



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 11 OCTOBER 2005**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**11TH OCTOBER 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

11TH OCTOBER 2005

### INDEX

					Page No.
1/01	<b>190-194 STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE A PART 3/PART 4 STOREY BUILDING, RESTAURANT (A3 USE) AT GROUND FLOOR, 13 FLATS AT 1ST, 2ND & 3RD FLOORS	GREENHILL	<b>P/1834/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	1
1/02	<b>GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH, KENTON ROAD, KENTON</b> REPLACEMENT CHURCH WITH DETACHED SINGLE/2 STOREY PLAYGROUP/ COMMUNITY BUILDING AT REAR, ACCESS, PARKING (REVISED)	KENTON EAST	<b>P/1783/05/CFU/TEM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	5
1/03	<b>ROOKS HEATH HIGH SCHOOL, EASTCOTE LANE, SOUTH HARROW</b> PART SINGLE/PART TWO STOREY BUILDING WITH GLAZED LINK AT EASTCOTE LANE FRONTAGE OF SITE	ROXBOURNE	<b>P/1589/05/CLA/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	12
2/01	<b>383 STATION RD, HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 OF PERMISSION LBH/38315 TO ALLOW OPENING 11:00 TO 02:00 SUNDAY TO WEDNESDAY AND 11:00 TO 02:30 THURSDAY TO SATURDAY	GREENHILL	<b>P/1627/05/CVA/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	16

2/02	<b>FRESHFIELD, 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	P/1493/05/DFU/AMH	GRANT	19
2/03	<b>ROXBOURNE FIRST SCHOOL, TORBAY ROAD, HARROW</b> SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING DETACHED BUILDING	RAYNERS LANE	P/1711/05/CLA/RJS	GRANT	23
2/04	<b>15-21 HEADSTONE DRIVE, HARROW</b> CHANGE OF USE OF 1ST, 2ND & 3RD FLOORS TO ALTERNATIVE, EITHER OFFICES (B1) OR HEALTHCARE (D1). ALTERATIONS TO PARKING & ACCESS RAMP AT REAR	WEALDSTONE	P/1917/05/CFU/CM	GRANT	28
2/05	<b>21 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE</b> REAR CONSERVATORY WITH RETRACTABLE ROOF	STANMORE PARK	P/1770/05/CFU/CM	GRANT	33
2/06	<b>120 OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE</b> REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY HOUSE WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF	BELMONT	P/944/05/DFU/AMH	GRANT	37
2/07	<b>CENTENARY PARK PAVILION, STANMORE</b> ALTERATIONS AND CHANGE OF USE FROM PAVILLION (CLASS D2) TO POLICE OFFICE (CLASS B1)	QUEENSBURY	P/1942/05/CFU/SC2	GRANT	42
2/08	<b>LAND R/O 47-49 GAYTON ROAD, HARROW</b> TWO SEMI-DETACHED BUNGALOWS, FORECOURT PARKING AND ACCESS FROM NORTHWICK PARK ROAD (RESIDENT PERMIT RESTRICTED)	GREENHILL	P/1591/05/DFU/CM	GRANT	46

2/09	<b>3RD FLOOR, PREMIER HOUSE, 1 CANNING ROAD, WEALDSTONE</b> CHANGE OF USE OF 550 SQ.M. OF 3RD FLOOR FROM OFFICES (CLASS B1) TO OFFICES/EDUCATIONAL USES (CLASS B1/D1c)	MARLBOROUGH	<b>P/1749/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	52
2/10	<b>GREEN VERGES, 22 PRIORY DRIVE, STANMORE</b> 2 STOREY SIDE TO REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS (REVISED)	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/1802/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	56
2/11	<b>LAND REAR