television reception due to obstruction or reflection of signals, and that factors such as the height/width of each face of the structure, the materials used and the orientation of the structure in relation to local transmitter may be taken into account at the application stage.

The proposal is not a large structure as envisaged in the guidance, though it could be argued that its prominence is heightened by the difference in site levels. Nonetheless, as a lightweight conservatory structure of relatively modest size it is considered unlikely that the proposal would represent a significant problem to TV reception at Leigh Court.

continued/

**4) Consultation Responses**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Applicant not a real person   | - application made by Mr. Arden, no reason to believe he doesn't exist                              |
| Site over-developed   | - it is not considered that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable over-development of the site |
| Will increase house size, appealing to families creating further parking problems and noise | - not considered to be significant given size of conservatory                                       |
| Inspector should be informed of modified plans  | - application to be determined by Local Planning Authority  |
| All other matters dealt with 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.



**FIRST FLOOR, PREMIER HOUSE, 38-40 HIGH STREET, P/1264/05/CFU/DT2  
WEALDSTONE**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CHANGE OF USE OF 1ST FLOOR TO OFFICES (CLASS B1) AND/OR  
MEDICAL/EDUCATIONAL SERVICES (CLASS D1)

ROLFE JUDD PLANNING for CENTRAL & N W LONDON NHS TRUST

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered floor plans and location plans dated 6/6/05.

**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 premises shall be used for the purpose specified on the application and for no other purpose, including any other purpose in Class B1 or Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1995 (or in any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).  
REASON: To safeguard the character and viability of the district centre.
- 3 The use hereby permitted shall not open to patients outside the following times:
  - a. 9.00am to 5:00pm Monday - Friday
  - b. 9.00am to 8.30pm Thursday and at no time on Bank Holidays.REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

## **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:  
C8 Health Care and Social Services  
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces  
EM18 Change of Use of Shops - Designated Shopping Frontages of Local Centres  
T13 Parking Standards
- 

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

1. Change of Use (C8, C16, EM18, T13)
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Site Area:	0.1285ha
Floor Space:	600.9 sqm
Council Interest:	None

### b) Site Description

- Site is on the eastern side of High Street just south of the junction with Canning Road.
- B1 offices occupy the upper three floors of the building.
- Ground floor is accessed from High street, first floor by lift from ground floor and via a loading bay at rear of Gladstone Road.
- Peel House multi-storey car park (257 spaces) is beyond Gladstone way at rear of site.
- The ground floor of the premises is designated Primary Shopping Frontage.
- The site is in the Wealdstone District Centre.
- The Council now wishes to sub-let the first floor accommodation that along with the ground floor, was given planning permission for use as a public library. The first floor is surplus to the Library's requirements.

### c) Proposal Details

- Permission is sought for a dual use of the first floor of the premises as Offices, (B1) class and/or an Educational/Medical use (D1) Class, so that the Trust/Harrow Mencap can relocate the services from the existing premises at Bessborough Road. To permit a dual use would allow the property to revert to a lawful B1 use during a ten year period as permitted development in accordance with Class E, Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town And Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. Should the applicants vacate the building it could be marketed with a B1 use and delays in securing a new occupier could be minimised.

### d) Relevant History

EAST/1267/02/LA3	Change of use of ground and first floors: retail and ancillary storage (Class A1) to library (Class D1) healthy living centre (sui generis), youth centre (sui generis), medical centre (Class D1) and nursery (Class D1), alterations to building	GRANTED 15-JAN-03
------------------	--	----------------------

Cont...

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The Central and North West London Mental Health Trust provide a range of mental health services on more than 75 sites across central and northwest London. The trust are the freehold owner of 44 Bessborough Road which is currently the base for the Harrow Community Drug and Alcohol Service. It is commissioned and funded jointly by the London Borough of Harrow's Drug Action Team and Harrow PCT, to provide a comprehensive range of services to those experiencing adverse physical, psychological and social consequences of substance misuse. The Trust works alongside the local authority's crime reduction/community service unit as part of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership, which aims to reduce drug and alcohol related crime and violence on the streets of Harrow.

A dual use also serves a practical purpose, as both the Trust and Harrow Mencap would need ancillary offices for the respective D1 services that they provide. A planning condition restricting the D1 element to medical and educational services only is recommended in this report.

The applicants wish to provide a stronger service within the community and This would involve increasing their staffing complement but the existing premises at 44 Bessborough Road are limited and would not provide sufficient floor space to meet anticipated needs. The floor space in Premier House would be greater than the Trust needs but would be sufficient to accommodate Harrow Mencap on the same site. Mencap propose to use the accommodation as offices and to provide educational and training facilities for people with learning difficulties in a supervised environment.

Currently the Trust employs a total of 18 staff, which they propose to increase to 26, so that the 'Tier 2' element of the service can be accommodated on the same site. This is a term to describe staff with specialist counselling skills. Harrow Mencap would have 20-25 staff at the premises. They estimate that an average of 20-25 people with learning difficulties visiting the resource centre on a daily basis.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	94	0	14-JUL-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Change of Use**

**a) Loss of Primary Retail Frontage**

The acquisition of the premises by the Council of the ground floor and first floors for use as a public library (D1 Use) took place in 2002. At the time, the view taken was that although the proposal was contrary to adopted and replacement UDP Policies, it was concluded that the new use, along with the other community uses that were proposed for the site, would contribute to the regeneration of Wealdstone District Centre without harming its primary function as a shopping centre. The retail use by Safeway PLC had ceased in 1995. A temporary lease for a fabric warehouse expired in 2003.

Cont...

It was felt that a range of community uses on the site would both complement the shopping function of the District Centre and revitalise it by bringing in people to use the facilities at a time when pedestrian activity had fallen significantly in the previous seven years. In this way, greater activity generated in the District Centre would also have benefits for the predominant retail uses that are there. It was concluded that the loss of a primary shopping frontage was outweighed by the overall benefits that a range of community uses could provide that would maintain the vitality and viability of the District Centre and that the proposal would not be in conflict with Policy EM18 of the (then) Deposit UDP.

This view has since been borne out by a review of the borough's library services carried out by the Audit Commission and published in March of this year, in which the increased membership of the library in the Wealdstone Centre was highly praised and was attributed to its central location.

**b) Residential Amenity, Parking and Accessibility**

In these regards Policy C8 is of most relevance. It advises that the provision of new of extensions to existing facilities will normally be permitted providing that there are sufficient appropriate social care and health care facilities to cater for the needs of the community. The provision of new or an extension to existing facilities will normally be permitted provided that the following criteria is satisfied: -

- i) the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents;
- ii) the premises are well serviced by public transport and accessible by a range of transport options to the catchment population they serve;
- iii) there would be no loss of a satisfactory residential unit unless there is an overwhelming need for such a development: and
- iv) the proposal provides the levels of car parking appropriate to the use of the building and would not have an adverse effect on highway safety.

There is residential occupation nearby, mostly in the form of flats over shops, on the opposite side of the High street and to the north and south of the site. It is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the existing living conditions of those residents.

The site is within the District Centre and has good public transport accessibility and is close to the Peel House public car park. The proposal would not generate a need for parking or an increase in traffic movement in excess of that experienced in terms of the current/ previous use of the premises. Moreover, the applicants stressed in their accompanying statement that, as a Government Body, they are keen to encourage sustainable modes of transport for their employees. As such, they have prepared a Travel Plan for all of their staff across the Trust. This has included an analysis of traffic activity in the area and provides a number of alternative forms of travel.

Cont...

The applicants have calculated that 20% of their staff travel solely by car in their journey to and from work. The Travel Plan includes incentives that encourage staff to use alternatives to the car. They include interest free rail season ticket loans, discounted for cycle sales, identification of problems restricting walking to work, a car pool database and organising video/teleconferencing instead of travelling to meetings. In these ways it is hoped that dependence by employees on car borne means of travel will be reduced. This is commendable and means that traffic conditions in the area of the district centre could improve in time.

No external alterations or extensions are proposed for the premises; therefore, no alterations to the existing access arrangements will be necessary. However, the agent will be advised of their obligations in relation to the Disability Discrimination Act 1985, Part III (Goods, Facilities, Services and Premises).

The proposal has already been accepted in principle under the previous permission (EAST/1267/02/LA3). The current scheme would enhance the existing social and health care provision in the borough, in a central and accessible location. As such, as well as meeting the criteria set out above, it is concluded that the proposal complies with the general aim of Policy C8 to improve community services.

## **2. Consultation Responses**

None.

## **CONCLUSION**

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

---

**LAND AT THE R/O 1-3 CANADA PARK PARADE,  
COLUMBIA AVENUE, EDGWARE**

**2/08**

**P/1701/05/CVA/TEM**

Ward: EDGWARE

REMOVAL OF CONDITION 13 OF PLANNING  
PERMISSION EAST/1277/01/FUL, SUBJECT TO  
PROVISION OF CAPITAL SUM FOR AFFORDABLE  
HOUSING

ASHMOUNT PROPERTIES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: L (-1) 01, L(-2) 20B

Inform the applicant that:

- 1) The proposal is acceptable subject to the provision of a unilateral undertaking under S.106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:-

the provision of a capital sum equivalent to 17½% of the open market realised value of the 4 units outlined on the approved drawings.

- 2) A formal decision granting the removal of Condition 13 of planning permission EAST/1277/01/FUL will be issued only upon the provision by the applicant of the aforementioned legal agreement.

- 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:  
SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need  
H5 Affordable Housing  
H6 Affordable Housing Target

---

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

- 1) Affordable Housing Considerations (SH1, H5, H6)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- north side of Columbia Avenue between properties in Burnt Oak Broadway and Vancouver Road
- previously occupied by disused factory, site now cleared of buildings
- vehicle access from Columbia Avenue to the south
- private access way at northern end of site leading to Burnt Oak Broadway
- residential premises in Vancouver Road to west
- residential and commercial/residential premises abut eastern boundary with Burnt Oak Broadway
- residential and commercial premises adjacent to southern boundary with Columbia Avenue

**c) Proposal Details**

- removal of Condition 13 of planning permission EAST/1277/01/FUL and provision of capital sum for affordable housing, to be secured by provision of a unilateral undertaking

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1277/01/FUL	Demolition of existing factory & erection of 2/3 storey building to provide 16 flats including 4 live/work units with parking & access	REFUSED 14-FEB-02
------------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

"1. The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site, by reason of inadequate amenity space and increased density contrary to the provisions of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan and to the detriment of the locality.

2. Car and motor cycle 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 highways would be detrimental to the free flow and safety of traffic on the adjoining highways and the amenities of neighbours.

3. The proposed vehicular access to the site would not be satisfactory since it includes a length of rear service road, wide enough for only one vehicle, on which loading and unloading regularly take place.

4. The proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of trees of significant amenity value which, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality."

APPEAL ALLOWED 22-NOV-02

Condition 13 reads as follows:-

"The development shall not begin until the details of the arrangements for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:

(a) the number (which shall not be less than four), type and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made;

continued/

- (b) the timing of the construction of the affordable housing;
- (c) the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both the initial and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing;
- (d) the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of prospective and successive occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.

The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved arrangements.”

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- contacted all of London Borough of Harrow's Housing Association Partners during December 2003 as follows: Paradigm Housing, Chiltern Hundreds H.A., Metropolitan Housing Trust, Stadium Housing, Paddington Churches H.A. , Asra H.A.
- with exception of Warden H.A. all Housing Associations advised that units were not suitable for their requirements
- Warden H.A. indicated in January 2004 that they may be interested in taking 4 affordable units
- between January 2004 and January 2005, after numerous meetings with Warden H.A., their agents and the Council's Affordable Housing Development Officer the Housing Association advised that the proposed units were not suitable as they did not fulfil the criteria set out for funding
- having exhausted all other means of satisfying Condition 13 have no option but to suggest a payment to the Council in lieu of providing the affordable units on-site
- propose to pay a capital sum equivalent to 17½% of the open market realised value for the 4 units that would otherwise have been affordable units
- proceeds can then be used by the Council as appropriate

<b>f) Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	97	4	23-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** No differences in issue presented by appellants during appeal and now by the developer; not convinced that Harrow Council cannot find 4 Key Workers as required by planning condition, especially as NHS community hospital/medical centres and schools are in close proximity to the site.

## **APPRAISAL**

**1) Affordable Housing Considerations**

The Housing Division's Affordable Housing Development Manager confirms that Warden H.A. initially reached an in principle agreement with the applicant to acquire 4 units, subject to their Board's agreement, for sale on a shared ownership basis.

However, having considered the matter further, Warden (and the Council) felt that the properties would be difficult to sell on a shared ownership basis because of their location and outlook, and were not therefore suitable for this tenure.

continued/



Warden then looked at options for either social rent or intermediate rent but their Board confirmed that they were not able to approve the acquisition of the properties for these purposes, as they do not meet approved standards and would not therefore be eligible for funding.

No other RSL's expressed any interest.

In these circumstances it is considered that the applicant has taken reasonable steps to find a nominated RSL to take on the 4 units which are required by Condition 13 to be provided as affordable housing.

In the absence of on-site provision it is suggested that the provision of a capital sum to be put towards the achievement of affordable housing elsewhere in the Borough represents a reasonable approach. The sum can be secured by the applicant supplying a unilateral undertaking under S106 of the 1990 Act. This will be prepared by the Council's Legal Services Division, whose costs will be paid for by the applicant.

The proposed contribution of 17½% of the open market realised value of the 4 units, which comprise 2 x 1-bed and 2 x 2-bed flats, can be expected to amount to some £150,000 based on the Council's estimated valuation of the properties when complete. Given the exceptional circumstances which have arisen, the above proposal is considered to be satisfactory, and in these circumstances removal of the condition is recommended favourably subject to the prior provision of the unilateral undertaking.

## **2) Consultation Responses**

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.

---

**269/271 STATION ROAD, HARROW**

**2/09**

**P/1193/05/CVA/SC2**

Ward: GREENHILL

VARIATION OF CONDITION 5 OF  
PERMISSION E/24/96/FUL TO ALLOW  
OPENING UNTIL MIDNIGHT SUNDAY TO  
WEDNESDAY AND 02:00 HOURS  
THURSDAY TO SATURDAY

---

GRAHAM BOLTON PLANNING for YATES GROUP PLC - SUZANNE WOOD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS

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

- 1 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:-  
(a) 10:30 hours to 24:00 hours, Sunday to Wednesday,  
(b) 10:30 hours to 02:00 hours, Thursday to Saturday,  
without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **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:  
EP25 Noise  
EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

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

- 1) Residential Amenity (EP25)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Town Centre:	Harrow
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- west side of Station Road opposite its junction with Sheepcote Road
- two storey building currently in use as a public house (Class A4)

continued/

Item 2/09 – P/1193/05/CVA continued.....

- both adjoining properties are currently in commercial use, a large retail unit (Littlewoods) adjoins the property to the south while a ground floor retail unit with residential above adjoins the property to the north
- St. Johns Church is situated directly opposite

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition 5 of permission E/24/96/FUL to allow opening until midnight Sunday to Wednesday and 02.00 Thursday to Saturday

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/24/96/FUL	Change of use: retail to licensed premises with food (Class A1 to A3), & shopfront	GRANTED 06-JUN-96
EAST/658/00/VAR	Variation of condition 5 of planning permission EAST/24/96/FUL to allow opening to midnight Thursday – Saturday	GRANTED 29-SEP-00
EAST/1013/01/VAR	Permanent variation of condition 5 of planning permission EAST/24/96/FUL to allow opening to midnight Thursday – Saturday	GRANTED 09-NOV-01
EAST/1381/02/VAR	Variation of condition 5 of planning permission EAST/24/96/FUL to allow opening to midnight on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays on permanent basis	GRANTED 22-DEC-03

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- Application made in light of the recent changes to the Licensing Regulations resulting from the Licensing Act 2003, permitting 24 hour licensing.
- The extension of opening hours would result in a dispersal of customers. Such a dispersal would be in line with current Government policy as the Government feels that a uniform time for closing encourages excessive drinking and increases pressure on police resources to keep control when everyone is forced out of the pubs at the same time.
- A relaxation of the opening hours will not harm the Council's management and development strategies for the town centre
- The applicant has previously contributed £3,000 to the Town Centre Infrastructure Improvements Fund to assist in the maintenance, cleansing and appearance of the public realm.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 32	Replies 0	Expiry 21-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Amenity**

The application property represents the last unit of primary shopping frontage within the Harrow urban centre to the north and adjoins some designated secondary shopping frontages. The premise is therefore situated within a predominantly commercial area.

Previous applications to extend the opening hours have been successful. An extension of the opening hours until midnight, between Thursday and Saturday, was originally granted temporary permission before being permanently permitted in December 2003. This application seeks to extend the opening hours by a further 2 hours, between Thursday and Saturday, from midnight until 2a.m. and by a further 1½ hours Sunday – Wednesday from 10.30p.m. to midnight.

A relaxation on the licensing laws is favoured by the Government and considering that there are other premises in the town which have no restrictions on their opening hours an extension by 2 hours and 1.5 hours respectively for the premises is not considered contentious. This, coupled with the predominantly commercial nature of the immediate area means that a variation of the previous 1996 condition is considered acceptable.

The Committee will be aware that the extended hours sought in this application have also to be agreed by the Licensing Panel. Should subsequent nuisance result to neighbouring residencies then any responsible authority may call for a review of the license at which time the terms of the license can be reconsidered.

### **2) Consultation Responses**

None

## **CONCLUSION**

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

**HARROW SCHOOL, FOOTBALL LANE AND P/2942/04/DFU/OH  
ADJOINING ACCESSWAYS, HARROW ON THE HILL**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

4 AREAS OF ROAD WORKS INCLUDING BOLLARDS, BARRIERS AND CONTROL BOXES; HARDSURFACING & ALTERATIONS TO GARLANDS LANE (REVISED)

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCS. for HARROW SCHOOL

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1181/100A, 101, 102A, 103, 104B, 105, 106A, 107B, 108A, 109A

**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 approval of the details noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - i) Colour and design of the barriers and control boxes
  - ii) Colour, design and dimensions of the bollards at the top of Football Lane
  - iii) The ground surfacing at the bottom of Garlands Lane

REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality and the appearance of the Conservation Area

**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  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
EP31 Areas of Special Character  
EP44 Metropolitan Open Land  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
D16 Conservation Area Priority

Cont...

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Conservation Area Character and Appearance/Setting of a Listed Building
  2. Character of Area/Metropolitan Open Land
  3. Public Right of Way
  4. Highway Safety
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

Details of this application are reported to Committee as part of the site lies in Metropolitan Open Land. This application was deferred at Officer's request from the meeting on 6th July 2005 in order to clarify access for fire appliances with respect to the use of the rising bollards. This applicant has since confirmed the proposed rising bollards can be operated by the fire brigade using a 'Gerda' key override at all times, even in the event of a power failure.

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character:	Special Char & Adv
Conservation Area:	Harrow: School
Council Interest:	None

### b) Site Description

- This application relates to four areas of road works at four separate locations, situated on the lower southeastern side of Harrow Hill.
- **Site 1** – Top of Football Lane (located within the Harrow School Conservation Area and within the Historic Harrow Archaeological Priority Area)
- **Site 2** – Adjacent to the athletics track (sited in Metropolitan Open Land, adjacent to the Harrow School Conservation Area)
- **Site 3** – Approximately 30 metres south of Spinney Cottages (located in the Harrow School Conservation Area and adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land)
- **Site 4 and 4a** – Garlands Lane (sited in Metropolitan Open Land, outside of the Harrow School Conservation Area)
- Sites 1 – 4 and 4a are all located within the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character

### c) Proposal Details

- **Site 1** – Three automatic rising arm bollards together with a reader control and intercom box. Access by designated users controlled by digital keypad, swipe card, key fob or parking disc plus an intercom connected to the security duty mobile plus those living beyond the bollards for visitors, deliveries etc

Cont...

- **Site 2** – Rising arm barrier to replace existing gate. This will be controlled by digital keypad, swipe card, key fob, parking disc or by intercom connected by the security mobile.
- **Site 3** – Rising arm barrier to be operated in the same way as the above, a pedestrian by pass gate will be incorporated around the barrier.
- **Site 4** – Rising arm barrier controlled in a similar manner to the above.
- **Site 4a** – Upgrading of Garlands Lane below site 4 to a tarmac surface throughout its length leading to the car parks. To improve access to these car parks, the proposal involves adjustment of the kerbs.

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/27/01/FUL	Replacement athletics track, 12 replacement tennis courts, two all weather pitches & fencing, area for field events, new equipment store to replace existing rugby pavilion, relocation of parade ground & car park & improvements to access from Watford Road	GRANTED 28-04-2003
----------------	--	-----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The School is currently looking at how they might improve security within their grounds and reduce the volume of traffic passing through to improve pedestrian safety for the boys, staff, visitors and walkers using the footpaths.
- The planning permission for the replacement athletics track provided for improvements to the access from Watford Road. Here an automatic sliding security gate and a pedestrian by pass gate will control the access. The automatic barrier on Watford Road will be opened for major school sports fixtures but will otherwise be operated by a digital key pad, swipe card, key fob or parking disc plus intercom. The gate will open automatically on exit. This entrance/exit is intended to be the main entrance for the members of the Hill Club (Sports Centre) golf club, tennis club and angling club along with visiting team coaches and visiting parents and supporters.
- The use of this entrance and exit will eliminate the need for cars to use Football Lane. This will enable Football Lane to be semi-pedestrianised at certain times which will also considerably reduce traffic flow for coaches and cars on Harrow on the Hill. To accommodate the pedestrianisation, barriers are required at various key points and this is the reason for this planning application.
- We believe the proposals will be unobtrusive and will preserve the features of the conservation area but enhance the visual characteristics by reducing vehicle flow through this important pedestrian route within School grounds to the benefit of Harrow on the Hill by way of traffic reduction over the Hill.

Cont...

- **Emergency Access** - The applicant confirms the security personnel will be notified of any emergency and they will have procedures in place to make arrangements for the relevant access point to be opened before the arrival of the emergency services. In addition to this, the intercom access system will be permanently staffed utilising the security duty mobile and/or remote monitoring station to cover out of normal hours. The emergency services will, in addition be made aware of the bollards and will be asked for any further requirements to be accommodated if deemed necessary. We can confirm that the proposed rising bollards can be operated by the fire brigade using a firemans gerda key override at all times, even in the event of a power failure.
- **Maintenance** - All barriers will be included in maintenance contracts for regular servicing and repair, including an out of hours emergency service. In addition, each barrier will incorporate a manual override to enable the access to be opened in the event of a failure or an emergency. The School has a 24/7-security presence provided in house. It is believed their management system will ensure that the barriers are carefully monitored, operated and maintained.

**f) 1st Consultation**

CAAC: No objections to the principle, but concerns raised over positioning of barrier about traffic backing up Football Lane. Concerns also raised over design of barrier and it should be made more rural to be in keeping with the conservation area.

**2nd Consultation**

CAAC: No objections as long as control boxes are blue or black.

English Heritage: No objection

London Fire & Emergency  
Planning Authority: No objection if the rising bollard is to be of the standard type which can be lowered using a standard Fire Brigade padlock or 'Gerda' key, both of which are carried on Fire Appliances throughout London

<b>1st Advertisement:</b>	Setting of a listed building Character of Conservation Area Public Right of Way	Expiry 30-DEC-04
---------------------------	---	---------------------

<b>2nd Advertisement:</b>	Setting of a listed building Character of Conservation Area Public Right of Way	Expiry 21-APR-05
---------------------------	---	---------------------

Cont...



1st Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	1	1	14-DEC-04

**Summary of Responses:** Harrow Hill Trust - Proposed barriers and bollards at top of Football Lane would not improve 'important' view. Proposal appears 'yellow, cheap and tatty' and would not improve the character of the conservation area. We hope improvement can be made. Concern that the barriers near the top of Football Lane might cause queuing traffic to back up onto Peterborough Road with obvious consequences on terms of congestion and safety.

2nd Notification	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	2	1	16-MAR-05

**Summary of Responses:** Harrow Hill Trust - We note the amendments to this application. The road has already been resurfaced in tarmac and new kerbstones have been fitted, new car park created with a similar surface. It is much more urban. The new surfacing is not in accord with the character and neither is the car park.

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Conservation Area Character and Appearance/Setting of a Listed Building**

Site 1 and site 3 are located within the Harrow School Conservation Area and site 2 is located adjacent to the Conservation Area. Site 1 at the top of Football Lane is the most prominent location of the four areas involved in this application, given its proximity to a number of important school buildings. The adjacent Science Schools building is locally listed and the adjacent Butler Museum is Grade II listed. The plans state that these bollards are to be painted black, this colour is considered acceptable as it helps to ensure that the bollards are not visually intrusive on the landscape. It is considered that the use of narrow bollards in this prominent location is less visually intrusive than a rising arm barrier and therefore would not have a detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. For the same reasons it is considered that the narrow bollards would not be detrimental to the setting of the adjacent local and statutory listed building.

Site 3 is not particularly prominent within the Conservation Area and is surrounded by a number of modern structures such as sheds and portakabins. It is considered that the installation of a rising arm barrier and control box would not have significant impact on this part of the Harrow School conservation Area.

Cont...

Site 2 is outside of the Conservation Area and is located at the bottom of the Hill and is not particularly prominent. It is considered that the installation of a vehicle barrier and control box in this location would not have a significant impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The proposed barrier at site 4 is also located outside of the Conservation Area, adjacent to Peterborough Cottage and is not considered to be a prominent location. Therefore it is considered that the installation of a vehicle barrier and control box in this location would not have a significant impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

All of the proposed control boxes and raising arm barriers will be painted dark blue. Reflective silver bands will be added to the barriers for safety reasons. It is considered that the use of this colour on the barriers will give them a more subdued appearance in accordance with the circumstances of each site.

## **2. Character of Area/Metropolitan Open Land**

Policy SEP5 of the Harrow UDP states that the Council will seek to protect and enhance inter alia, Metropolitan Open Land and Areas of Special Character. Both designations are identified as being of “strategic land use importance for London.”

The hard surfacing and new kerbstones within site 4a replaces a gravel track. There is already a large expanse of tarmac within the adjoining car parks and access roads leading to the athletics track as well as hard surfacing throughout the length of Garlands Lane leading from Peterborough Road to site 4a.

In respect of the existing site circumstances it is thought that the principle for hard surfacing the site at 4a is acceptable, however the overall appearance of the materials used should be considered. The use of tarmac throughout the length of the site at 4a would be desolate and would only exacerbate the perception of modern hard surfacing materials at this point. In order to conserve the appearance of the surrounding area, the use of a resin bound (bonded gravel) surface is suggested between the beginning of the car parks and up to the existing gate.

Policy EP44 recognises that “Metropolitan Open Land is located within urban fabric... and is not necessarily protected for its countryside character, but rather for its open character and provision for community needs.” It is considered that the proposed area of hard surfacing does not amount to development that would detract from the openness of this area of MOL. Taking into account the topography of the site and the surrounding area, and the distance from public land or land outside the school’s ownership, it is considered that there would be little public impact of the additional area of hard surfacing.

Cont...

### **3. Public Right of Way**

The development at the top of Football Lane (site 1) is the only area of road works that affects a public right of way. All of the other sites are located within areas of land that are privately owned by the School.

The bollards when raised would allow for pedestrian access through the spaces in between each bollard and therefore the installation of this area of road works would not impede the public right of way.

Details of the bollards dimensions have been requested by condition, and subject to this, it can be ensured that disabled access via the spaces between the bollards can be agreed.

### **4. Highway Safety**

There is a space of approximately 24 metres between the proposed bollards at Football Lane and the junction with Peterborough Road. This space would allow for at least three medium sized vehicles to wait without encroaching onto Peterborough Road and accordingly there are not considered to be any adverse highway safety implications.

The applicant has provided a supporting statement that addresses the concerns raised by the Highways Engineer and the London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority. It is considered that the measures relating to emergency access and maintenance are acceptable, therefore there are not considered to be any concerns with regards to this component of the scheme.

### **5. Consultation Responses**

	Addressed in Appraisal
Highway safety	“ “
Design of barriers	“ “
Affect on conservation area	“ “
New Surfacing out of character with MOL character	“ “

### **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.

TWO STOREY SIDE TO REAR; SINGLE STOREY FRONT,  
REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION (REVISED)

MAYUR PATEL for MR KIRIT PATEL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: KP/PA05/100, KP/PA05/101A; DP/PA05/102A

**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:

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) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as a petition has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- No. 6 Hazelcroft, Pinner is a detached, brick built house
- as it is at the end of a cul-de-sac where the houses are set at an angle from each other
- the shape of the rear garden is triangular
- the numbers of the houses run consecutively along one side of the street so that the neighbouring properties are No. 5 and 7 Hazelcroft
- there has been a single storey side garage and breakfast room extension on No. 5 up to the boundary towards No. 6. This extension is 3.1m high on the boundary and projects approx 1m to the rear of the rear wall at No. 6
- between No. 5 and 6 there is a 1.6m high close board fence and between No. 7 there is a 1.8m close board fence
- the rear garden is approx 14m deep at its shortest length and 20m at the longest

**c) Proposal Details**

- the previous proposal was unacceptable due to aspects of the scheme being outside the guidelines in the SPG
- the first floor rear extension on the previous proposal was in line with the flank wall of the ground floor aspect. This resulted in the proposed first floor rear aspect of the extension to interrupt the 45° splay drawn from the single storey rear corner of the neighbouring dwelling which has a protected breakfast room window. The first floor rear flank wall has been pulled back to comply with this 45° rule
- the front porch on the previous application has been reduced to draw in line with the front wall of the existing bay
- removal of a detached garage and the construction of a two storey side to rear extension, a single storey front extension and a single storey side to rear extension to a detached dwelling house
- the first floor element of the two-storey side extension is set back from the main front wall for a distance of 1 metre and is sited 0.9m from the side boundary shared with 5 Hazelcroft.
- the two-storey rear extension is to project 3.3m into the rear garden from the rear wall of the original house. The front wall of the first floor element of the two-storey side extension is in line with the main front wall of the existing property.
- the single storey side to rear extension will be 3.3m into the rear garden and 3.7 at the bay window. The single storey part of the rear extension will measure 8.7m across the rear elevation. The plot is triangular, and the proposed projects out from the side of the original house by 3m then up by 2.5 and out again by another 1m. The extension will have a pitched roof; the midpoint of the pitch will be 3.3m. At the closest point to the boundary the height of the extension will be 3.5m.
- the front extension will project forward of the main front wall of the house by 0.7m

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

P/922/05/DFU	Two storey side to rear; single storey front, rear and side extension	REFUSED 29-JUN-05
--------------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed two-storey rear extension, by reason of its size and siting in relation to No. 5 Hazelcroft, would appear unduly bulky and overbearing when viewed from the rear of that property, to the detriment of the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and character of the locality.
2. The proposed single storey front extension, by reason of its depth and siting, would appear unduly bulky and obtrusive in the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the locality.”

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 2	Replies 1 petition of 12 signatures	Expiry 04-AUG-05
-------------------------	-----------	---	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** concerns from previous application still apply, parking concerns, destruction of front garden, terracing effect, 'acoustic bowl' increasing noise levels in the turning circles, strains placed on sewerage dispersal and water supply, root disturbance to mature trees, 45 deg. angle should be taken to ground floor not first, bulky appearance, disruption from building works

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

Hazelcroft is characterised by detached brick built houses originally of a similar style, around the end of a cul-de-sac. There have been a number of other 2 storey side extensions in the street notably at No. 2, 3, 4 and 10.

The front extension is shown to draw in line with the existing bay window and not project beyond it, within the guidelines found in the SPG. It is considered therefore that this extension will not be obtrusive in the street scene,

The side extension would appear subordinate to the original house due to the lower ridgeline of the roof. The hipped roof at the side will serve to reduce roof bulk and retain the overall character of the house. There is a first floor set back of 1m is proposed as well as a gap of 0.9m from the boundary. Both the set back and the separation from the boundary will protect the character of the vicinity and avoid a 'terracing' effect. As such these aspects fulfil the guidelines set in the Adopted SPG. The single storey elements to the rear of the property would also satisfy the adopted Householder SPG in terms of character of the area.

continued/

**2) Residential Amenity**

Within the SPG two-storey side extensions are acceptable in principle however to protect the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties the SPG outlines the 45° code guidelines. The extension will be over 9.5m from the boundary shared by No. 7. As such the extension will have the greatest impact on the occupiers of No. 5. There is an existing extension on the boundary at No. 5 that has a breakfast room with a large window facing into the rear garden. Adjacent and to the rear of this is a patio area amenity space. The distance beyond the existing rear wall of the neighbouring breakfast room and the proposed development will be 1.5m deep into the rear garden and set 1.3m from the boundary. The corner of the breakfast room is set 0.25m from the boundary, thus giving a total distance of 1.75m from the corner of the breakfast room to the proposed extension. The 45° plane from the corner of the property at No. 5 at first floor will not be interrupted by the proposed extension. This guidelines state clearly that no part of any new extension should interrupt a 45° splay drawn on a plan from the nearest first floor or two storey of any next-door dwelling. As the extension does not interrupt the 45° plane, this extension is within the guidelines found in the SPG.

No. 5 has 2 first floor windows towards the rear in the flank elevation facing No. 6. Both these windows are obscure glazed and are some distance away. Therefore these windows would not be affected if they were considered protected. Both first floor flank windows are obscure glazed and are some distance away. Therefore these windows would not be affected if they were considered protected. The ground floor is a double garage to the boundary and does not have any windows.

It is not considered that there will be an unacceptable level of actual or perceived overlooking onto neighbouring properties from the flank windows of the two-storey extension. There are no first floor or ground floor windows on the flank elevation of the proposed rear extension, in accordance with guidelines in the SPG. On the rear elevation there are is a window at first floor level and two windows and a set of French doors at ground floor level. It is considered that due to the windows and door being rear facing that there will not be an unacceptable level of overlooking on to neighbouring properties.

The single storey side to rear extension also fits within the Adopted Household SPG. It is considered that due to the set back of 1.1m from the boundary and approx 6.5m between the extension and the house at No. 7 that the height of the proposed development will not present an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of No 7. Due to this distance between the houses, there are no windows that would experience an unacceptable impact from the proposed single storey side to rear development.

The distance of approx 10m to the rear boundary and the long length of the adjacent garden to the rear at Rowland Ave it is considered that the impact of the development on the privacy of those properties is not unacceptable.

To conclude, the previous reasons for refusal have been overcome in this application.

continued/

**3) Consultation Responses**

Planning concerns raised are considered in the appraisal

Multi occupancy beyond a household of six persons sharing will require a further planning application, this decision was determined on the facts presented in the current application

Noise created externally is not a material planning consideration

The proposal fits the relevant policies in the UDP regarding parking

There is no hard standing in the front garden shown in this proposal

Concern regarding the disruption and inconvenience caused by construction at current and future developments in the area is not a material planning consideration

Sewerage and drainage are not a material planning consideration

There are no trees protected under a Preservation Order in the application site

**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.



SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

JOHN L SIMS for BEAZER INVESTMENTS LTD

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordnance Survey and Drawing nos. LC/03/1 and LC/SS/05/3.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no LC/55/05/3 shall be installed in the front 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.
- 3 Materials to Match

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 31 - No Future Extensions
- 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  
SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy  
D14 Conservation Areas  
D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
EP33 Development in the Green Belt  
EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

---

Cont...

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

1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP6, EP33, EP34)
  2. Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (D14, D15, SD2)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

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

### **b) Site Description**

- Site located within the Little Common Conservation Area, Metropolitan Green Belt and Area of Special Character.
- Applicant property comprises of a 2 storey end of terrace property.
- Little Common Conservation Area is characterised by a variety of building designs and styles.
- Applicant dwelling abuts the rear gardens of a number of properties both within Little Common and Hilltop Way.
- Existing property and those surrounding have irregular shaped plots.
- Single storey conservatory has previously been attached to the rear elevation of the dwelling.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Proposed application involves the erection of a single storey side extension.
- Proposed extension extends 1.8m from the side of the existing dwelling and is set back 0.2m from the façade of the property.
- A distance of 3.5m is proposed between the back of the main dwelling and the rear of the extension.
- One window opening, at the front of the dwelling, is proposed.
- The roof of the extension is pitched towards the front and flat at the rear.
- The extension is 1.8m at the front, its widest point. It then narrows towards the rear to extend 0.8m from the existing gable wall of the applicant property. This narrowing is due to the presence of a boundary fence, which runs at an angle towards the rear of the property. The extension is proposed to run parallel to this wall maintaining a 1m distance between the proposed extension and boundary wall.
- Extension to provide a downstairs bathroom for the residents of 17 Little Common.

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

P/2746/03/CFU Two storey side extension

REFUSE  
21-APR-2004

The reasons for refusal were as follows:

1. The proposal would give rise to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, which would reduce the openness of the site and detract from the character of the Green Belt.
2. The proposed alterations, by reason of unsatisfactory design, bulk and appearance of the terrace and this part of the Little Common Conservation Area.
3. The proposed alterations by reason of unsatisfactory bulk, width and position of a 1st floor window would appear overbearing and give rise to a problem of perceived overlooking of the rear garden of 6 Hilltop Way.

**e) Notifications**Sent  
3Replies  
0Expiry  
18-AUG-2005**APPRAISAL****1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character**

UDP Policy No. requires that 'development will be strictly controlled within the green belt to ensure that such land remains primarily open and existing environmental character is maintained or enhanced' and in the case of extensions to dwellings, 'not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling'.

	Original	Existing	% Over original	Proposed	% over original
Footprint (m2)	34.66	45.30	+30.70%	49.94	+44.09%
Floor Area (m2)	69.32	79.96	+15.34%	82.86	+19.5%
Volume (m3)	201.89	231.68	+14.75%	245.59	+21.65%

The existing dwelling has been previously extended, resulting in an overall increase of 15% in floor area and 15% in volume. An application for a much larger two-storey side extension was recently refused by the Council because the extension was considered to be disproportionate in terms of size of the original dwelling. This application would have nearly doubled the original footprint and volume of the house (both +98%) while also resulting in an 83% increase to the floor area of the original dwelling. The current application represents a major scaling down in terms of extension and this can be seen in the table of figures above. This reduction has resulted in a smaller area of space being lost at the side of the dwelling compared to the previous application which necessitated a sizeable section (approx 70m2) of the adjoining rear garden (6 Hilltop Way) being acquired. As the current proposal maintains the existing boundary and is relatively small scale, the openness of the applicant property, adjoining property and Metropolitan Green Belt is not threatened.

Cont...

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

The proposed side extension would add a further 1.8m to the width of the existing end of terrace dwelling compared to the 3.5m proposed in the previous application. The extension narrows towards the rear in order to run parallel with the angled boundary wall. A minimum distance of 1m is maintained between the side of the extension and the existing boundary wall. The roof of the proposed addition is pitched towards the front and flat at the rear while the reduction in height to a one storey extension is a favourable amendment. The extension is stepped back by 0.2m from the front of the main dwelling as was recommended in the previous refusal.

The applicant property forms part of a terrace of 3 terraced houses of which No.17 is located at the western end, furthest from the road and facing towards the rear garden of No.12 Little Common. The general width, bulk and visibility of the property and proposed extension, is not considered to adversely impact on the symmetry of the group of 3 terraced dwellings and shall preserve the character and appearance of the Little Common Conservation Area.

## **3. Residential Amenity**

The construction of a 1-storey extension within the existing boundary wall of No. 17 will not have any negative impacts on neighbouring residential amenity levels. The down scaling of the extension to a single storey development with no windows to the rear ensures that there are no overlooking issues in relation to the rear garden of No.6 Hilltop Way. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in amenity terms.

## **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 GATES AT ENTRANCES AND RESURFACING OF DRIVEWAY**

MR M ALWIS

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Untitled Plan of Frontage (Received 24/08/05), Elevation to show the proposed gates and posts, Ordnance Survey.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission

**INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

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

D14 Conservation Areas

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

D16 Conservation Area Priority

---

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

1. Green Belt Land and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, SD2, EP31, EP32, EP33, D4)
2. Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (D14, D15, D16)
3. Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
4. Consultation Responses

Cont...

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

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

### b) Site Description

- two-storey property set in large grounds with trees and hedge on front boundary.
- two vehicular entrances from Hillside Road and tarmacadam driveway with low kerbing where drive meets grass verge on Hillside Road.
- neighbouring dwelling 'Balblair' close to western entrance.
- property located in Metropolitan Green Belt, Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character and Pinner Hill Conservation Area.

### c) Proposal Details

- erection of two 5-bar timber entrance gates and resurfacing of driveway with bituchem asphalt.

### d) Relevant History

None.

### e) Consultations

CAAC: No objections to the gate. A muted colour should be used for the driveway.

Advertisement:	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 11-AUG-2005
----------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 5	Replies 0	Expiry 26-JUL-2005
----------------------	-----------	--------------	-----------------------

Cont...

## **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 Green Belt. The existing dense hedge and trees that run along Hillside Road would not be affected. This hedge would be of the same height as the posts (1.5m). Due to the modest scale of the proposal the proposal is not considered to affect the character, appearance, setting or openness of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

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

The property is located in Pinner Hill Conservation Area, which has a rural character. The scheme does not propose to enlarge the existing area of hardstanding and will not affect the existing soft landscaping at the front of this property. There are no objections to the relaying of the existing driveway, as the asphalt is in a poor state. The use of a traditional asphalt for the driveway would be appropriate for the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

### **3. 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. The nearest property 'Balblair' is sited adjacent to the western entrance at 'Green Island Lodge', however the existing hedge on the common boundary would obscure views of the gate from that site. Furthermore the proposal is of modest scale.

### **4. 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.

---

**18 BROOKSHILL AVENUE, HARROW**

**2/14**

**P/1080/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE  
STOREY REAR EXTENSION

B TAYLOR for MR & MRS HOOPER

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: AO/2836, AO/2812/2

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. AO/2812/2 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 The window(s) in the flank 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.

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 19 – Flank Windows
- 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 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 and Area of Special Character (SEP6, SD1, EP33, EP34)
- 2) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
- 3) Consultation Responses

continued/



## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character

Green Belt

Council Interest: None

### b) Site Description

- semi-detached property on cul-de-sac off Brookshill Avenue
- second last property in the row with open land to the north
- the original dwelling has previously been extended by means of a single storey sun lounge and a large garage to the side, with caravan parked to the front
- significant number of single and two storey extensions to other properties in Brookshill Avenue, most notably Nos. 22 and 24 opposite
- property located in Metropolitan Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character

### c) Proposal Details

- construct a double storey side extension to replace the existing garage and sun lounge with single storey utility to rear and porch to front

### d) Relevant History

None

### e) Notifications

Sent  
5

Replies  
1

Expiry  
30-JUN-05

**Response:** Size of bathroom window in ground floor, it should be frosted glass, impact on drainage system once work finished.

## APPRAISAL

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

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 the openness of it. It is noted that the property has been previously extended, by means of a sun lounge infilling the rear corner, and a garage to the side.

	Original	Existing	% increase over original	Proposed	% increase over original
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	60.72	79.63	31%	85.62	41%
Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	111.24	130.15	17%	157.93	42%
Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	340	412	21%	528	55%

continued/

The development proposes an increase to the footprint, floor area and volume of the building. The footprint would only be increased by 10% over the existing situation due to the replacement of the garage and sun lounge. While the floorspace and volume increases to the property would be more significant, they are not considered to be disproportionate or detrimental to the Green Belt given the siting of the property in relation to the neighbouring properties and the size of approved extensions to other properties in Brookshill Avenue.

The main two storey part of the proposed extensions would respect the original building line to the front and back, with an infill corner at first floor level where the original building has an L shape. As the flank boundary of the property meets the rear garden boundary of No. 16 on the main Brookshill Avenue and there are further buildings between the site and the open space to the north, the proposal would not unduly affect the openness or character of the Green Belt. Although the attached house No. 20 has not been extended, the pair of semi-detached properties opposite at Nos. 22 and 24 have had substantial extensions in recent years. The approved extension to No. 24 EAST/422/00/FUL is of particular importance as it is of similar appearance from the road, and indeed has a greater depth to the rear. The property is one of 4 in this cul-de-sac and thus there would be no streetscene implications for Brookshill Avenue. In these circumstances, the lack of the normal requirement for a 1m setback at first floor level and a subordinate roof is considered to be acceptable.

Overall, the proposed extensions are not considered to be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt, given the siting in respect of the flank boundaries and neighbouring properties, and the similar size and bulk of the extensions to other neighbouring extensions.

## **2) Residential Amenity**

The proposed side extension 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. The flank wall of the two storey element would be sited 0.9m from the rear garden boundary of No. 16 and a total distance of approximately 11m from the rear of that dwelling. A condition has been imposed on the flank bathroom window to ensure obscure glazing that would prevent overlooking. The proposed single storey utility room to the rear would be away from the boundary with the attached property.

## **3) Consultation Responses**

Bathroom window – see report above

Drainage – not a planning issue

## **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.

---

**46 STATION ROAD, NORTH HARROW****2/15****P/1422/05/DFU/OH**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

CHANGE OF USE AT GROUND FLOOR FROM ESTATE AGENTS (CLASS A2) TO RESTAURANT & CAFE (CLASS A3); CONVERSION OF FIRST & SECOND FLOOR OFFICES TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; EXTERNAL STAIRCASE AND ALTERATIONS AT REAR

HOWARD J GREEN for MR E BECKETT

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 01, 12B, Site/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 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. 12B 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.
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
- 5 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 6 Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Use
- 7 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 21 – Bottle Recycling
- 2 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 3 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 4 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

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:
- |      |  |
|------|--|
| SD1  | Quality of Design  |
| 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                  |
| D6   | Design in Employment Areas   |
| D8   | Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments |
| EP25 | Noise  |
| T13  | Parking Standards  |
| H8   | Empty Homes and Property in the Borough                                  |
| H9   | Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats                       |
| EM17 | Change of Use Shops - Secondary Shopping Frontages                       |
| EM25 | Food, Drink and Late Night Uses  |
| C16  | Access to Buildings and Public Spaces                                    |
- 

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

- 1) Change of Use of Shops – Secondary Shopping Frontage (EM17, EM25, C16, D6, D8)
  - 2) Residential Amenity
  - 3) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
  - 4) Conversion of Houses and other Buildings to Flats (SH1, SH2, D4, D5, EP25, H8, H9)
  - 5) External Staircase (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

#### **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as two petitions objecting to the development have been received.

##### **a) Summary**

Town Centre	North Harrow	
Car Parking	Standard:	3.6 (max.)
	Justified:	1
	Provided:	2
Council Interest:	None	

##### **b) Site Description**

- three storey mid-terraced building located on the eastern side of Station Road

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/1422/05/DFU continued.....

- original two storey and single storey rear projection with a flat roof
- located within North Harrow District Centre, within parade designated as secondary shopping frontage
- the premises (including the upper floors) has established use as an A2 office
- the whole of the premises is currently vacant
- on-street parking controlled (double yellow lines in front of premises) come pay and display bays within the district centre and public car park with a 5 minute walk of the site to the north west

**c) Proposal Details**

- it is proposed to change the use of the ground floor A2 commercial unit into a restaurant/café (A3)
- the second part of the proposal is to change the use of the upper offices on the first and second floors into two self-contained flats
- access to the flats would be via a rear external staircase leading to a mezzanine level within the building

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/U/10215	Use of premises as estate agents and surveyors offices. established use approval	GRANTED 22-OCT-74
-------------	--	----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The ground floor of the property is situated within a Secondary Shopping Frontage and therefore policy EM17 of your adopted UDP applies
- Since it has lawful A2 use (see Established Use Certificate dated 22<sup>ND</sup> October 1074), change of use to A3 use (under the terms of the recently amended Use Classes Order) would not add to the proportion of non-retail use at street level
- So far as the conversion of the upper floor accommodation is concerned this is fully in accordance with Government and London Plan policy advice concerning making the best use of vacant upper floor accommodation in Town Centres by providing small residential units. The property is situated in a sustainable location and thereby also has the support of UDP policy H8
- In order to provide access to the residential accommodation (the upper floors currently being accessed through the ground floor accommodation), an external staircase at the rear of the premises is proposed- something which is already characteristic of the area

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 13	Replies 2 + 2 petitions with total of 195 signatures	Expiry 13-JUL-05
-------------------------	------------	--	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** welcome proposals to regenerate area and hope it will entice new A1 uses;

parking problems, access at rear, market for restaurants and cafes saturated, decline in trade over past 5 years, noise, waste, currently ample choice of food outlets in area, adverse effect on existing small restaurants/takeaways, severe competition from other areas, i.e. Pinner, Hatch End etc, concerned about the application for additional cafe/restaurant (A3) use

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Change of Use of Shops – Secondary Shopping Frontage**

In light of the application site being located in the designated secondary shopping frontage of a local parade, EM17 is the relevant policy of the adopted UDP. This policy restricts changes of use away from A1 retailing premises. The established use of the subject property is non-retail and as a result the proposed change of use from A2 to A3 would not result in the further loss of retail provision from North Harrow District Centre. The concentration of the non-retail uses surrounding the premises is established, therefore the proposed change of use would not add to this concentration.

It is considered that the proposed use as an A3 unit is appropriate to this district centre location and would be primarily for visiting members of the public.

The proposed plans indicate an area to the rear of the property that would be used for bin storage (i.e. for the business and the proposed flats above). Due to the arrangement of the levels, external access to this bin area would be via a ramp. It is considered that the siting of this bin area is acceptable with regards to the neighbouring properties. There is reasonable access at the rear of the property via the service road for vehicular access to collect the refuse.

The current application involves a change of use and does not involve any modifications to the front elevation of the building. Accordingly, the existing access arrangements are to remain unaltered; the width of the door is not less than 800mm. This is in accordance with the leaflet entitled “Access for All” and would therefore would not reduce the access for persons with limited mobility.

### **2) Residential Amenity**

Given the potential for a food and drink premises to cause detrimental amenity impacts for the nearby residencies (if hours of operation and noise/fume emissions are left unrestricted), selected restrictive conditions are proposed.

No details regarding a ventilation flue for the proposed A3 use has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Accordingly, a planning condition has been suggested to ensure that the change of use does not commence until details of a ventilation flue have been submitted and are to the satisfaction of the LPA, this is order to protect the residential amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

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

The service road to the rear of the site at Station Road is a private road that is used by vehicles delivering produce to the shops and as an access route to car parking in the rear yards of these shops. The road is also used as an access route to North Harrow Library and for informal parking. Within the proposal there are two parking spaces included at the rear of the site. The Unitary Development Plan states that for an A3 use, provision would be based on a provision of no greater than 1 space per 15 employees and the application proposes two spaces, which would be used for employees of the business.

continued/

Due to its locality, the site is well serviced by public transport and a public car park is within a 5-minute walk of the site. Coupled with this, the parking restrictions of the car park are such that after 6.30pm customers of the proposed establishment would not have to pay to park their vehicles. It is recognised that the surrounding roads have problems related to parking, however it is considered that these issues can be largely attributed to commuters parking and leaving their vehicles whilst they use the tube at the nearby North Harrow Underground Station. It is reasonable to assume that a many of the visitors to the proposed restaurant would visit as part of an overall trip to North Harrow District Centre and would park accordingly. Other users of the proposed restaurant could arrive by foot. The nature of the proposed business means that a majority of the custom would occur towards the evening time, after 6.30pm when parking in the designated public car park is free.

**4) Conversion of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats**

The site is located within a District Centre location. The first and second floors above the commercial unit are currently vacant and were previously used as A2 offices. Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan supports initiatives to bring empty residential property back into use and where appropriate will encourage the conversion of other empty premises above shops into residential use. The proposed change of use of the offices into flats would contribute to the viability of North Harrow by ensuring the residential population within the District Centre is maintained.

**The suitability of the new units created in terms of sizes, circulation and layout**

In terms of floor space, these vacant office spaces above the commercial unit would convert well and the size of the proposed flats are considered satisfactory. The proposed units both comprise of one bedroom, each flat has a separate bathroom, kitchen/diner and reception area. The second floor flat is split level, with the kitchen/diner on the mezzanine level and the remainder of the flat on the second floor. Access to both of the units would be to the rear via an external staircase leading up to the internal mezzanine level. Each flat would have its own independent entrance door on the flank wall. It is considered that the size of the proposed flats would reasonably meet the needs of non-family occupiers that the development would be likely to attract.

The vertical arrangement of the flats' rooms within the building avoids conflicting bedroom and living room uses and would therefore help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict.

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

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 properties by way of noise and/or disturbance.

**The level of useable amenity space and parking available**

There is no proposed parking or amenity space for the proposed flats. However, given the town centre location and taking into account the Local Planning Authorities flexible approach to promoting such conversions (policies SH1, SH2, H8) and advice contained in PPG3 in terms of access to public transport, employment, shopping, leisure and local services, it is not considered that a parking or amenity reason for refusal is justified.

continued/

**5) External Staircase**

The external staircase would be sited in a space between the two-storey rear projection of the property and the single storey rear extension at number 48 Station Road and it does not extend beyond these rear additions. The proposed staircase is to a height that leads to a mezzanine floor, in between the ground and first floors. It is considered that the height of the new staircase would not lead to any unreasonable overlooking or loss of privacy to the residential occupiers of the upper floors at number 50 Station Road. The existing single storey rear extension at this property is to a height that mitigates any overlooking of the flank kitchen window.

The siting of the staircase in between the two existing buildings would help to stifle nuisance arising from persons using the staircase.

There is one other staircase on the rear of this parade leading to the residential property of number 50 next door; therefore it is considered that the addition of the staircase at the rear of number 46 would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

**6) Consultation Responses**

Addressed in report

**CONCLUSION**

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



TWO SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS, FORECOURT, PARKING AND ACCESS FROM NORTHWICK PARK ROAD (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for MR S O'BRIEN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered Site Location Plan, Drawing No. 05/2340/1 & 05/2340/2.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 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 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 4 Levels to be Approved
- 5 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
- 6 Contaminated Land - Commencement of Works
- 7 Contaminated Land - Prevention of Pollution
- 8 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.

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 Water - Disposal of Sewage  
11 Water Storage Works  
12 Landscaping to be Approved  
13 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained  
14 Landscaping to be Implemented  
15 Trees - Protective Fencing

#### INFORMATIVES

- 1 Standard Informative 23 -Considerate Contractor Code of Practice  
2 Standard Informative 27 - Access for All  
3 Standard Informative 33 - Residents Parking Permits  
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  
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  
D8 Storage of Waste, Recyclable and Re-Usable Materials in New Developments  
D10 Trees and New Development  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

1. Residential Character (SD1, D4)
  2. Neighbouring Amenity (D4, D5)
  3. Parking and Highway Considerations (T13)
  4. Impact on Tree (D10)
  5. Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)
  6. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to the Planning Committee as a petition against the proposal has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	3
	Provided:	2
Site Area:	580m <sup>2</sup>	
Floorspace:	245m <sup>2</sup>	
Habitable Rooms:	8	
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Backland site located in the former rear gardens of 47-49 Gayton Road, known as The Gayton Hotel.
- Access is from Northwick Park Road to the rear of 51 Gayton Road.
- Site almost completely hard surfaced and currently used as a builders yard for storage of materials and machinery (use appears to be unlawful and has been referred to Enforcement).
- A small chalet building occupies the middle of the site and a small garage is located to the northwest corner beside a large Monterrey Cyprus tree (not protected).
- Site enclosed by high close boarded wooden fencing and hedging.
- Residential properties adjoin the site to north (Hanbury Court) and southwest (45 Gayton Rd).

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Erection of two semi-detached bungalows with pitched/hipped roof and rooflights.
- Two parking spaces would be provided to the forecourt of the site with additional space for cars to be parked in a tandem configuration.
- Separate amenity space would be provided for each unit.
- A large mature tree located to the north west corner of the site is proposed to be retained.

### **d) Relevant History**

P/2809/04/CFU	Two storey detached building at rear to provide 3 flats with 2 attached garages, access and forecourt parking	REFUSED 07-FEB-2005
---------------	---	------------------------

Cont...

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of excessive site coverage by building and a lack of space around the building, 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 proposed development, by reason of the height and bulk of the building, combined with a change in levels would be overbearing and obtrusive in relation to the garden and amenity space of the adjoining residents, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers thereof.
3. The proposed development, by reason of siting and orientation would give rise to overlooking and loss of privacy, to the detriment of residential amenity.
4. The proposed parking arrangement does not provide adequate forecourt and manoeuvring area, and the development would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway

P/666/05/CFU

Two storey terrace of 3 houses, access and car parking

REFUSED  
11-MAY-2005

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of excessive site coverage by building and a lack of space around the building, 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 proposed development, by reason of the height and bulk of the building, combined with a change in levels would be overbearing and obtrusive in relation to the garden and amenity space of the adjoining residents, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers thereof.
3. The proposed development, by reason of siting and orientation would give rise to overlooking and loss of privacy, to the detriment of residential amenity.
4. The proposed parking arrangement does not provide adequate forecourt and manoeuvring area, and the development would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to safety and the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.
5. Insufficient information has been provided regarding the proposed levels of the submitted scheme to enable a full assessment of the impact of the proposals on existing tree, which represent an important amenity feature.

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- This application follows other applications which have recently been refused, and seeks to address those issues.
- We have provided for two small chalet bungalows in order to reduce the impact on adjoining owners and prevent overlooking.
- Car parking is provided at a level which we consider to be appropriate given its town centre location.

Cont...

**f) Consultations**

Thames Water:	No objections
Environment Agency:	No comments

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	43	20	02-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** Does not take account of local district which has family houses with large gardens; high roof line intrudes into the garden area of other Gayton Road houses; vehicle access is in an unexpected location that would create a hazard for children and the elderly; contrary to a safe family environment; entrance is too small for fire engine; very busy road with hotels and school; height affects the view from other properties on Gayton Road; noise and disturbance from cars; unlawful uses on the site.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Residential Character**

The surrounding area is predominantly characterised by residential properties whereby large dwellings are set in deep plots. A number of hotels are situated in the immediate locality including those directly in front of the proposal site fronting Gayton Road and also opposite on Northwick Park Road. The site is currently used as a builders yard and is almost completely hard-surfaced. There does not appear to be any planning history regularising the use as a builders yard and although aerial photographs indicate that the use has been in place for a number of years the use is not lawful.

With respect of the prior refused schemes, it is highlighted that the current proposal is drastically reduced in scale, with respect of both number of units and the size of the buildings. By scaling the number of units from 3 to 2 and reducing the scale to single storey bungalows with accommodation within the roofspace it would ensure that the proposed development is to a form and scale that is compatible with surrounding buildings, whilst limiting offsite impacts. The site coverage would allow ample space around the buildings for appropriate landscaping and the proposed dwellings would have ample setbacks from boundaries to limit any impacts of visual bulk and prominence. This would ensure that the development would not result in a loss of amenity for either neighbouring or future occupiers of the site.

Cont...

## **2. Neighbouring Amenity**

With respect of issues of building bulk, prominence and impact on adjoining properties, as already highlighted, the revised scheme has addressed offsite impacts by appropriately reducing the scale of the scheme. The revised scheme that is predominantly single storey in scale with accommodation within the roofspace has addressed the issues previously associated with the bulk and footprint of the previously proposed building with the lack of space around it. The current scale of the proposed would give rise to a loss of outlook and would not have an overbearing impact on the adjoining garden and main amenity area for residents on that side of Hanbury Court.

The proposed rooflights would not result in undue overlooking.

## **3. Parking and Highway Considerations**

The application proposes 2 on site spaces to the front forecourt area, with additional area to accommodate 2 further vehicles in a tandem configuration. This level of on site parking is deemed to be appropriate, particularly with respect to the proximity of the site to Harrow Town Centre and the associated transport links. Furthermore it is highlighted that parking restrictions apply within the locality, thus to prevent further demand for on-street parking, the development will be deemed “resident permit restricted”, thus residential occupiers of the building will be ineligible for residential parking permits.

## **4. Impact on Tree**

Although not specifically protected, the large on site tree is considered to be an important amenity feature. Specifically the revised development plans detail that the proposed building would be sited sufficient distance from the proposed tree to ensure that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the long-term health of the tree.

## **5. Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the adopted 2004 UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range and types and sizes. The proposed scheme is considered to achieve this.

## **5. Consultation Responses**

See 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.

---

**7 ABERDEEN ROAD, WEALDSTONE****2/17****P/1283/05/DFU/JP2**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CONVERSION OF HOUSE INTO 2  
SELF-CONTAINED FLATS, SINGLE  
STOREY REAR EXTENSION  
(RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

C&S ASSOCIATES/W H SAUNDERS for B BRENDAN-LANGAN

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: CS/BBL/01 Rev.B, CS/BBL/02 Rev.B

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) – 4

- 5 Refuse Arrangements - Use

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 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:

S1 The Form of Development and Pattern of Land Use

SD1 Quality of Design

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

H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats

T13 Parking Standards

---

continued/

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Conversion Policy
  - 2) Character of Area
  - 3) Residential Amenity
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## INFORMATION

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

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	0
	Provided:	0
No. of Residential Units:	2	
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- site located on eastern side of Aberdeen Road, containing a mid terrace dwelling
- dwelling set back approximately 2.8m from the street frontage
- rear of dwelling contains two storey annex mirroring that at 9 Aberdeen Avenue
- rear of site small with tree on neighbouring property (No.5) shading most of the rear of the site
- path alongside annex provides access to ground floor utility room and another rear access is located at the end of the annex

### c) Proposal Details

- single storey rear extension at end of annex, being the same width as the annex
- conversion of property into flats with one upper and one lower
- single front entrance will be retained with two doors just inside providing individual access
- ground floor flat has access to the rear yard by way of a rear access door
- upper level flat does not have access
- the application has been amended during its processing, with rooms now being stacked more appropriately with the same uses being above/below each other with both lounges located at the front with the bedroom being access from the landing
- the bathroom is located toward the rear, with the kitchen/dining areas in the existing rear access
- no parking is able to be provided on site

### d) Relevant History

None

### e) Notifications

Sent  
8

Replies  
0

Expiry  
15-JUL-05  
continued/



## **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 is appropriate, with bedroom above bedroom, bathroom above bathroom, kitchen above kitchen, and living room above living room. Such an arrangement of rooms within the units would minimise the potential noise disruption between the two units and maintain residential amenity.

#### **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 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 provision of no private amenity space for the first floor flat is considered to be acceptable in this case. The unit is mid-terraced and as such first floor access to the rear garden cannot be reasonably provided. The site is located within walking distance of Byron Recreation Ground.

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

No car parking spaces are proposed to the front of the site as the site has a small front yard area with insufficient area for a parking space.

As parking is effectively excluded from the front yard area, there is sufficient space for adequate refuse storage arrangements. Pedestrian access is retained at the front of the site.

#### **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. There are no parking spaces proposed on site however due to the sites proximity to public transport on Wealdstone High Road, it is considered that the lack of on site parking will not result in detrimental impacts to parking in the area. Further to the above, the application has been reviewed by the Councils Transportation Engineer, who has stated that there are no objections with regard to transportation matters. In addition, an informative note advises of restriction of residential parking permits for the site which will ensure that the proposed development will not result in additional on street parking.

continued/

**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 elevation. Although activity associated with the property would be likely to intensify, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Aberdeen Road. According to Council property records, Aberdeen Road does not contain a high level of residential flat conversions.

**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, however it is not considered that this would be so significant as to be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

**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.

---

**HORSESHOE BAR, 326 EASTCOTE LANE, SOUTH HARROW**

**2/18**

**P/1702/05/CVA/CM**

Ward: ROXBOURNE

VARIATION OF CONDITION TO ALLOW OPENING  
MONDAY - THURSDAY 10:00 TO 01:00; FRIDAY &  
SATURDAY 10:00 TO 02:00; SUNDAY 11:00 TO 01:00

LEO MULLANE

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS received 18-JUL-05

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

- 1 The premises shall not be used except between 10.00 hours and 01.00 hours on Mondays to Thursdays, between 10.00 hours and 02.00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays and between 11.00 hours and 01.00 hours on Sundays.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **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:  
EP25 Noise  
EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses
- 

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- north side of Eastcote Lane on the corner of Kings Road
- site occupied by public house on the ground floor and residential unit above
- commercial premises with flats above to west and residential properties at Kings Road
- bungalows to north of rear access road

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition 5 of Appeal Ref. APP/M5450/A/00/1054764 (LBH Ref. WEST/663/00/FUL) to allow extension of opening hours to 10.00 hours and 01.00 hours on Mondays to Thursdays, between 10.00 hours and 02.00 hours on Fridays and Saturdays, and between 11.00 hours and 01.00 hours on Sundays

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/663/00/FUL	Change of use from off licence to wine bar (Class A1 to A3) on ground floor with forecourt parking	REFUSED 30-OCT-00 ALLOWED ON APPEAL 01-MAR-01
-----------------	--	---

Condition 5 reads:

The premises shall not be open for customers outside the following hours:-

10.30 – 23.00 Mondays – Saturdays

10.30 – 22.30 Sundays

<b>e) Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	105	1	15-AUG-05
<b>Summary of Response:</b> Noise			

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Residential Amenity**

Planning permission WEST/663/00/FUL, as allowed on appeal on 1st March 2001, which allowed the change of use of the premises from an off licence to a wine bar contains conditions which prevent the transmission of noise caused by music or other amplified sound and plant and machinery to neighbouring premises. These conditions are intended to prevent against negative impact on residential amenity from noise generation within the building. The Community Safety Division also has powers under the Environmental Protection Act to take action to abate such nuisance.

The main issue in considering the proposal to extend the opening hours of the premises is the possible intensity of noise and disturbance from outside the building and the impact on neighbouring residences. The applicant has indicated that the floorspace of the premises is 30m<sup>2</sup> which amounts to a modest size pub situated in a parade of other commercial properties. While there are flats over the application property and residential occupiers at the bungalows to the rear of the site, it is considered that the proposed extension of hours would not result in any further impacts on living conditions than the application considered by the Council in 2000 and decided by the Planning Inspectorate on 1st March 2001. In the previous appeal, the Inspector considered that the “prominence of the location and its openness to view would tend to reduce such effects”. He also considered that “while this (the proximity to residential properties) is not an ideal situation, it seems to me to be typical of many urban roads and that it is not unduly harmful”.

continued/

Thus it is not considered that the proposed extension of opening hours would be unduly detrimental to amenity. The Committee will be aware that the extended hours sought in this application also need to be agreed by the Licensing Panel. Should subsequent nuisance result to neighbouring residences then any responsible authority may call for a review of the license at which time the terms of the license can be reconsidered.

**2) 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 grant.

---

**88-92 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE**

**2/19**

**P/1036/05/CFU/SC2**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CHANGE OF USE: ANCILLARY RETAIL TO RESIDENTIAL  
ON 1ST AND 2ND FLOORS TO FORM 7 FLATS,  
ALTERATIONS AND ENTRANCE AT GROUND FLOOR  
(RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)

ROGER L HAMMOND for NIZA ENTERPRISES LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS, 01-06, S01-S06

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:  
(a) the extension/building(s)  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
- 4 The first floor terrace at the rear of the building shall be used for escape purposes only and not for sitting out or amenity use. The terrace shall be enclosed by 1.8m high translucent screen (or similar) details of which shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The screen shall be retained henceforth.  
REASON: To prevent overlooking of neighbouring premises.

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
- 3 Standard Informative 33 – Residents Parking Permits
- 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

H3 New Housing Provision - Land Identified for Housing and Vacant Sites

H10 Maintenance and Improvement to Existing Housing Stock

T13 Parking Standards

EM8 Enhancing Town Centres

---

continued/

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

- 1) Retail Impact (EM8)
  - 2) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, H10, H3)
  - 4) Parking (D4, T13)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Town Centre	Wealdstone	
Car Parking	Standard:	7.8
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	0
Habitable Rooms:	16	
No. of Residential Units:	7	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- northern corner of junction of High Street and Grant Road within Wealdstone District Centre
- building currently occupied by supermarket ('Budgens') and comprises 2-storeys plus rooms in roof-space fronting High Street, 2 storeys with flat roof fronting Grant Road and single storey with flat roof on remainder of site, plus stairs/lift towers
- situated within a designated secondary shopping frontage area. Surrounding area is mixed use with ground floor retail/services with residential units above
- men's clothing shop with residential above adjoins the applicant property to the north. A mixture of ground floor uses including a butchers, estate agents, DIY store, solicitors and a Woolworths outlet all of which have residential above, are located directly opposite the applicant premise
- alleyway located to the rear of 88-92 High Street beyond which are further ground floor commercial premises (café + barber shop) with residential above
- the site on the opposite side of Grant Road from the applicant property is currently being redeveloped to provide residential accommodation

### **c) Proposal Details**

- change of use from ancillary retail on first and second floors to form 7 flats, alterations and the formation of a new entrance at ground floor level
- 5 no. 1 bed flats and 2 no. 2 bed flats are proposed
- development of flat roofed extension at first floor level, glazed flank wall to northern elevation + rendered rear wall
- reduction of existing ground floor retail area by approx 26%
- relocation of storage and ancillary shop facilities from the upper floors to ground floor level resulting in an approx 40% reduction in retail space

continued/

Item 2/19 – P/1036/05/CFU continued.....

- no car parking facilities proposed
- similar proposal for a change of use from ancillary retail to residential on first floor only plus first floor rear extension to provide 5 flats was recently granted permission in June 2003.

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/8580/D	Illuminated fascia sign	GRANTED 11-JUL-63
P/479/03/CFU	Change of use: ancillary retail to residential (Class C3 and A1 to C3) on first floor, and first floor rear extension, to provide 5 flats (Resident Permit Restricted)	GRANTED 05-JUN-03

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 46	Replies 0	Expiry 21-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Retail Impact**

The proposed works would affect the ground floor customer area of the existing store, which is located within a designated secondary retail frontage area.

At present, the first and second floors of the premise are used for storage purposes and offices ancillary to property's main retail use. A conversion of the first and second floors to provide residential accommodation would necessitate a relocation of these storage facilities to ground floor level. The south side of the store is proposed to be partitioned off in order to accommodate this relocation of storage facilities including freezers. It is also proposed to relocate a lift from the rear of the store and provide a new entrance for residents within this area. The new entrance would be located on the Grant Road elevation towards the southwest corner of the property.

A reduction of approx 26% in ground floor customer retail space is therefore proposed to accommodate this relocation. The applicant wishes to reduce the size of the store by using the south side of the ground floor for storage purposes while retaining the northern part of the floor. In order to offset this loss the applicant is proposing to convert an existing storage area to the rear of the northern section to customer retail use, thus resulting in the customer retail area extending from the front of the building to the rear. A decrease in store size will also mean a reduction in space required for the storage of goods.

The current storage space appears to be in excess of what's required for the store. The first floor area, while used for storage, is still under utilised while the second floor is currently vacant apart from some staff toilet accommodation. A conversion of these floors to residential use and a relocation of storage facilities to the ground floor would represent a much more efficient use of space within the building and Wealdstone district centre.

continued/



The previous permission does not result in a loss of customer retail space due to the fact that part of the first floor is retained for storage purposes. However, the previous application would see the second floor remain under utilised. While the current application would see a loss of just over a quarter of current customer retail space the Council feels that the provision of residential accommodation on the first and second floors more than compensates for this loss. The 7 residential units sought would maximise the potential of both floors will also providing accommodation within an urban centre.

UDP Policy EM8 favours mixed use developments especially with a residential element as this brings diversity to urban centres and leads to an increase in their vitality. It also helps to increase the patronage of other uses within the town centre. The policy specifically advocates utilising empty floor-space above shops in order to increase the vitality of an area, particularly if new units are created. The Council feels that utilising the first and second floors of the applicant property in order to provide residential units, will have a positive affect on Wealdstone District Centre and will, in turn, offset any loss in ground floor customer retail area.

The loss of this retail space is therefore not considered detrimental to retail integrity.

**2) Appearance of Area**

The proposed extension would be screened form the High Street and Grant Road frontages by the existing building.

The glazed north-facing flank wall which would project beyond a first floor flank wall at no.94 would be lightweight in appearance and the rear wall would be set back by some 3.7m from the rear face of the building.

It is therefore considered that the application proposed would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the surrounding area.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The provision of housing accommodation in Town Centres is encouraged in UDP Policy EM8 and small units are encouraged in UDP Policy H3.

The Council feels that the proposed flats would be self-contained and provide an acceptable standard of accommodation.

In terms of neighbouring amenity, the north-facing glazed flank wall which serves a corridor overlooking yards behind commercial units in the High Street, will not result in any loss of residential amenity.

At rear first floor level one bedroom window and a kitchen window would face a garden behind No. 4 Grant Road, which has a first floor flat above a ground floor barber shop. It is not known whether this flat has access to the garden. The proposed windows are however, considered to be located a sufficient distance away from this property and coupled with a condition requesting some form of translucent screening, will not impact negatively on residential amenity levels.

continued/

At second floor level, all existing window openings are to be retained. The windows to the front overlook High Street and their conversion will not result in any amenity loss. The rear windows are positioned a further 12m back from the first floor rear windows and overlook the yards of adjoining commercial ground floor premises. These windows are at a similar height to the second floor windows of adjoining, occupied upper floor residential units. The Council considers that their conversion, to provide residential accommodation, would not have a negative impact on neighbouring residential amenity levels.

**4) Parking**

The scheme would be Resident Permit Restricted to deter car ownership. Given also the Town Centre location and the availability of public transport, the lack of on-site parking can be supported.

**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.

**MARLBOROUGH SCHOOL, 81 MARLBOROUGH HILL, P/1784/05/CLA/SC2  
HARROW**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO HALL, PROVISION OF NEW DOORS TO CLASSROOM  
BUILDING

RICKARD PARTNERSHIP for HARROW COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Ordnance Survey and Plan Nos. 3108/02, 03, 04 and 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

## **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:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

---

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

1. Character of Area (SD1, D4)
  2. Amenity of Neighbours (SD1, D4)
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: Council Owned School

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- Situated on northern side of Marlborough Hill and bounded to the east by Badminton Close.
- Mixture of one and two-storey buildings, constructed in the 1960's and currently used as a junior and infants school.
- Immediate area is predominantly residential. The applicant property is surrounded on all sides by residential units.

**c) Proposal Details**

- Single storey extension to the existing 2-storey school hall located behind the main entrance to the school. The proposal also includes the installation of two doors to the front classrooms of the building adjoining the main school building entrance and opposite the main access route to the school grounds.
- Extension sought to provide extra space in the existing hall as opposed to any additional classrooms.
- Existing hall is to be extended southwards by 5m onto an existing enclosed yard.
- Extension will create an additional 58sqm of space for the school hall.
- Internal works regarding access routes and the removal of partition walls and doors will accompany the works.
- A flat roof with two roof lights is proposed for the extension.

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/616	Development of a new primary junior mixed infants school	GRANTED 01-JUL-66
LBH/616/1	Erection of an additional classroom	GRANTED 19-MAR-68
LBH/616/2	Erection of single storey extension to provide 3 new classrooms	GRANTED 24-SEP-68
EAST/630/93/FUL	Alterations and single storey extensions	GRANTED 07-MAR-94

**e) Notifications**

Sent 18	Replies 0	Expiry 17-AUG-2005
------------	--------------	-----------------------

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Character of Area**

The area surrounding the applicant school is predominantly residential. The school is well established and has been servicing the local area since the mid 1960's. During this time the school has expanded to accommodate an increase in student attendance. The extension sought in this application however is not considered to accommodate for an increase in future student numbers but rather to improve facilities for existing students. The proposed works are to extend the school hall rather than provide additional classrooms.

The single storey extension proposed is relatively small scale and will not be disproportionate to the existing school. The hall is to be extended southwards by 5m onto an existing enclosed yard and will provide an additional 58sqm of school hall space. The discreet location of this extension, behind the front building, means that the new development is outside the public realm and cannot be viewed from street level. This location coupled with the scale of the development means the proposed extension will have a minimal effect on the residential character of the area.

The doors proposed are at the front of the school building near the main entrance and will provide an alternative access to the two front classrooms at this location. These doors will allow parents to pick up their children from the front of the building rather than travel around to the back of the school. The doors will also provide access to both classrooms during the course of construction.

### **2. Amenity of Neighbours**

While the school is situated in a predominantly residential area, the Council considers that the works proposed will have a minimal effect on the amenity levels of local residents. The location of the extension, within in the centre of the school building, and its small scale mean the proposed development can not be viewed from local residential properties. The application therefore eliminates any overlooking, overbearing or loss of privacy issues usually associated with contentious cases involving residential amenity levels.

The nature of the works proposed indicates an intention not to accommodate an increase in student numbers but instead to improve the school facilities for existing students. This is because the application is to extend the existing school hall as opposed to the creation of extra classrooms. The works, therefore will not lead to a major increase in students or any subsequent increase in noise and traffic levels and as such will not impact negatively on the amenity levels of local residents.

Cont...

### **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.

---

**PLOTS 1, 2 & 6, 88 HIGH ST AND 19 & 25 KING HENRY  
MEWS, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/21**

**P/1218/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS AND CONVERSION OF THREE FLATS  
TO FORM ONE DWELLING

ARCHER ARCHITECTS for MR R DEACON

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: SK20, 21, 22, ALL PLOTS rev.F, Site Plan

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

1 Time Limit - Full Permission

**INFORMATIVES**

1 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

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

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

D16 Conservation Area Priority

EP25 Noise

EP31 Areas of Special Character

T13 Parking Standards

2 This permission relates only to the change of use from three flats to one house and does not convey any permission or consent required for any alterations either internal or external.

---

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

1) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers

2) Parking and Access

3) Loss of Residential Accommodation

4) Character and appearance of Conservation Area; Setting of Listed Buildings; Area of Special Character

5) Consultation Responses

continued/

---

## **INFORMATION**

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

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Conservation Area: Harrow on the Hill Village

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- former King's Head Hotel building – original Georgian element adjacent to boundary with No. 86
- approved conversion of former hotel building comprises two ground and first floor maisonettes (plots 1 & 2), one ground floor flat (plot 3), two first floor flats (plots 4 & 5) and three second floor flats (plots 6, 7, 8)
- plot 6 has approved fire escape route over roof of two storey projection (above plot 2) at rear
- approved two storey dwelling projects beyond former hotel building at rear (plot 14) with main windows and entrance facing south-west (into site) but with single storey (glazed roof) projection to north-east side, two and a half storey terraced dwellings beyond
- adjoining property No. 86 used as restaurant on ground floor with basement kitchen and rooms above, adjacent upper room has windows to front and rear, owner has advised that upper rooms form a manager's flat (no kitchen or independent access) but currently used as ancillary office' listed building consent and renewal planning permission granted for rear conservatory extension to restaurant
- site within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and Area of Special Character; Nos. 82-86 and former King's Head Hotel listed (Grade II)

### **c) Proposal Details**

- conversion of plots 1, 2, 6 (88 High Street, 19 & 25 King Henry Mews) to single family dwelling
- dwelling would comprise three reception rooms on ground floor, four bedrooms and a study on the first floor and three further bedrooms, a further study and a dressing room on the second floor

continued/



**d) Relevant History**

Kingsgate, former King's Head Hotel

WEST/143/02/FUL	Change of use: hotel to residential and part food and drink (C1 TO C3 and A3) 3 storey extension to hotel with accommodation in roofspace and conversion to provide 16 flats and detached 2 storey blocks with accommodation in roofspace to provide 3 bed flats and 11 terraced and 2 semi detached properties with access and parking	APPEALED AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED 12-FEB-03 (A condition removed Permitted Development Rights)
WEST/144/02/LBC	Listed Building Consent: Part demolition and works associated with conversion to residential and A3 use	APPEALED AGAINST NON- DETERMINATION ALLOWED 12-FEB-03 (A condition removed Permitted Development Rights)
P/851/05/DLB	Listed Building Consent: Railings and screen to roof terrace at rear	UNDETERMINED
P/598/05/DFU	Alterations and revised boundary treatment to flat roof adjoining Flat 6 to provide terrace with railings	UNDETERMINED

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: Would welcome fewer residential units on the Hill. Consider the impact on the Listed Building. The creation of one dwelling should take its design cue from the original listed building rather than from the design of the three flats.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area		Expiry 14-JUL-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 8	Replies 0	Expiry 04-JUL-05

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Amenity of Neighbouring Occupiers**

The proposed conversion would secure a single dwelling largely within the confines of the original Georgian building and isolated from the other flats that are to be retained. Room uses adjacent to the walls common with the other flats at first and second floor levels would be bedrooms and at ground floor level there would be no horizontal conflict of bedroom and non-bedroom uses. In these circumstances, and together with the de-intensification of use within the building that would result, it is not considered that the proposal would lead to circumstances detrimental to the amenity of other occupiers within the building. Neither is it considered that any unacceptable relationship would occur in terms of the proposed dwelling and No. 86.

The proposal would not materially affect overlooking relationships beyond the approved situation and in these circumstances neither is it considered that there would be any detriment to the privacy amenity of other occupiers within the development. The use of the second floor roof as a balcony is the subject of a separate application.

### **2) Parking and Access**

The dwelling would be accessed via the original building frontage and is considered to be acceptable. It is also considered that, as a single dwelling, the proposals parking requirement would be no greater than that of three separate flats (and may be reduced) for which provision has already been made within the approved redevelopment.

### **3) Loss of Residential Accommodation**

Policy H11 of the replacement Harrow UDP (2004) presumes against the change of use from residential to non-residential. In the subject instance the site would remain in residential use and whilst the number of units would be reduced from three to one, taking into account the Council's housing supply date and in particular the success in achieving flatted units in recent years, it is not considered that the loss of flat units and the formation of a luxury dwelling is unacceptable. Moreover it is considered that the benefit of the proposal in conservation terms (see below) would outweigh the loss of residential units, consistent with UDP Policy D16.

### **4) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area; Impact on Listed Building; Area of Special Character**

The Kings Head developed in 4 stages. The first building on the site dates from the 17th century and is a two storey single room deep structure. This was extended by the erection of the Georgian block, at the northernmost end of the site, which was built in front of the older building. The (now demolished) Assembly Rooms were added next, in the mid 19th century, and the Edwardian central block, which links the Georgian wing to the Assembly Rooms were added last, c1900.

continued/

The approved scheme for the conversion of the Kings Head to residential use allowed the horizontal sub-division of the building into flats. It was ensured that the original physical building elements were retained, by not allowing the removal of the large sub-dividing walls or the central Georgian stair, but the flats do span across the different building elements. This would mean for example that while the stair is left in situ, it would not be used in its entirety, as the top floor would not gain access from the central Georgian stair.

This proposal is to be welcomed in that it would allow the Georgian and earlier wings, the historic core of the building, to be used as one unit. This would allow the whole stair to be used and for the Georgian wing, in particular, to be understood as a single element of the building, allowing its historic character to be more clearly read to occupiers and visitors. As such it is considered that the proposals would preserve the historic character of the listed building and is therefore considered acceptable.

As a listed building the dwelling would have no permitted development rights. Internal and minor external alterations would continue to be controlled through the listed building consent regime.

Similarly it is considered that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. There would be no material impact on neighbouring listed buildings.

It is not considered that the development would have any adverse effects on any feature that contributes to this part of the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character.

**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.

---

**49 BRANCKER ROAD, KENTON****2/22****P/774/05/DFU/AMH**

Ward: KENTON EAST

2 STOREY SIDE TO REAR, SINGLE STOREY FRONT &  
REAR EXTENSIONS, REAR DORMER; CONVERSION TO  
2 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS

MR JAMSHED JEE

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: WJ/49/01; 02; 02(existing ground floor); 03; 04; 04(existing front elevation); 05;  
05(existing rear elevation); 06; 06(existing side elevation); 07; 08; 09;  
WJ/49BR/04; site plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until a scheme for:-
  - (a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste
  - (b) and vehicular access theretohas been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4

**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:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

T13 Parking Standards

H9 Conversions of House and Other Buildings to Flats

---

continued/

## MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

## INFORMATION

This application is report to Committee as the scheme conflicts with agreed policies, standards and guidelines and is recommended for grant. This revised planning application only differs from that previously granted (P/1099/03/DFU) through the enlargement of the proposed rear dormer window.

### a) Summary

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	2
Council Interest:	None	

### b) Site Description

- semi-detached dwelling on site to eastern side of Brancker Road
- extension under construction at time of site visit
- adjacent dwelling to the north has extension similar to that proposed within this current application
- space on front driveway to accommodate two parked cars

### c) Proposal Details

- application seeks permission for a two storey side to rear extension; single storey front and rear extension; rear dormer; and conversion to 2 self-contained flats

### d) Relevant History

P/1099/03/DFU	Two storey side to rear single storey front and rear extension, rear staircase; rear dormer and conversion to two self-contained flats	GRANTED 21-JUL-03
P/2814/04/DFU	Two storey side to rear, single storey front and rear extensions and rear dormer	WITHDRAWN 14-JAN-05

e) Notifications	Sent 8	Replies 0	Expiry 12-MAY-05
------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Conversion Policy

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

The internal layout and vertical stacking of the proposed units is not considered to be ideal. A kitchen/diner area is proposed directly above a ground floor bedroom. Notwithstanding, this element of the scheme is identical to a recently approved application that is still valid. In light of this it is considered that a refusal could not be reasonably justified on these grounds.

continued/

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

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 recommended that permission be conditional upon the agreement and implementation of a scheme of sound insulation.

**The level of useable amenity space**

The proposed flats would be provided adequate private amenity space, immediately adjacent to the rear elevation of the building.

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

Two car parking spaces could be provided to the front of the building.

It is considered that the size of forecourt is of sufficient size to ensure adequate refuse storage arrangements, parking, soft landscaping and pedestrian access could be facilitated, however to ensure that an satisfactory scheme is implemented, it is recommended that any permission granted be conditional upon the approval and implementation of an appropriate scheme.

**Traffic and highway safety**

The existing crossover would be utilised. It is not considered that the use of the crossover to serve the conversion would present be prejudicial to highway safety.

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

The proposed dormer window would measure 4.4m wide as oppose to c2m wide as within the previous application. The enlarged dormer would remain well contained within the roof slope, complies with householder SPG, and is considered to be acceptable. It is necessary for the applicant to apply for the whole scheme (conversion, side extension and rear dormer) as the previous permission has not yet been fully implemented.

**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.

---

**FRESHFIELDS, 12 REENGLASS ROAD, STANMORE****2/23****P/1493/05/DFU/AMH****Ward: CANONS**

1ST FLOOR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE TWO STOREY HOUSE, SINGLE AND 2 STOREY REAR EXTENSION, FRONT PORCH, ALTERATIONS TO ELEVATIONS (REVISED)

MANCE DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE for MR NILESH SHAH

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: p-149-AL (2) 01 Rev.B; 02 Rev.B; 03 Rev.B; 04 Rev.B; 05 Rev.B; 06 Rev.B; 07 Rev.B; 08 Rev.A; p-149-AL (01) 01 Rev.A

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 The window(s) in the flank 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.
- 4 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), 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.
- 5 Restrict Use of Roof as a Balcony
- 6 Landscaping to be Approved
- 7 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 8 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
- 9 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 10 Trees - Protective Fencing
- 11 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling

**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

continued/

- 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)      Character of Area
  - 2)      Residential Amenity
  - 3)      Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee at the request of a Nominated Member. This is a revised planning application. Permission has already been granted (P/863/05/DFU) for substantial first floor extension to the dwelling. The principal difference between this application and the previously approved scheme is the incorporation of a two-storey rear extension to the northern most part of the dwelling.

**a)      Summary**

TPO

Council Interest:                      None

**b)      Site Description**

- detached residential dwelling on site to eastern side of Reenglass Road, adjacent to corner at merger with Glanleam Road
- site occupied by bungalow
- adjacent dwelling to south is bungalow design with dormers in roof
- permission granted for substantial dwelling on site to north (Longfield)
- site subject to a TPO

**c)      Proposal Details**

- the application proposes the construction of a substantial single, first floor, and two storey extension to the existing bungalow to provide a 2 storey house with rooms in the roof
- to the southern side of the dwelling the proposed first floor extension would project some 6m beyond the main rear wall of the adjacent bungalow (Merrimore)
- to the northern side of rear elevation a two storey rear projection c3m deep and 5.5m wide is proposed. The roof above this element would be c8.75m wide, overhanging the extension below
- a skylight would be sited on the new roof above the main dwelling

continued/



**d) Relevant History**

P/3191/04/DFU	First floor extension to provide 2 storey house, single storey rear ext, front porch, alterations to elevations	REFUSED 15-FEB-04
---------------	---	----------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed development, by reason of excessive size and bulk would have an unacceptable relationship with the adjacent dwelling (Merrimore) appearing unduly overbearing and obtrusive to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of that dwelling.”

P/863/05/DFU	First floor extension to provide 2 storey house, single storey rear extension, front porch, alterations to elevations (revised)	GRANTED 27-MAY-05
--------------	---	----------------------

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 8	Replies 0	Expiry 18-JUL-05
-------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

The area is characterised primarily by large detached two-storey houses, of varying styles. The principle of allowing a substantial first floor extension to the building has previously been accepted. It is not considered that the two-storey rear extension that is now proposed would have any significant impact on the appearance of the resultant building in the street.

It is not considered that the proposed roof light would appear unduly obtrusive in the street scene. The roof light would be sited centrally in the flat section of the roof, and as such views of the roof light from the street would be oblique.

The site is subject to a Tree Preservation Order, served on the 7<sup>th</sup> Feb 2005. Only one protected tree stands within close proximity to the proposed development site, and that is an Ash tree c10m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. Conditions above have been suggested in the interest of protecting this tree.

It is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact upon the character of the area.

**2) Residential Amenity**

Given the separation of between the adjacent bungalow and the proposed extension to the southern side of the dwelling, the proposal would adequately comply with the 45° code in relation to the adjacent bungalow (Merrimore).

The orientation of the application building in relation to the north of the adjacent Merrimore is favourable, and will minimise the potential for over shading.

continued/

The proposed balcony would be some 7.25m distance away from the boundary with the adjacent dwelling, sited roughly centrally within the plot width, given this substantial distance from the boundary, it is not considered that this would give rise to an unreasonable level of overlooking, above that which might reasonably be expected in residential location such as this.

It is not considered that this part of the development would have an unacceptable impact on the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of that adjacent property. This element of the scheme (the first floor extension to the southern half of the dwelling, incorporating balcony) remains the same as that proposed with the previously approved scheme, and as such the principle has been accepted previously.

The proposed two-storey extension to the northern side of the rear elevation would be sited well away from the boundary with the adjacent Merrimore, and shielded from the site to the north (Longfield) by dense evergreen trees. No dwelling exists on the plot to the north, however, planning permission exists for a substantial house on this site. It is considered that this dwelling would be sited sufficiently far from the development proposed within this application so as to ensure future occupiers would not suffer any unreasonable effect from the extension proposed within this application.

It is not considered that the proposal would adversely impact visual or residential amenities of any of the adjacent occupiers.

**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.

---

**LAND ADJ. 269 WATFORD ROAD, HARROW**

**2/24**

**P/136/05/CFU/RJS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT DETACHED BUILDING TO ACCOMMODATE POOL AND GYM FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH ADJACENT DWELLING HOUSE

ELEY & ASSOCIATES for ALI MUSANI

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Title No.NGL722670, unnumbered existing block plan, 12/101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 1150-11B, 12B, 20B

**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 building hereby approved shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the adjoining dwelling at 269 Watford Road.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**  
**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION:**  
The decision to grant permission has been taken having regard to the policies and proposals in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan set out below, and to all relevant material considerations including any comments received in response to publicity and consultation, as outlined in the application report:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
SEP5 Structural Features  
SEP6 Areas of Special Character, Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land  
SD1 Quality of Design  
EP44 Metropolitan Open Land  
EP45 Additional Building on Metropolitan Open Land  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout

continued/

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

- 1) Metropolitan Open Land and Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, EP31, EP44, EP45)
  - 2) Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Neighbours (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Metropolitan Open Land

Area of Special Character

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- plot of land adjacent to residential property of 269 Watford Road
- plot accommodates open land to the front and rear thirds of the site whilst the central third of the site accommodates a single storey commercial building
- the flat roofed commercial building accommodates a height of 2.4m and a footprint of approximately 18 x 11m
- the building has been previously utilised for ornamental fish breeding and sales business but the business has recently ceased operations on the site
- the residential property at 269 Watford Road is noted as being located with the borough boundary of Brent Council, whilst the site is located within Harrow
- the adjoining site to the north is Harrow School Farm

**c) Proposal Details**

- the proposed development site relates only to the area of land covered by the footprint of the existing commercial building and this relates to approximately the middle third of the land parcel located adjacent to 269 Watford Road
- demolition of existing commercial building, development of replacement detached building to accommodate a pool and gym in conjunction with the adjacent dwellinghouse
- replacement building would have a footprint of 18 x 8.5m and would have a shallow pitched roof with eave height of 2.4m from and 2.8m to the central ridge

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/609/94/FUL	New vehicular access and hardsurfaced car park	REFUSED 11-NOV-94
WEST/34/95/CLE	Certificate of Lawful Existing Use and Development: Structure for fish breeding, rearing and sales	ANR 28-MAR-95

continued/

WEST/206/95/CON	Retention of existing vehicle access and hardstanding and change of use of land from agricultural to parking in connection with fish breeding business	REFUSED 10-OCT-95
WEST/121/96/CLE	Certificate of Lawful Existing Development: Hardsurfacing of land	REFUSED 15-AUG-96
WEST/548/96/CLE	Certificate of Lawful Existing Development: Hardsurfacing of land	REQ 27-NOV-96
WEST/645/02/FUL	Re-development to provide a detached bungalow with access and forecourt parking	WITHDRAWN 24-JUN-03

f)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 2	Expiry 16-MAY-05
----	----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Bulk, size and form of proposed development will be detrimental to the character of what is a semi-rural setting, site located within Metropolitan Open Land and it is difficult to see how the proposed use could be regarded as appropriate, in addition proposed roof garden would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to both adjoining gardens and Harrow School Farm, current use of the site blends in more easily with rural nature of the adjoining agricultural and buildings have an agricultural feel and scale, development in form proposed, including landscaping proposals will result in unacceptable urbanisation of this Metropolitan Open Land, a substantial gymnasium and pool are not compatible with Metropolitan Open Land.

## APPRAISAL

### 1) Metropolitan Open Land and Area of Special Character

The site is located within the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character and is additionally designated as Metropolitan Open Land. In such terms the proposal must be considered with respect to its impact on the character and openness of the area. Policy EP44 requires that Metropolitan Open Land be kept primarily open in character and free from building development. However as the application is for a replacement building, there is no policy objection provided that the new building has no greater impact than the existing building. Additionally Policy EP31 d) requires redevelopment schemes to preserve or improve the character and appearance of the Area of Special Character.

With respect to the replacement building, it is highlighted that it is smaller in footprint than the existing building. Whilst the replacement building would have the same depth of 18m, the width would be only 8.5m, where the existing building has a width of 11m.

continued/

The replacement building is proposed to be partially excavated into the site, in order to minimise the overall height of the building. With respect to the front elevation, the existing building extends above natural ground level to a height of 2.4m. With respect of the front elevation, the proposed building accommodates a shallow pitched roof with gable end, with a height of 1.8m to eave line and 2.8m to the apex of the ridge. Although the proposed building is technically taller than the building to be replaced, nevertheless the average height of the building (between eave and ridge), when viewed from the street is only 2.3m. This is below the 2.4m height of the existing flat roofed building. With its limited height, coupled with the building being narrower in width than the building being replaced, it would ensure that the proposed building would pose no greater impact on the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land. Additionally, the shallow pitch of the roof would preserve the character and appearance of the Area of Special Character as it would relate to a number of other large pitched roof buildings on the adjacent property. For these reasons it is considered that the proposed replacement outbuilding would not have a detrimental impact on the openness and character of the locality with respect of the Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character and Metropolitan Open Land classifications.

**2) Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Neighbours**

The proposed single storey building would pose no greater impacts over adjoining properties than the building to be replaced. therefore there is no concern of the proposal causing detrimental impacts.

**3) Consultation Responses**

Loss of privacy – no roof garden is proposed, the proposed roof is a traditional ridged design.

Other issues addressed in report.

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**REAR OF 7/9 VILLAGE WAY EAST, HARROW****2/25****P/1503/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

SINGLE STOREY STORAGE BUILDING AND  
PARKING SPACES AT REARJRA DESIGN ASSOCIATES for MR T J HARRIS

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/78/01C; site plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 The extension hereby approved shall not be used at any time other than in association with the use of the ground floors of Nos. 7 & 9 fronting Village Way East, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, the viability of Rayners Lane District Centre and the free flow/safety of traffic using Village Way East.
- 4 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied or used until the parking and servicing area to the rear of No. 9 Village Way East has been laid out in accordance with the arrangement shown on the approved drawing No. 04/78/01C. The area shall be made available for the parking of vehicles associated with, and the servicing of, Nos. 7 & 9 Village Way East at all times unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the viability of Rayners Lane District Centre and the free flow/safety of traffic using Village Way East

**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:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SD3 Mixed-Use Development
- ST2 Traffic Management
- EP25 Noise
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D7 Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres
- EM22 Contaminated Land
- T13 Parking Standards

---

continued/

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

- 1) Impact on Amenity and Character
  - 2) Impact on Traffic and Rayners Lane District Centre
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as the applicant is related to a member of the Planning Committee.

### **a) Summary**

Town Centre                                      Rayners Lane  
Council Interest:                                      None

### **b) Site Description**

- hardsurfaced parking area to rear of Nos. 7 and 9 Village Way East
- ground floor of No. 9 in retail use (model shop); Nos. 1-7 (odds) all vacant, presumed last use retail; residential flats above (access at rear)
- service access from Village Way East runs between Nos. 9 and 11 to rear
- adjacent Nos. 3 and 5 have single storey breeze-block outbuildings (disused) up to the irregularly angled rear boundary
- within Rayners Lane District Centre; ground floors designated as secondary shopping frontage; Village Way East part of borough distributor road network
- on-street parking controlled (pay and display) 8.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday – disabled bays outside Nos. 7 and 9

### **c) Proposal Details**

- single storey extension to rear of No. 7, 19.3m deep adjacent to boundary with No. 5 and 5.5m wide, flat roof to height of 3.1m
- rear and east flank elevation to include roller shutter doors, glazed entrance lobby between to link main body of extension with existing building
- area to rear of No. 9 to be laid out as 6 car parking spaces

### **d) Relevant History**

#### 3 Village Way East

WEST/323/94/FUL	Single storey rear extension and new shopfront	GRANTED 12-JUL-94
-----------------	--	----------------------

#### 5 Village Way East

WEST/615/97/FUL	Rear Dormer	GRANTED 24-OCT-97
-----------------	-------------	----------------------

LBH/41222	Single storey rear extension to provide storage facility	GRANTED 02-AUG-90
-----------	--	----------------------

continued/



Item 2/25 – P/1503/05/DFU continued.....

7 Village Way East

P/1447/03/DFU	Change of Use: ground floor Class A1 to Class A3	GRANTED 04-AUG-03
P/510/04/DFU	Single storey rear extension	GRANTED 26-APR-04
P/2898/04/DFU	Single storey storage building and parking spaces at rear	REFUSED 28-JAN-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal for the formation of an independent storage/warehouse use would result in overdevelopment of the site of Nos. 7/9 Village Way East, and would unduly increase levels of activity and noise/disturbance on and around the site, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring first floor flats.
2. The proposal, resulting in the loss of servicing facility for the existing premises and potentially prejudicing the use of the rear access road, would lead to increased use of the highway for servicing purposes and could curtail the viability of existing units fronting Village Way East, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and the vitality/viability of the Rayners Lane district centre.”

9 Village Way East

WEST/857/01/FUL	Change of Use: retail (Class A1) to restaurant/hot food take-away (Class A3) on ground floor	GRANTED 22-JAN-02
P/2898/04/DFU	Single storey storage building and parking spaces at rear	REFUSED 28-JAN-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposal for the formation of an independent storage/warehouse use would result in overdevelopment of the site of Nos. 7/9 Village Way East, and would unduly increase levels of activity and noise/disturbance on and around the site, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring first floor flats.
2. The proposal, resulting in the loss of servicing facility for the existing premises and potentially prejudicing the use of the rear access road, would lead to increased use of the highway for servicing purposes and could curtail the viability of existing units fronting Village Way East, to the detriment of the free flow of traffic and the vitality/viability of the Rayners Lane district centre.”

No. 11 Village Way East

WEST/275/01/FUL	Single storey rear extension to provide office accommodation	GRANTED 24-MAY-01
-----------------	--	----------------------

continued/

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The proposed storage building is now linked to the existing building and its use will be associated with No. 7 Village Way East
- Nos. 1-23 Village Way East do not service from the service road and therefore there is no justification for insisting upon an exception. Most of the buildings are built out to the service road and make no provision for parking. If the proposed extension was reduced by 5m the area would be used as parking by others and would interfere with a vehicle being loaded until the perpetrator had been found. You will note that I am providing 6 parking spaces which is more than any other shopkeeper.
- It is suggested that the building is left as proposed but that the car parking space No. 6 is also used for servicing the property and a roller shutter on the flank would allow access. The rear roller shutter will allow a loaded vehicle to be stored securely overnight which is essential. The type of vehicles servicing Nos. 7 & 9 would be small Ford transit type vehicles. As the proposed servicing arrangements are far superior to other existing buildings arrangements it is hoped approval can now be recommended.

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
71

Replies  
0

Expiry  
21-JUL-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Impact on Character and Amenity**

The extension would enclose a small area to the rear of No. 7, which provides secondary pedestrian access and light to the rear of the ground floor unit and the only means of access to the first floor flat, with a glazed entrance lobby. With the glazed roof the effect of the proposal on light reaching this area would be limited, and as windows to non-habitable areas the overshadowing/loss of light impact on these is not considered to be unacceptable. With a new flank entrance and gated access it is also considered that the proposal would improve the first floor flats entrance and, therefore, would enhance the amenity of the occupiers beyond that which is characteristic for this area.

There are many single storey additions and outbuildings to the ground floor commercial units in this part of the Rayners Lane District Centre.

Notwithstanding its depth and subject to construction in matching materials, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity or character of the locality.

In terms of noise and disturbance, the proposal has now been presented as a storage facility for the existing ground floor unit; this can be secured by the application of an appropriate condition. Subject to use as an integral part of the existing premises and not independently, it is no longer considered that there would be a material increase in levels of commercial activity that would be detrimental to the residential amenity of first floor occupiers.

continued/

In all of these circumstances it is considered that the previous reason for refusal NO. 1 had been satisfactorily overcome.

**2) Impact on Traffic and Rayners Lane District Centre**

Six parking spaces to the rear of No. 9 would provide for the parking and servicing requirements of Nos. 7 and 9; a condition is suggested to ensure that this arrangement is maintained and control of over any future change.

By retaining a servicing and parking facility at the rear and as a non-independent building it is considered that the revised proposal need not lead to increased use of the highway for servicing of the existing premises, nor that as a result would there be any risk to the viability of the existing units fronting Village Way East. The proposal has not been amended, as had originally been suggested, to reduce its depth to a level that would provide servicing gap between its rear elevation and the service road. However it is considered that the explanation provided by the applicant – that the extension could be serviced from the side (i.e. on the land to the rear of No. 9) – is satisfactory and the proposal need not, therefore, lead to circumstances disruptive to other uses of the service road.

In all of these circumstances it is considered that the previous reason for refusal No.2 had been satisfactorily overcome.

**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.

**PROVISION OF NEW GATES ACROSS ENTRANCE IN WOOD LANE**

GAMI ASSOCIATES LTD for MR H HALAI

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: pg/gs/50a, 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 and drawings showing details of any electrical apparatus have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:  
(a) gates  
The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality, the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building.

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5 Structural Features

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

SD1 Quality of Design

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

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

T15 Servicing of New Developments

---

continued/

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

- 1) Green Belt Impact (SEP5, SEP6, EP33)
  - 2) Character of Area of Special Character (SEP5, SEP6, EP31)
  - 3) Character and Appearance of Area and Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D15)
  - 4) Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings (SD2, D11)
  - 5) Traffic Impact (T15)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

Consideration of this application was deferred at the Committee meetings on 6th and 27th July in order to undertake a Members Site Visit which took place on 30th August.

Although the Committee resolved that this application be determined alongside the Change of Use application (P/1306/05/CFU) it has not been possible to report the later application to this meeting. Indeed, it is not absolutely clear that the application will be reported to the October meeting.

In these circumstances, the application for front gates is therefore placed on the agenda for two reasons:-

- 1) at the request of the applicant who is particularly concerned about security issues on the site, and
- 2) because a continuing delay on determining this application (received in April 2005) is considered to be unreasonable.

### **a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Listed Building

Conservation Area: Little Common, Stanmore

Green Belt

Site Area: 6.6 ha

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- large site on south side of Wood Lane close to junction with Warren Lane, grounds extending to Dennis Lane to the west
- within Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character
- northern part within Little Common Conservation Area
- southern part within Site of Nature Conservation Interest
- occupied by leisure and fitness club, vacant for several years
- buildings concentrated along Wood Lane frontage
- comprise squash courts/restaurant building (2 storeys) plus single storey changing accommodation, gymnasium, restaurant, open air pool
- Garden Cottage within grounds is Grade II Listed
- other buildings listed by virtue of attachment or location within curtilage

continued/

Item 2/26 – P/754/05/CFU continued.....

- main car park adjacent to Wood Lane, with overspill parking at rear at lower level
- access from Wood Lane through gap in Grade II Listed wall along Wood Lane frontage
- open air tennis courts, landscaped grounds plus woodland and open land beyond buildings
- land within Wood Farm to east
- Stanmore Country Park to south
- religious centre to west
- residential property to north

**bb) Listed Building Description**

Garden Cottage:

- circa 1840, faces away from road
- long 2-storey, 5 casement windows, fourth in gabled projecting wing
- round headed
- door in second bay with blind window over
- band at first storey
- slate roof

Boundary Wall:

- mid C.19
- yellow stock brick wall, some 4m high, stone coping, about 110m long

**c) Proposal Details**

- provision of pair of double gates across entrance in Wood Lane, opening inwards
- 3m height adjacent to listed wall, increasing to 4.4m in centre
- total width 7.5m
- comprised of vertical railings with decorative features
- wrought iron proposed, painted black
- amended drawing no. pg/gs/50a received 24-MAY-05 (simplified design of gate)

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/4249/1	Use of land as sports club with erection of 7 squash courts & ancillary accommodation, demolition & reconstruction of part of boundary wall to provide new vehicle access to Wood Lane & construction of car parking	GRANTED 21-OCT-77
LBH/4249/2	Details pursuant to planning permission LBH/4249/1	GRANTED 06-JAN-78
LBH/38355	Alterations, new covered swimming pool & covered link, first floor covered patio, reform entrance steps and use of squash court for staff accommodation and ancillary purposes (Partly Implemented)	GRANTED 17-AUG-89

continued/

LBH/44981	Leisure Development – golf course, stables, hotel and extensions to existing club, car parking, country park and visitor centre (including Wood Farm)	REFUSED 03-MAR-93
-----------	---	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposals would represent an overintensive use of the site resulting in overdevelopment within the Green Belt.
2. The proposed hotel is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and very special circumstances to justify it being allowed in the Green Belt have not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
3. The hotel building and associated car parking would be of excessive scale, contrary to the Council’s policies and detrimental to the Area of Special Character, the Green Belt and the Conservation Area.
4. The proposed hotel would have an adverse impact on the setting of Garden Cottage, a Listed Building.”

LBH/44980	Listed Building Alterations/extensions for ancillary facilities for club, new hotel and golf course	Consent: REFUSED 09-MAR-93
-----------	--	-------------------------------

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed covered way would be premature in the absence of acceptable associated redevelopment proposals.”

P/2716/03/CFU	Refurbishment of Garden Cottage as dwelling, demolition of all other buildings, 3 x 3 storey buildings to provide 15 flats, basement parking, detached dwelling, 2 detached garages, alterations to boundary wall	WITHDRAWN 17-MAY-04
---------------	---	------------------------

P/2715/03/CLB	Listed Building Consent: Internal & external alterations to Garden Cottage & demolition of curtilage listed structures	WITHDRAWN 17-MAY-04
---------------	--	------------------------

P/2714/03/CCA	Demolition of all buildings apart from listed building, 'Garden Cottage'.	WITHDRAWN 17-MAY-04
---------------	---	------------------------

P/1306/05/CFU	Change of use: Leisure to religious uses including conversion of garages to Caretakers House. Increase height of squash/functions building by 1m	CURRENT
---------------	--	---------

continued/

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: (1st Proposal)

Need to see the gates in relation to adjoining brick wall. Traditional metal gates would be acceptable but should take their cue from age of brick wall and should be a subservient entrance to Springbok House. Gates should be set back behind brickwork so steel mechanisms are hidden from view.

CAAC: (2nd Proposal)

The revisions are an improvement on the previous design, but the comments from the previous CAAC meeting of 23 May 2004 still apply. The design should be more subdued and in keeping with the wall. The gates should be squared at the top, rather than curved upwards to a point.

**Advertisement**

Character of Conservation Area/  
Setting of Listed Building

Expiry  
09-JUN-05

**Notifications**

Sent  
2

Replies  
0

Expiry  
01-JUN-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Green Belt Impact**

The proposed gates would be permeable in appearance, and have an insignificant impact on the openness and character of the Green Belt.

**2) Character of Area of Special Character**

The proposal would not affect the structural features which comprise the Area of Special Character.

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

An acceptable design is shown for the gates which, together with the use of wrought iron materials, would preserve the character of the Conservation Area and the appearance of the area.

**4) Impact on the Character and Setting of the Listed Buildings**

The proposed gates would be physically separate from the adjacent listed wall and there is therefore no need for listed building consent. The gates would be mostly subordinate to the height of the wall with only the centre section rising some 300mm above it.

The gateposts would be located behind the wall, and overall the proposals would provide an acceptable impact on the character and setting of the listed wall, while also securing the site.

continued/



**5) Traffic Impact**

The gates would be set back by almost 6m from the edge of the carriageway, enabling vehicles to stand clear of the highway while waiting for the gates to open to the benefit of the free flow of traffic.

**6) Consultations**

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.

---

**120 OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE**

**2/27**

**P/944/05/DFU/AMH**

Ward: BELMONT

REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY HOUSE WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF

P WITHAM, ADT CONSULTANTS LTD for MR HASNAINI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 0404/PA01; PA02.

**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 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no 0404/PA01 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.
- 3 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 **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

---

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

1. Character of Area
  2. Residential Amenity
  3. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as a petition objecting to the scheme has been received, and the application is recommended for Grant.

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	2
	Justified:	2
	Provided:	2
No. of Residential Units:	1	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- two storey detached dwelling on south-east side of Old Church Lane, Stanmore.
- detached dwelling to south-west, no. 118, has two storey extension to part side with 1m set back at first floor front (bathroom window to first floor rear elevation); two storey rear extension across the width of the original dwelling, rear dormer and single storey extension to remainder of adjacent side.
- detached dwelling to north-east, no. 122, has two storey extension across width of original dwelling house and further single storey projection to adjacent part of rear; single storey extension to adjacent side and facing first floor flank window to bathroom.
- nos. 114-130 (even) smaller, less spacious house types; dwellings to west beyond more characterised by more spacious settings (see O.S) and different design/proportions.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Application seeks permission for the retention of a replacement two-storey house with accommodation in the roof.
- The dwelling has single and two storey elements with an overall footprint of c140m<sup>2</sup>.
- The building has a similar appearance to that of the resultant building in the event that the previous valid permission (P/1467/04/DFU) for an extension to the original house had been implemented correctly. This application is required as a consequence of the substantial demolition of the original dwelling during the implementation of the above permission, as such, the development could not be considered as an extension to the original house. The key differences between the approved scheme and the latest scheme are detailed below.
- The apex of the main roof scales from the plans at 8.9m high. This is 0.6m higher than detailed within the previously approved scheme.
- The first floor side extension is set back from the main front wall by 800mm. This was set back 1m in the approved scheme.

Cont...

- The single storey front extension adjacent to number 118 projects approximately 500mm beyond a similar projection at number 118. This is similar to the approved scheme however a chamfered bay window on the approved scheme has been replaced with a shallower curved bay window.
- A balustrade above the single storey front extension that was present in the approved scheme has been deleted.
- The rear dormer window is larger than that depicted within the approved plans. The approved plans showed the upper corners of this to be sited 0.4m from the edges of the roof whereas the dormer constructed is flush with the edges of the roof.

**d) Relevant History**

P/1559/03/DFU	Two storey side and rear, single storey front, side and rear extension, alterations to roof with rear balcony	WITHDRAWN 04-SEP-03
P/2803/03/DFU	Two storey side and rear, single storey front, side and rear extension, alterations to roof with rear dormer	GRANTED 02-FEB-04
P/1467/04/DFU	Two storey side and rear, single storey front side and rear extension, alterations to roof with rear dormer (revised)	GRANTED 10-AUG-04

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 8	Replies 2 (inc petition with 16 signatures)	Expiry 13-MAY-05
-------------------------	-----------	--	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** open and spacious setting is characteristic of street; strong sense of openness; structure that has been built does not fit in with street scene or character of area; gaps between buildings is important feature of street; earlier extensions in street have had regard to space about buildings to avoid terracing; no regard for Council guidance; character and streetscene doomed; dwelling dwarfs previous building; Interferes with detached house at 118; restrictions put upon 122 with regards to extension in 2002; replacement house guided by different rules; property demolished without permission; removal of party wall; excessive bulk; virtually attached to 118; some councils do not allow extensions of this nature; drawings inaccurate; plans inaccurate - bay is level with 'turret' in reality; crosses boundary line; insufficient information is misleading; why do they need 7/8 bedrooms?; precedent.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

This application needs to be considered in the light of the recent grant of planning permission for the extension of the original dwelling house (P/1467/04/DFU). This application is required as a consequence of the substantial demolition of the original dwelling during the implementation of the above permission, as such, the development could not be considered as an extension to the original house. An application for a replacement dwelling was required.

### **1. Character of area**

The Council guidelines (HSPG, 2003) require first floor side extensions to be setback a minimum of 1m from the main front building line. This scheme incorporates a setback of only 800mm. Given the variation in building line that occurs in the street as a result of various projecting bays and differing house styles it is considered that a lesser setback may be reasonably justified and that the building will not result in the creation of a perceived terrace of dwellings. The design of the dwelling, incorporating a subordinate element adjacent to number 118 ensures that the detached character is retained.

It is not considered that the differences between the approved scheme and this current scheme significantly alter the appearance of the resultant building in the streetscene. It is not considered that the replacement dwelling has an unacceptable impact on the character of the area.

The replacement building is c0.6m higher than the original building. There is no uniform height to the buildings in Old Church Lane, and it is not considered that the height of the replacement dwelling is unreasonable or out of character in the locality.

The proposed dormer window remains contained in the roof slope and has a similar appearance to one constructed at number 118. It is not considered that this has any significantly adverse impact on the character of the locality.

It is considered that the alterations to the single storey front extension to delete the balustrade on the roof represent a positive amendment, and will result in a building with a more sympathetic appearance in the street.

### **2. Residential amenity**

It is not considered that the differences between the approved scheme and this current scheme significantly alter the impact of the resultant building on the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

Cont...

The building on site is not wholly consistent with the approved plans (P/1467/04/DFU) for the extension of the original dwelling house. The resultant building is larger. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered that the differences are sufficient to warrant the refusal of this planning application. It is not considered that the differences amount to a material change against which a refusal of planning permission could be reasonably sustained.

### **3. Consultation Responses**

Planning considerations have been addressed above.

- *Restrictions put upon 122 with regards to extension in 2002/replacement house guided by different rules* – Every application is assessed on it's own merits.
- *Property demolished without permission* – This falls beyond the control of the LPA, the current application has been submitted retrospectively to redress the situation.
- *Removal of party wall* – This is a civil matter.
- *Some councils do not allow extensions of this nature* – Every LPA has different supplementary planning guidance.
- *Drawings inaccurate/insufficient information* – sufficient information was supplied to assess the application. Discrepancies found were not considered to be material.
- *Why do they need 7/8 bedrooms?* – The need for such a dwelling of the size proposed is not a material planning consideration. The application has been assessed as as an application for a replacement single family dwelling. Any deviation from this use, that does not benefit from Permitted Development, will require planning permission.
- *Precedent* - Every application is assessed on it's own merits.

### **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.

---

### 3 WELBECK ROAD, SOUTH HARROW

2/28

P/1055/05/DFU/OH

Ward: WEST HARROW

CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL  
TO HEALTHCARE SERVICES (GP  
DIRECT) WITH PLATFORM LIFT AT SIDE

HOWARD J GREEN FRICS for G P DIRECT

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 0429/PL01, PL02, PL104B, PL105A, PL106A, PL107A

Inform the applicant that: -

- 1) The proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a variation of a Legal Agreement (relating to 5 & 7 Welbeck Road and to include 3 Welbeck Road) within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to: -
  - i) The number of general parishioners, qualified medical advisors and nursing staff seeing and consulting with patients within the Surgery at any one time shall be limited to 6.
  - ii) That the number of non-medical staff attending the Surgery on the course of their employment shall at any one time be limited to 8.
  - iii) That the total number of NHS or private patients eligible by virtue of registration to receive treatment within the Surgery shall be limited at any one time to 8,000.
  - iv) That all qualified medical practitioners practising within the Surgery will give written consent to the Harrow Primary Care Trust to provide every 6 months or on request, details of the latest group capitation figure for the practice, otherwise known as "the group list size", and details of individual practitioners' capitation figure if requested.
  - v) That on request of the Local Planning Authority each medical practitioner practising within the Surgery shall give details of their capitation figure otherwise known as "the patient list size" within fourteen days of request.
  - vi) That the Surgery shall only be open to patients between the hours of 8am to 8pm on Mondays to Fridays and 9am to 12 noon on Saturdays except in the case of emergencies.
- 2) A formal decision notice, subject to there being no further objections as a result of the extended period of notification and subject to the planning conditions noted below, will be issued upon the completion, by the application, of the aforementioned legal agreement.

continued/

Item 2/28 – P/1055/05/DFU continued.....

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Completed Development - Buildings
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Disabled Access - Buildings

**INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All
- 3 Standard Informative 32 – The Party Wall etc. Act 1996

**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
- SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
- SC1 Provision of Community Services
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
- T13 Parking Standards
- H11 Presumption Against the Loss of Residential Land and Buildings
- C8 Health Care and Social Services
- C9 Doctors' Surgeries

---

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

- 1) Community Benefit (SC1, C8, C9)
  - 2) Loss of Residential Accommodation (H11, C9)
  - 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D9)
  - 4) Residential Character (D4, D9)
  - 5) Traffic/Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:
	Justified:
	Provided:
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- semi-detached property located on southern side of Welbeck Road, opposite green 'island'

continued/



Item 2/28 – P/1055/05/DFU continued.....

- part of a row of four semi-detached properties (nos. 1, 3, 5 and 7). Numbers 5 and 7 have already been converted into doctors' surgeries
- small single storey side extension, towards the rear of the property
- driveway up the side of the property
- on-street parking is available

**c) Proposal Details**

- revised proposal for the conversion of a residential property into a GP surgery
- it is proposed to extend the doctors surgery practice (currently in numbers 5 and 7) into number 3 Welbeck Road (semi adjacent to number 5 Welbeck Road)
- the ground floor plan shows a consulting room, waiting room, reception and bathroom
- the first floor plan shows two further consulting rooms (dietician and phlebotomy) along with a bathroom and staff toilet. The current 'box' room would be converted into a store
- this application has replaced the previously unacceptable front ramp with a platform lift to the side of the property and the lift would be sited approximately 3 metres beyond the main front wall of the property
- as in the previous application, the proposal would utilise residential accommodation, previously there was no evidence to support the need for the service

**c) Relevant History**

7 Welbeck Road

LBH/42981	Change of Use: Staff flat to additional surgery accommodation	REFUSED 02-JUL-91 ALLOWED ON APPEAL
-----------	---	--

5 Welbeck Road

WEST/723/97/FUL	Change of Use: Residential to doctors surgery (Class C3 to D1) and single storey extensions to both nos. 5 and 7	GRANTED 05-MAR-99 SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT
-----------------	--	--

3 Welbeck Road

P/2654/04/DFU	Change of use from residential to healthcare services (GP direct with ramp at front)	REFUSED 27-JAN-05
---------------	--	----------------------

Reasons for refusal:

- "1. The proposed change of use would result in loss of residential accommodation, contrary to the relevant policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

continued/

2. The proposed change of use would result in an over intensive use of the property which, by reason of associated disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring property and be out of character in the locality.
3. The proposed access ramp in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene, and result in unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.”

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Extensive statement received from agent, summarised below:

- When your UDP policies are carefully considered it can be seen that this proposal is in accordance with the Strategic Health Authority and your policies to provide local healthcare facilities.
- What I accept was a valid criticism of the appearance of the scheme (the ramp) has been omitted. The residential character of the area of the area will not be compromised.
- Your authority recognises the difficulties local healthcare have in finding appropriate locations. I consider Nos. 3, 5 and 7 Welbeck Road are ideally situated and their use strikes the right balance between providing local facilities and protecting the amenities of residents.

**e) Consultations**

HCPT:

The Harrow Primary Care Trust supports GP Direct's application for planning permission to develop 3 Welbeck Road as an additional surgery premises. The new GP contract encourages GP practices to provide a wider range of services for patients in their surgeries closer to home, obviating the need for patients to attend hospital. Many practices are restricted by lack of space and the proposed expansion will assist the practice to provide services for a rapidly expanding patient list.

<b>1st Notification</b>	Sent 10	Replies 1	Expiry 30-MAY-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** No objection

<b>2nd Notification</b>	Sent 10	Replies 0	Expiry 15-JUN-05
-------------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Community Benefit**

The applicant has provided a supporting statement, which indicates that there will be qualitative as well as quantitative benefits to the new accommodation. The expansion into the new premises will ensure that waiting times for patients are reduced and will also ensure that the doctors can continue to provide services for their existing patients. The applicant has provided the LPA with the Strategic Health Authority Policy Statement (which supports improved local access) and a letter of support from the Harrow Primary Care Trust (which was not received on the previous occasion). GP Direct currently own five sites, three of which fall within the jurisdiction of Harrow Council. The applicant states that for a number of months they have been exploring different expansion options to alleviate pressure of the existing sites. It is considered that of the range of the existing sites within Harrow, this site is the most suitable. It is therefore considered, that in light of the new information the application satisfies the criteria of policies C9 and H11.

### **2) Loss of Residential Accommodation**

It is considered that the negative impacts of the proposed expansion are outweighed by the community benefits of this proposal. Previously it was considered that the loss of this residential space would have been contrary to policy H11 of the adopted UDP. It is acknowledged that the LPA recognises that in exceptional circumstances it might be appropriate to locate certain community services within residential units or on land allocated for housing. In satisfying the criteria for policy H11, the onus is on the applicant to prove to the LPA that there is a need for the service and that the facility cannot be reasonably accommodated elsewhere. On the previous occasion the LPA did not receive any response from the Harrow PCT in support, however on this occasion the Harrow PCT have given their full support to this application- therefore demonstrating that there is a need.

### **3) Residential Amenity**

It is acknowledged that the proposed change of use of number 3 would increase the daytime use of this property. There will be more comings and goings of patients and staff activity with consequential amenity impact. This impact is likely to be lesser at the weekends and during the evenings especially if controlled by condition as suggested. On balance of the reduced evening and weekend activity and the community benefit (i.e. in light of the new information) the level of activity associated with the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

The previous application for change of use of number 5 in 1997 was granted subject to a legal agreement stipulating the maximum amount of staff allowed on the site at any one time as well as a maximum patient list of 6,000. The reason this agreement was imposed was to limit the amount of activity within the area. Due to an ever-increasing population and pressures on the existing services, the purpose of extending the surgery into a further property would primarily facilitate extra patients. Due to the difficulty of obtaining sites (outside of residential areas) that are suitable for GPs it is considered that a marginal increase in the maximum patient list size and staff numbers would be acceptable and would be subject to a variation of a legal agreement. continued/

The proposed platform lift would be sited approximately 3 metres beyond the main front wall of the property and would not be an obvious addition in the street scene. The siting of the proposed platform lift would ensure that the visual amenities of the area are protected.

**4) Residential Character**

Upon reconsideration of the site circumstances, when considering Welbeck Road as a whole, it is deemed that the predominant character of the road would remain as residential. This proposal would result in three out of the four properties on this part of Welbeck Road in non-residential use. It is proposed to retain the existing landscaped area within the front garden; therefore the appearance of the property would not change drastically in the street scene. The grass island directly in front of the property further mitigates the impact on the character here. It is considered that any remaining harm is outweighed by the benefit of providing this extra service to the community.

**5) Traffic/Highway Safety/Parking**

The existing Surgery at numbers 5 and 7 already has provision for two parking spaces in the front garden and two parking spaces in the rear garden. GP surgeries are generally sited within an area that is easily accessible to the catchment population, and mostly within walking distance of the site. The surrounding roads are not resident permit restricted. The Council's Transport Engineers have confirmed that there is on street parking facilities available. There are no objections in principle on parking grounds; therefore it is considered that a parking reason for refusal cannot be justified.

**6) 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.

---

**99 ARUNDEL DRIVE, HARROW**

**2/29**

**P/1475/05/DFU/KMS**

Ward: ROXETH

CONVERSION OF DWELLING HOUSE TO TWO SELF-CONTAINED FLATS AND ONE HOUSE; PARKING AT FRONT AND REAR

ENCINOL CONSTRUCTION UK LTD for MR & MRS KUMARENDRAN

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: ST/99/04 R1

**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 The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a scheme of landscaping of the front and rear gardens, to include details of the screening of the bin store, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area and to enhance the appearance of the development.
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Disabled Access – Buildings
- 7 Refuse Arrangements - Use

### **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:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- 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
- H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
- T13 Parking Standards
- EP25 Noise

---

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

- 1) Conservation Policy (H9, T13)
- 2) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5)

continued/

- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 4) Changes from Previous Schemes
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	4 max.
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	3
No. of Residential Units:	Existing: 1 Proposed: 3	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- 2-storey semi-detached dwelling with 2-storey side and single storey rear extensions
- property is located on corner of Arundel Drive and an un-named cul-de-sac
- attached neighbour un-extended
- unattached neighbour (opposite side of cul-de-sac) has 2-storey side to rear extension and converted to 5 units (LBH/28333)
- no hard surfacing to front at present
- rear garden extends to c.110.5 sq. m with detached garage at rear

### **c) Proposal Details**

- it is proposed to convert the semi-detached property to two self-contained flats and one 2-bedroom house
- the proposed conversion relates to the dwelling as extended. No further extensions are proposed
- the flats would be located in the original house, the single storey rear extension and part of the 2-storey rear extension. They would be accessed via the existing entrance door, with internal arrangements to facilitate access to the upper unit in the lobby area. A ramp to the entrance door is proposed to facilitate disabled access to the ground floor unit
- the house would be located in the existing 2-storey side extension and the remainder of the 2-storey rear extension. It would be accessed by the existing entrance door in the 2-storey side extension
- the proposal includes 1 parking space to the front on the existing hardsurfaced area, to the right of the entrance door, with the area to the left of the entrance door being landscaped and planted. Pedestrian access would be via a path between the parking and landscaped areas. A further 2 parking spaces would be provided at the rear of the property, partly on the site of the existing garage
- a storage area for 3 refuse bins is proposed on the east side of the rear garden abutting the boundary with the cul-de-sac

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/119/02/FUL	Two storey side to rear and single storey rear extension	GRANTED 08-APR-02
P/254/05/DFU	Conversion of dwelling house to four self contained flats; parking at front and rear	REFUSED 18-APR-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed conversion would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of associated disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and be out of character in the locality
2. The proposal makes no provision for access to the rear garden from the first floor flats and thus provides an inadequate standard of amenity for the future occupiers thereof.
3. The internal layout of the proposed flats would be likely to give rise to unreasonable levels of noise transmission between the units, to the detriment of the amenities of future occupiers thereof.
4. The proposal does not include satisfactory arrangements for the disposal and collection of waste arising from the development.
5. The submitted plans do not include provision for disabled access to the ground floor units.
6. The proposed parking arrangements would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to the safety of pedestrians and other users of the adjacent highways, and would result in the loss of potential green space on the frontage.”

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 13	Replies 1 + 1 petition of 14 signatures	Expiry 11-JUL-05
-------------------------	------------	---	---------------------

**Response:** More traffic, less parking available, reduced security to other properties, safety of pedestrians, loss of green space, inadequate refuse provision, unsatisfactory internal layout giving rise to noise transmission.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Conversion Policy**

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

In a significant change from the previously refused scheme, the revised proposal comprises a 2-bedroom house, a 1 bedroom ground floor apartment, and a 2-bedroom first floor apartment. The proposed house and first floor flat would comprise of 3 habitable rooms, whilst the ground floor flat would comprise 2 habitable rooms. All 3 units would exceed the Institute of Environmental Health standards for habitable floorspace. It is therefore considered that the conversion would not result in overcrowding.

continued/

The proposal would not result in a reduction in the availability of single family dwelling houses on Arundel Drive. Having regard to the Council's policy and guidelines, it is not considered that the proposal would constitute an over-intensive use of the site, nor is it considered that any detrimental change to the single-family dwelling house character of Arundel Drive would occur as a result of the proposed conversion. Furthermore, given the policies of the Council in respect of meeting housing need and facilitating of a range of housing types and sizes, it is considered that the proposal should be favoured.

**Standard of sound insulation measures between units**

The vertical arrangement of the proposed layout would be generally acceptable in terms of noise reduction. Furthermore, the noise insulation condition suggested would serve to negate potential noise disturbance within the converted property and between it and the attached neighbour.

**Amenity space**

The property would have a rear garden area of approximately 100 m<sup>2</sup> with access available from all 3 units. The garden would be divided into 3 areas with c.22m<sup>2</sup> allocated to the 2-bedroom house, c.40m<sup>2</sup> to the ground floor flat, and c.23m<sup>2</sup> to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor flat. It is considered that this level of provision would be sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers of the units, and would not amount to an over intensification of the use of the garden.

**Parking and Forecourt Treatment**

The recently adopted UDP sets a maximum of 1.2 spaces for units comprising 2 habitable rooms and 1.4 parking spaces for units comprising 3 habitable rooms. The maximum parking requirement generated by this proposal would therefore be 4 spaces, including 0.6 spaces for visitor provision. The previously refused scheme showed parking space for 2 cars to the front of the property, accessed via a dropped kerb and 2 spaces at the end of the rear garden. Whilst this would accord with the maximum standard, it would not enable landscaping to be provide within the front garden, resulting in the parking area appearing unduly obtrusive in the street-scene. The revised proposal however, reduces overall provision to 3 spaces of which only one would be on the forecourt. The submitted plans suggest that this would be surrounded by planted areas with the area between the access path and the boundary with the cul-de-sac also given over to soft landscaping. Despite the shortfall of one space, given the relatively close proximity of local bus and rail routes, this is considered to be acceptable subject to the submission of full details of the landscaping and its implementation being required by condition. It is also considered that the reduced width of the vehicle crossover required at the front of the property would enable the previous objections on grounds of pedestrian and highway safety to be overcome.

The proposal indicates arrangements for the siting of refuse bins. These would be sited in an enclosed are at the rear of the property adjacent to the boundary with the cul-de-sac. Such a location is considered to be acceptable subject to it being adequately screened from the adjacent footway.

continued/



**2) Character of Area**

Given that the proposals comply with the criteria set out in policy H9 and there are no extenuating circumstances, it is not considered that there would be any detrimental impact on the character of Arundel Drive as a result of this conversion. It is recognised that the property on the opposite side of the cul-de-sac has been converted to apartments but it is considered that the conversion of no. 99 would not impact detrimentally on local character, especially as the conversion would include a 2-bedroom dwelling house.

**3) 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 owners.

**4) Changes from Previous Schemes**

The main differences from the previous scheme (P/254/05/DFU are the reduction in the number of proposed units from 4 to 3, and the reduction in car parking provision from 4 to 3 off-road spaces. The previous scheme was considered unsatisfactory as the proposed number of units (4) would have resulted in the property being over intensively used, especially as the vertical arrangement of the rooms would not have minimised potential noise transmission. It is considered that the reduction to 3 units, enables these problems to be overcome.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Traffic – addressed above

Parking – addressed above

Pedestrian safety – addressed above

Refuse – addressed above

Internal layout – addressed above

Security of other properties – beyond scope of this application

**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 TORBAY ROAD, HARROW****2/30****P/1126/05/DFU/KMS**

Ward: RAYNERS LANE

TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR  
EXTENSION; CONVERSION OF EXTENDED BUILDING  
TO 3 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS; PARKING AT REAR

SMITHS for PACELAND ESTATES LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 9441/001, 002A, 003, 010B

**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 north 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 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 5 Landscaping to be Approved
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Refuse Arrangements - Use

**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:

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

---

continued/

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

- 1) Two Storey Side, Single Storey Side and Rear Extensions (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Conversion of Dwellinghouse to Flats (H9, EP25, SH1, SH2)
  - 3) Traffic and Highway Safety/Parking (T13)
  - 4) Character of Area (SD1, D4, D5, D9)
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

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

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	4 max
	Justified:	See report
	Provided:	3
No. of Residential Units:	Existing: 1 Proposed: 3	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- end of terrace dwelling located on corner of Torbay Road and Capthorne Avenue
- forecourt partly hard surfaced with hedges to front and side boundaries; on-street parking not resident permit controlled
- rear garden to an approximate depth of 20 metres (approximately 180m<sup>2</sup> area)

### **c) Proposal Details**

- the application proposes the conversion of the property into three self-contained units
- the ground floor units would have 1 bedroom each, whilst the first floor unit would have 3 bedrooms
- access to all three units would be via the existing entrance door with internal arrangements to facilitate access to the individual apartments in the lobby area
- single and 2-storey side and rear extensions are also proposed
- front elevation of side extension would be setback from front elevation of existing building; ground floor flank elevation would abut Capthorne Avenue boundary with first floor set in by 0.5m
- rear extensions would project 2.263m from existing rear elevation

### **d) Relevant History**

None

### **e) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
19	1 + petition of 24 signatures	30-MAY-05

**Response:** Loss of light, noise and disturbance during construction, traffic safety and parking, conversion for financial gain of applicant, noise due to increased occupancy and layout, overdevelopment, devaluation of neighbouring property, tenure type of proposed flats, maintenance of party fences and frontage landscaping, ongoing noise and disruption from works to other nearby properties.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Two Storey Side, Single Storey Side and Rear Extensions**

As part of the proposed conversion to apartments, it is proposed to construct extensions to the side and rear of the existing building.

The proposed side extension would project 3.2m from the flank elevation of the existing building to abut the boundary with Capthorne Avenue. Its front elevation would be set 1m behind that of the existing building at both ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor levels, whilst the 1<sup>st</sup> floor would be set 0.5m off the Capthorne Avenue boundary. The extension would have a subordinate hipped roof. It is considered that this extension would not appear unduly bulky in the streetscene and would be sufficiently subordinate in appearance to respect the character of the existing building. As the nearest neighbouring property on this side is separated from the application site by Capthorne Road, there would be no impact on that property.

The single storey element of the proposed rear extension would project 2.263m from the ground floor rear elevation of the existing dwelling and its attached neighbour. It would abut the boundary with the attached neighbour and the inside flank of the 2-storey rear extension, and as amended, would incorporate a 3m high flat roof. Given that this element fully accords with householder guidance, it is considered that its impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupier would be acceptable.

The 2-storey element of the proposed rear extension would be set away from the boundary with the attached neighbour by 3.2m. It would comply with the 45-degree code in relation to no. 260 and the orientation of the properties is such that undue overshadowing or loss of light would not result. At 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, it would be set 1m in from the boundary with Capthorne Avenue, 0.5m more than the 2-storey side extension, with a subordinate roof over. This extension would comply with householder guidance and it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on the character of the existing dwelling or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

### **2) Conversion of Dwellinghouse to Flats**

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

In terms of floor space, the dwelling as proposed to be extended would convert well and the size of the proposed flats is considered satisfactory. The proposed ground floor units would both comprise of one bedroom, whilst the loft floor unit would comprise three bedrooms. All three units would have separate living room/kitchen, and bathroom areas. Access to all three units would be via the existing front entrance door, with internal arrangements to facilitate access to the individual apartments in the lobby area. The vertical arrangement of the rooms within the building would avoid conflicting bedroom and living room uses and would therefore help to avoid undue internally generated noise conflict. It is not considered that the proposed conversion to apartments would constitute overdevelopment.

continued/

**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. Furthermore, the suggested noise insulation condition would further negate potential noise disturbance between the units themselves and the attached neighbouring property.

**Amenity Space**

In terms of outdoor amenity space, the property currently has a rear garden area of approximately 180m<sup>2</sup> although construction of the proposed extensions and the proposed parking area would reduce this area to approximately 130m<sup>2</sup>. This area would be sub-divided to enable all three units to have their own private amenity areas. This level of provision is considered to be acceptable in accordance with the advice given in policy H9, which states that all units in conversions involving end of terrace properties should normally have access to rear gardens.

**Front garden / forecourt treatment**

The existing forecourt is partly hard surfaced, although this is screened by the existing hedges to the front and side boundaries. The proposal to convert the property into apartments includes provision for 3 off-street parking spaces at the rear of the property, with access from the existing rear service road. As no parking would be provided at the front this proposal represents an opportunity to substantially increase the amount of frontage greenness in order to enhance the attractiveness of the area, and the appearance of the property in the streetscene.

The amended plans indicate details related to the storage of refuse/waste, which are considered to be acceptable. The amended plans also show a gently graded ramp to the front entrance of the ground floor unit. This is considered acceptable in providing disabled access to this unit in accordance with policy H18.

**3) Traffic and Highway Safety**

As a single family dwelling house, the existing property generates a maximum parking requirement of 1.8 spaces, including 0.2 for visitor provision. Following conversion to 3 flats the property would generate a maximum requirement for 4 spaces, including 0.6 spaces for visitor provision. The submitted plans show provision for 3 off-street parking spaces at the rear of the property. Given that the site is within walking distance of Rayners Lane district centre, which is well served by public transport, and the availability of on-street parking within the vicinity of the development, it is not considered that refusal on grounds of insufficient parking provision would be justified. The Council's transportation manager has been consulted and raised no objection regarding the level of parking provision proposed, subject to manoeuvring space being increased to 6m. This issue has been addressed through the submission of amended plans.

The layout of the parking area would enable vehicles to enter and exit the rear service road in a forward gear and is therefore considered not to be prejudicial to users of the adjacent highway. Additionally, the removal of the existing forecourt parking space would reduce the potential for conflicts at the intersection of Torbay Road and Capthorne Avenue.

continued/

**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 Torbay Road would occur as a result of this proposed conversion. Whilst it is recognised that activity at the front of the property would be likely to intensify due to its occupation by three households, it is not considered that the effect of this would be so significant as to harm the character of this part of Torbay Road.

**5) Residential Amenity**

Similarly, given that the proposed conversion complies with the criteria set out in policy H9, and that the extensions comply with householder guidance, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining owners

**6) Consultation Responses**

overlooking/loss of privacy – addressed above

loss of light – addressed above

noise and mess during construction – not a valid planning consideration

character of area – addressed above

appearance of refuse / waste bins – addressed above

traffic safety and parking – addressed above

conversion for financial gain of applicant, devaluation of neighbouring property, tenure type of proposed flats – not valid planning considerations

noise due to increased occupancy / overdevelopment – addressed above

maintenance of party fences and frontage landscaping – not a valid planning consideration

ongoing noise and disruption from works to other nearby properties – not a valid planning consideration

**CONCLUSION**

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

VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF  
PERMISSION E/254/02/FUL TO ALLOW  
NURSERY USE FOR 12 CHILDREN

SUQUENA PANJWANI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Site Plan rec'd 15-JUN-05

**GRANT** variation(s) in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans.

- 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:  
SC1 Provision of Community Service  
C3 Nursery Provision in Residential Premises and Areas  
T13 Parking Standards
- 

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

- 1) Character of Area (SC1, C3)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (C3)
  - 3) Traffic and Parking (C3, T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	1
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	4
Site Area:	442m <sup>2</sup>	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- north side of College Hill Road
- occupied by semi-detached house
- ground floor in use as Nursery School for 10 children
- first floor used for residential purposes
- 4 parking spaces provided in hardsurfaced front garden

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- variation of Condition 2 of planning permission EAST/254/02/FUL to allow nursery use for 12 children

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1314/01/FUL    Change of use of ground floor from REFUSED  
residential to nursery school (Class C3 to D1)    15-FEB-02  
with parking at front (20 children)

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed change of use would result in an over-intensive use of this semi-detached property which, by reason of increased noise, disturbance and general activity, would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
2. Car parking cannot be satisfactorily provided within the curtilage of the site to meet the Council’s 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) and the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3. The site is considered to be locationally unsuitable for a use of this nature and intensity, given the levels of traffic on College Hill Road and the propensity of parents to drop children off and pick them up from the kerbside.”

EAST/254/02/FUL    Change of use of ground floor from REFUSED  
residential to nursery school (Class C3 to D1)    16-APR-02  
with parking at front (revised for 10 children)

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, and the likely increase in parking on the neighbouring highways would be detrimental to the free flow of safety of traffic on the neighbouring highways and the amenities of neighbouring residents.
2. The site is considered to be locationally unsuitable for use of this nature, given the levels of traffic on College Hill Road and the propensity of parents to drop children off and pick them up from the kerbside.”

APPEAL ALLOWED 06-DEC-02

Condition 2 reads as follows:

“The number of children cared for, at any one time, shall not exceed 10.”

**e) Applicants Statement**

- all arrival and collection times staggered, priority given to parents not using cars to escort children
- no more than 6 children in garden at any one time in order to ensure that noise levels kept to a minimum
- staff ratios well above OFSTED requirements ensuring all children under strict supervision and involved in structured activities throughout the day

continued/



f)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 36	Replies 1	Expiry 26-JUL-05
	<b>Summary of Response:</b> On-street parking			

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The proposed increase in the number of children from 10 to 12 would not represent a significant change to the existing character of the premises, nor the impact of the use on the character of the area.

### **2) Residential Amenity**

In relation to this issue, the Inspector who allowed the appeal relating to this use commented as follows:

“Having regard to the general background noise associated with the adjoining busy road, the impact on surrounding residents would be very limited in terms of additional noise and disturbance from the car’s delivering and collecting children, particularly if the opening hours were to be restricted as suggested. Likewise, although some noise might be generated by their play, the children’s use of the enclosed rear garden would not be so intensive as to materially affect the neighbour’s living conditions.”

The lack of complaints about this use and low level of response to notification suggests that the day nursery is being run without undue detriment to neighbouring amenities.

The approved drawing shows 3 playrooms for use by children on the ground floor, so that 12 children could be accommodated, in principle, at a ratio of 4 per room. This would not represent an over intensification of use in any one room.

With regard to the rear garden, it is suggested that the proposed increase in numbers would not generate such additional noise and disturbance as to unacceptably impair neighbouring amenity.

### **3) Traffic and Parking**

The Inspector considered that the car parking at the front of the premises would enable staff and the residents to park clear of the highway. He suggested that parents would park their cars and walk to the premises, rather than drop them off at the kerbside. He noted that the parking and waiting of cars is not restricted on either side of the carriageway, and that visibility is good and not unduly restricted by parked cars. He concluded that “parents moving away from the premises would not place themselves or other road users at risk by creating the circumstances likely to result in a collision.” The highway circumstances have not changed since the appeal was allowed, and as only 2 additional children are proposed it is suggested that the proposal is acceptable in highway and traffic terms.

continued/

**4) Consultation Responses**  
Addressed in report.

**CONCLUSION**

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

## SECTION 3 - OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

**246/248 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HATCH END**

**3/01**

**P/1234/05/CVA/CM**

Ward: HATCH END

REMOVAL OF CONDITION 5 OF  
PERMISSION W/8/02/FUL TO PERMIT USE  
OF OUTSIDE REAR AREA FOR DINING

D EDWARD KING for ASK RESTAURANTS

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Drg. No. 01997/03; OS

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

- 1 The proposed use of the outdoor garden area for customer floorspace would give rise to increased disturbance and general activity at unsociable hours and would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

#### INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: EP25, EP30, T13, EM8, EM25, EM26

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Residential Amenity
- 2) Parking
- 3) Consultation Responses

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Locally Listed Building

Town Centre: Hatch End

TPO

Council Interest: None

#### b) Site Description

- no. 246-248 operates as ASK Restaurant located on the north side of Uxbridge Road, additionally being the last commercial premises at the eastern end of Hatch End shopping centre
- the site is bounded to the west by a public house and to the east by an apartment development
- the rear of the property encompasses an overgrown disused plot, beyond which are the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Hillview Road
- a number of trees on this area of the site are covered by Tree Preservation Orders
- immediately to the rear of the building is a small paved patio area (6.3m x 6.3m)
- beyond the patio is a small garden area, bounded by a semi-circular shade cloth fence (2m high) and screening planting

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- removal of Condition 5 of W/833/97/FUL to allow use of rear garden as additional customer floorspace
- an area measuring approximately 6 x 6m is proposed to be used, including a 2m high feather board fence
- the site currently caters for 90 patrons within the building
- the number of additional seats proposed for the rear garden area has not been nominated, nor has the intended time of use or whether any outdoor umbrella/heating equipment would be provided for the outdoor area

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/44515/92/FUL	Change of use from retail (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3) with parking at rear	REFUSED 26-MAY-92
WEST/412/96/FUL	Change of use: Post Office (Class A1) to Public House (Class A3) and single storey rear extension with beer garden at rear	WITHDRAWN 02-SEP-96
WEST/612/96/FUL	Change of use: Post Office (Class A1) to Public House (Class A3) and single storey rear extension (revised)	REFUSED 02-DEC-96
WEST/833/97/FUL	Change of use: Class A1 to A3 (retail to food and drink) on ground floor and single storey rear extension with external fire escape staircase	REFUSED 23-FEB-98 APPROVED ON APPEAL
WEST/8/02/FUL	Single storey rear extension to provide additional customer circulation space	GRANTED 11-APR-02
P/1069/03/CVA	Variation of Condition 8 of W/833/97/ful to allow use of rear garden as additional customer floorspace	REFUSED 12-SEP-03

Reason for refusal:

“The proposed use of the outdoor garden area for customer floorspace would give rise to increased disturbance and general activity at unsociable hours and would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.”

**e) Notifications**

Sent  
72

Replies  
9

Expiry  
13-JUL-05

**Summary of Responses:** Increased noise and disturbance; lack of parking; increase in traffic with increase in patron numbers; loss of green environment with loss of trees and shrubs; previous reason for refusal remains valid; ASK restaurant is already in breach of Condition 6 of W/833/97/FUL as they open their back doors and use the picnic tables that were installed in 2003 alleged; existing pollution from smell of cooking; no change in planning terms since the previous appeal and refusal.

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Amenity**

The restaurant was originally approved by the Planning Inspectorate in 1998. However the Inspectorate specifically imposed the following condition as Condition 6 of permission WEST/833/97/FUL:-

“The use hereby permitted shall not take place outside the building and all the doors within the ground floor rear elevation shall be kept closed at all times, except in the event of fire or other emergency which requires the premises to be rapidly vacated.”

A later application W/8/02/FUL approved a single storey rear extension to provide additional customer circulation space, however included the same restrictive condition as listed above as Condition 5.

Clearly the Planning Inspectorate envisaged the detriment any outdoor seating could pose for nearby residential properties, therefore imposed the above restrictive condition when they originally approved the restaurant application. It is considered that there are no extenuating circumstances that would warrant the variation or otherwise total removal of this restrictive condition. Furthermore some objections allege that the outdoor area has already been used by the restaurant in contravention of the restrictive condition, with this demonstrating the disruption that would be caused if formally allowed.

With respect of residential dwellings within close proximity of the site, these include flats to the east and residential dwellings to the north. In light of the close proximity of residential uses the removal of the restrictive condition is deemed to be inappropriate given the potential for associated disturbance to be caused by the general activity, that would detract from amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties.

In addition to the above it is highlighted that the applicant has already made a previous application (P/1069/03/CVA) to vary Condition 6 of planning permission WEST/833/97/FUL which was refused.

As there has not been a material change in circumstance, the removal of Condition 5 of planning permission WEST/8/02/FUL is considered unreasonable as the proposed use of the outdoor garden area for customer floorspace would give rise to increased disturbance and general activity at unsociable hours and would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

### **2) Parking**

Due to the layout of the property, the site does not provide for any on-site parking. However it is considered that the proposed use of the outdoor area would not significantly increase demand for parking within the surrounding locality. Furthermore with existing parking restrictions within the vicinity and other available parking within the surrounding locality, no specific objections are raised against the development with respect of vehicle parking.

continued/

**3) Consultation Responses**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Increased noise and disturbance  | - addressed above                                |
| Lack of parking  | - “ “  |
| Increase in traffic with increase in patron numbers  | - “ “  |
| Smell of cooking   | - Environmental Health issue                     |
| Loss of green environment with loss of trees and shrubs  | - no trees and shrubs are proposed to be removed |
| Previous reason of refusal remains valid; ASK restaurant is already in breach of condition 6 of W/833/97/FUL as they open their back doors and use the picnic tables that were installed in 2003 alleged | - matter referred to Planning Enforcement Team   |

**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.

CHANGE OF USE OF NO 55 FROM FLATS TO NURSING HOME (CLASS C3 TO C2)  
SINGLE/2 STOREY LINKED EXTENSION TO 53 & 55 FOR ADDIT BEDSPACES  
(REVISED)

PAUL SAMSON for MR & MRS SPANWICK SMITH

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1:1250 Site Location Plan, 850-100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106.

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

- 1 The proposal would give rise to a concentration of non-domestic uses in an inappropriate location and an over-intensive use of the site, generating a level of activity and a scale of built development which would be out of character with the Moss Lane Conservation Area, and thereby fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 2 The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its size and siting, would give rise to losses of outlook and privacy, to the detriment of neighbouring residential amenity.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 36 - Measurements from Submitted Plans
- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision:  
1994 Harrow Unitary Development Plan: E6, E38, E45, T13, H15, C9  
2002 Revised Deposit Draft Harrow Unitary Development Plan: SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17, H15, T13, C12.  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan: SD1, D4, D5, D14, D15, H14, C8, T13.

---

## **MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (1994 UDP) (DRAFT REPLACEMENT UDP) (2004 UDP)**

1. Conversion Policy (H15, C9) (H15, C12) (H14, C8)
  2. Character and Appearance of Conservation Area (E6, E38, E45) (SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17) (SD1, D4, D5, D14, D15)
  3. Neighbouring Amenity (E45, H15) (D4, H15) (D4, H14)
  4. Parking and Traffic (T13) (T13) (T13)
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Archaeolog.Area/TPO: Tree Preservation Order  
Conservation Area: Pinner Moss Lane

Car Parking	Standard:	11 (no standard) (no standard)
	Justified:	11 (see report)
	Provided:	9
Site Area:	0.26ha	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- east side of Moss Lane within Moss Lane Conservation Area.
- no. 53 - detached extended 2-storey house in use as Nursing Home (Class C2), parking in front garden.
- no. 55 - semi-detached extended 2-storey house, in use as 3 flats, parking at front.
- residential use at no. 51. Nursing Home Office and managers accommodation at no. 57, Nursing Home at no. 59.
- this part of Moss Lane characterised by large detached dwellinghouses of individual design.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of no. 55 to Nursing Home (Class C2), in association with no. 53, to provide 37 bedrooms in total.
- single/2-storey extension to link nos. 53 and 55.
- single-storey link extension set back 10.8m from front wall of no. 53, and 13.2m from front wall of no. 55, dummy pitched roof at front with flat roof beyond first floor element at side of no. 53 connecting with existing extension, flat roof.
- first-floor extension behind no. 55, flat roof.
- retention of 6 existing parking spaces in front of no. 53, and 3 spaces in front garden of no. 55.
- proposals are complemented by application P/1299/04/CFU which proposes the change of use of no. 59 Moss Lane from Nursing Home to single-family dwellinghouse (see agenda item 2/03).

Cont...



**d) Relevant History**

**No. 53**

LBH/6003	Erection of 2 storey rear extension and conversion of dwelling house into old peoples home	GRANTED 14-APR-71
----------	--	----------------------

A number of permissions for extensions to provide additional accommodation have been granted since 1971.

**No. 55**

LBH/34373	Conversion to residential home for the elderly with parking (including no. 57)	REFUSED 19-MAY-88
-----------	--	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposal would lead to a concentration of non-domestic uses which would be out of character with Moss Lane and contrary to Policy 46 of the Harrow Borough Local Plan.

Appeal Dismissed: 22-MAY-89

LBH/37155	Conversion to residential home for the elderly with parking and single storey rear and side extensions (revised) (including no. 57)	REFUSED 02-FEB-89
-----------	---	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposal would lead to a concentration of non-domestic uses and an over-intensive use of the site with forecourt parking, generating a level of activity and appearance which would be out of character with Moss Lane Conservation Area which comprises predominantly single family dwellings.

Appeal Withdrawn: 31-JUL-89

WEST/39/01/FUL	Single storey rear extension	REFUSED 10-APR-01
----------------	------------------------------	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposed extension, by reason of additional rearward projection in relation to the existing building and the adjoining property, would appear unduly bulky and obtrusive and would constitute an inappropriate form of development, to the detriment of the visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the character of the locality, contrary to Policy E45 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan.

Cont...

WEST/1080/02/FUL	Change of use of No. 55: self contained flats to nursing home (class C3 to C2) and first floor/2 storey linked extension to 53 and 55 to provide additional bedspaces	REFUSED 03-JUL-03
------------------	---	----------------------

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposal would give rise to a concentration of non-domestic uses and an over-intensive use of the site, generating a level of activity and a scale of built development which would be out of character with Moss Lane Conservation Area, and thereby fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
2. The proposed extension, by virtue of its size, design and siting, would be harmful to the appearance of the existing houses, result in the loss of space about the buildings and give rise to losses of outlook and privacy, to the detriment of the character of the Conservation Area and neighbouring residential amenity.

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections - the proposals would not have a significant impact on the streetscene as are well set back from the road.

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 20-MAY-04
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 21	Replies 4	Expiry 04-MAY-04
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** would create ugly disproportioned building, would block tree vistas, would turn 2 separate houses into 1 huge irregular one, fails to conserve amenity of road or architectural integrity, increased traffic volumes, noise and disturbance.

Pinner Association: proposal is acceptable.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Conversion Policy**

Policy H14 in the 2004 adopted UDP is relevant to this issue and sets out criteria for consideration.

Cont...

In terms of (B) and (C) respectively, the site is remote from public transport and facilities such as shops etc, and would not normally be acceptable for Care Home use. This proposal could only be supported if a grant of planning permission is accompanied by a S106 agreement which would require that no. 59 revert to residential use so that the number of Care Homes in the vicinity remained at 2. In the absence of such an agreement the proposal would give rise to an over-intensification of the proposed use in an inappropriate location. Criteria (A) and (D) dealing with impacts on the character of the area, neighbouring amenity and parking are discussed below.

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

The previous application proposed a 2-storey linking extension which would have detracted from the existing space between nos. 53 and 55, to the detriment of the character of the properties and views between the properties. The predominantly single-storey link which is now proposed would be less dominant, retain sufficient space at upper levels, adequately preserve the integrity of the properties, and permit satisfactory views through the gap.

The flat roof design of the proposed extensions would match those of existing extensions to the buildings and can be accepted in this context.

It is therefore considered that the proposals can be accepted in terms of streetscene impact. However, concern is expressed at the scale of the proposed rear extensions which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and neighbouring amenity as discussed below.

## **3. Neighbouring Amenity**

The proposed single-storey rear extension is shown to project some 6m beyond a similar existing extension adjacent to No. 57, a projection in total of some 17.5m beyond the ground floor rear wall of the neighbouring house.

In addition, a first floor rear extension would project about 13m beyond the neighbouring main rear wall and to within 2.5m of the boundary.

These extensions would give rise to a loss of residential amenity to no. 57 and excessive site coverage to the detriment of the character of the Conservation Area.

A first floor side window would enable overlooking of no. 57, although this could be obscured.

Cont...

#### **4. Parking and Traffic**

In dismissing the appeal against the refusal in 1988 to grant permission for the change of use of nos. 55 and 57 to a Care Home, the Inspector concluded that increased traffic resulting from the scheme would be detrimental to the quiet secluded residential character of the area.

It is considered, were no. 59 to revert to a single family dwellinghouse, that there would be no significant implications for traffic flows in this application.

In the absence of this guarantee, however, the cumulative impact in traffic terms of Care Homes at nos. 53, 55 and 59 would be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area.

Front garden hardsurfacing is shown to remain at its existing level with all existing vegetation retained, and no objection is raised in principle to this aspect of the proposal.

#### **5. Consultation Responses**

- loss of trees - this should not result from the proposals.
- other issues discussed in report.

#### **CONCLUSION**

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

**HIGHWAY LAND AT SUDBURY HILL, OPPOSITE  
SOUTH HILL AVENUE, HARROW**

**P/1957/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

8M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND  
EQUIPMENT CABINS

LCC DEVELOPMENT SERVICES LTD for T-MOBILE (UK) LTD

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 50827/01; /02; /03; /04

**REFUSE** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the receipt of no further material planning objections by the end of the notification expiry period on 8th September 2005, for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of street furniture to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general; it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Sudbury Hill Conservation Area and would adversely affect important views.

**INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: D24, D14, D15, EP31
- 

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

- 1) Telecommunications Development (D24)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (D24)
  - 3) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Area of Special Character (D14, D15, D24, EP31)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Conservation Area: Sudbury Hill

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- grass verge inside pavement at Sudbury Hill opposite junction with South Hill Avenue, adjacent to boundary wall of Chasewood Park
- boundary wall steps down to reflect fall of ground level to south east down Sudbury Hill, ranging from approximately 2 – 2.5m in height

continued/

Item 3/03 – P/1957/05/CFU continued.....

- mature trees inside boundary wall of Chasewood Park, pedestrian entrance to which is sited just to the south east
- nearby street furniture includes BT cabinet and public bench
- levels fall away down South Hill Avenue to the west and Sudbury Hill to the south east
- site located in Sudbury Hill Conservation Area and Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character

**c) Proposal Details**

- 7.7m streetworks pole and associated equipment cabinets
- materials: grey tower; dark green steel cabinets
- an ICNIRP certificate of compliance has been included with the application

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- The site benefits from a back drop of large mature trees and nearby street furniture including lamp posts and BT equipment cabinets, which provides an appropriate context for the pole; the site is located such that significant separation is achieved from residential properties in the vicinity; views into the site from surrounding areas are well screened; T-Mobile has a clear requirement for an installation within this particular area and no other suitable structures, buildings or sites exist; the proposal is ICNIRP compliant

<b>f) Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area			Expiry 08-SEP-05
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 448	Replies Awaited	Expiry 26-AUG-05	

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Telecommunications Development**

Policy D24 of Harrow's 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 providing coverage to the residential areas surrounding Harrow on the Hill and as no other suitable alternative sites were available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. No suitable existing buildings or structures were available.

continued/

The site is located in a Conservation Area and an Area of Special Character, therefore special consideration should be given to the impact on the list of structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. Thus the issue shall be dealt with separately below.

The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves a slimline pole intended to mimic a streetlamp, with a shrouded antenna at the top, and associated equipment cabinets adjacent. However, the pole and cabinets would be located on the east side of the bend of Sudbury Hill, where no high level items of street furniture currently exist. The pole would thus be of excessive size, particularly given the prominent siting on the bend and as levels fall away down South Hill Avenue to the west and Sudbury Hill to the south east. Due to the existence of existing street furniture such as the public bench and BT cabinet adjacent on the grass verge, the proposal would result in a proliferation of street furniture. The design of the structure would be out of character with the general appearance of the area and thus would be detrimental to visual amenity.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the Local Planning Authority should not consider the health aspects further.

In summary, it is considered that due to excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity to existing street furniture, the proposal would give rise to a proliferation of street furniture to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

- 2) **Character and Appearance of Conservation Area and Area of Special Character**
- The consideration of the visual impact of the proposed development on the character of the streetscene and the area in general as outlined above has direct implications for the impact on the Conservation Area and the Area of Special Character. Policy D14 of the HUDP states that the Council will seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas by, among other things, preparing specific policies and proposals and supplementary planning guidance for each conservation area. Policy D15 of the HUDP states that development should not adversely affect the streetscape, roofscape, skyline and setting of the Conservation Area, or significant views in or out of the area; and the development should not adversely affect open spaces or gaps in the townscape which contribute to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Policy EP31 of the HUDP aims to protect skylines and views from intrusive development.

continued/

In the Sudbury Hill Conservation Area Policy Statement paras. 9.3.3 and 9.3.4, the almost semi-rural character of the road is described, with large areas of open space to both sides glimpsed behind roadside planting, and the statement refers to the spaces between and around buildings being particularly important in both providing settings for and breaks and contrasts within the townscape. Map H of the policy statement identifies important views in the area, including a long distance skyline view from the proposed mast siting down South Hill Avenue and towards South Harrow, a glimpsed view from the proposed siting through the trees towards the open space surrounding the Chasewood Park development, and short distance streetscene views of the character of the immediate townscape to the north and south east on Sudbury Hill. Given the sensitivity of the location proposed and the negative impact on the streetscene previously attributed to the excessive size, appearance, prominent siting and proximity of the pole and associated cabinets to existing street furniture, it is considered that the proposal would adversely affect important views, to be resisted in accordance with Policy (4) of the Sudbury Hill Conservation Area Policy Statement and Policies D15 and EP31 of the HUDP.

The Conservation Area Policy Statement also identifies the neutral or positive impact of the majority of existing items of street furniture on the character of the Conservation Area. Para. 10.5.4 of the statement states that care is needed to ensure that any new or replacement items of street furniture do not detract from the character of the area. It states furthermore that existing areas, particularly around road junctions, should not become unnecessarily cluttered with a plethora of road signs. Policy (5) of the policy statement states that 'wherever possible replacement street lamps and other items of street furniture should be in keeping with the character of the area in terms of design, materials and location'. It is argued that the proposal would result in a proliferation of street furniture given the proximity of the public bench and BT cabinet, the pole would result in unnecessary clutter at the busy road junction of Sudbury Hill with South Hill Avenue where there are some existing road signs and street lamps, and the appearance of the pole would be out of keeping with the attractive mock-Victorian street lamps that are found on both sides of the road between South Hill Avenue and Julian Hill.

Thus the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and Area of Special Character, and would adversely affect important views.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The proposal would not impact on the amenity of residents in the area, given the distance from neighbouring properties. The pole and cabinets would be sited at a distance of 20m from the nearest property at Sudbury Lodge, however there is a 2m close boarded fence on the boundary of that property with Chasewood Park and mature trees in the intervening space, thus the structure would not be visible. The pole would be approximately 30m from the front of Gooden Cottage opposite, this is also considered to be sufficient distance so as to preserve residential amenity.

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

continued/



**4) 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.

---

**LAND OUTSIDE 48 COURTENAY AVENUE, HARROW  
WEALD**

**5/01**

**P/1956/05/CDT/CM**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

DETERMINATION: 7.7M HIGH TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
MAST AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS

LCC DEVELOPMENT UK LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 50699/01, 50827/02 Rev A, 50699/03 Rev A, 50699/04 Rev A

1. Prior approval of siting and appearance **IS** required.
2. **REFUSE** approval of details of siting/appearance for the following reason(s):
  - 1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, appearance and prominent siting, would be detrimental to the visual amenity and the character and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: D24

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- grassed area at junction of Long Elmes and Courtenay Avenue with pathways leading from houses to highway edge
- slip road to front of properties on Courtenay Avenue for parking, bus stop to south
- existing street lamps and BT cabinets on grass area at all sides of roundabout

### **c) Proposal Details**

- 7.7m streetworks pole and associated equipment cabinets
- materials: Grey tower; Dark Green steel cabinets
- an ICNIRP certificate of compliance has been included with the application

### **d) Relevant History**

None

continued/

**e) Applicants Statement**

The proposal is compliant; the selected site utilises an area of land which is generally used to accommodate other similar street type furniture installations such as lamp posts; the proposed streetworks blend in very well and would have a similar appearance and presence to the tall (8m) street lamps dotted around the area; the openness of this wide junction helps to provide an appropriate context; its location is generally away from immediate residential area.

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
77

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
30-AUG-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Telecommunications Development**

Policy D24 of Harrows 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 providing coverage to the area and as no other suitable alternative sites were available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. No suitable existing buildings or structures were available.

The site is not located in a conservation area, an area of special character, or near any of the structural features as identified in Policy SEP5.

The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves a slimline pole intended to mimic a streetlamp, with a shrouded antenna at the top, and associated equipment cabinets adjacent. While the proposed height of the streetworks would appear similar to the existing street lamps, several of which are situated on the grass verge and footpaths on this exposed junction of Courtenay Avenue and Long Elmes, the design of the structure and the proximity of its associated cabinets would be sufficiently different and bulky so as to result in an obvious and obtrusive feature in the streetscene. Given the openness of the junction and the small scale of the houses at either side, as well as the rise in levels up Courtenay Avenue, the pole and cabinets would be unduly prominent and detrimental to visual amenity.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the LPA should not consider the health aspects further.

continued/

**2) Residential Amenity**

The proposal would not impact on the amenity of residents in the area, given the distance from neighbouring properties. The pole and cabinets would be sited a distance of 24m from the nearest properties at 48 and 50 Courtenay Avenue, and over 25m from the properties opposite on Courtenay Avenue.

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

**3) Consultation Responses**

Awaited

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**JUNCTION OF SHAFTESBURY AVENUE/WELBECK  
ROAD, SOUTH HARROW**

**5/02**

**P/2021/05/CDT/CM**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

DETERMINATION: 8M HIGH  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST  
AND 2 EQUIPMENT CABINETS

LCC UK

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 50826/01 Rev.A, /02 Rev.A, /03 Rev.B, /04 Rev.B

1. Prior approval of siting and appearance **IS** required.
2. **REFUSE** approval of details of siting/appearance for the following reason(s):
  - 1 The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, appearance, and prominent siting would be unduly obtrusive to the detriment of visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

**INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: D24
- 

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

- 1) Telecommunications Development (D24)
  - 2) Residential Amenity (D24)
  - 3) Consultation Response
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- grass verge and planted area on island where Welbeck Road meets Shaftesbury Avenue, with pavement around
- existing streetlamp on inside edge of pavement to northwest on Shaftesbury Avenue
- shrubs/small trees of approximate average height of 5-6m occupying majority of island
- entrance to West Harrow Recreation Ground opposite with high trees and flowers to front
- residential properties on Shaftesbury Avenue to northwest and south, and on Welbeck Road to west
- doctors surgery at Nos.5 and 7 Welbeck Road

continued/

**c) Proposal Details**

- 8m streetworks pole and associated equipment cabinets
- materials: grey tower; grey steel cabinets
- an ICNIRP certificate of compliance has been included with the application

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicants Statement**

Views into the site from the surrounding areas are well screened; northbound traffic on Shaftesbury Avenue will see the mast set against the vegetation backdrop and southbound traffic will only see the top of the pole until quite close to the site; for residential properties on Welbeck Road only the top of the pole will be visible; the pole will blend in with the context of the streetscape, being located along the line of street lamp posts at a comparable height; large traffic island is not being used for anything else; the proposal is ICNIRP compliant

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
84

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
02-SEP-05

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Telecommunications Development**

Policy D24 of Harrows 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 providing coverage and as no other suitable alternative sites were available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. No suitable existing buildings or structures were available.

The site is not located in a conservation area or in/near any of the 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 a slimline pole intended to mimic a streetlamp, with a shrouded antenna at the top, and associated equipment cabinets adjacent. However, the pole and cabinets would be sited on a prominent junction in a residential area where the shrubs and small trees on the traffic island would not provide sufficient backdrop for a commercial structure of this size. The pole would be visible over the foliage when travelling southeast from The Ridgeway and from Welbeck Road, and would be especially prominent when viewed from Shaftesbury Avenue and Whitmore Road to the south and east. Sited on the corner of the traffic island, the structures would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the residential character of the area. Furthermore, the majority of the foliage on the traffic island is deciduous and thus the area will appear quite open during winter months.

Finally, the proposed site and any emissions associated with it should not present any health hazards. The proposal would comply with ICNIRP and thus the LPA should not consider the health aspects further.

In summary, it is considered that due to excessive size, appearance and prominent siting the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity and appearance of the street scene and the area in general.

## **2) Residential Amenity**

The proposal would not impact on the amenity of residents in the area, given the distance from neighbouring properties. The pole and cabinets would be sited a distance of 20m from the nearest property at 269 Shaftesbury Avenue, however there high mature trees on the boundary of that property with Welbeck Road, thus the structure would not be overbearing. The pole would be approximately 40m from the front of the nearest houses on Welbeck Road, this is also considered to be sufficient distance so as to preserve residential amenity.

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

## **3) Consultation Responses**

Awaited

## **CONCLUSION**

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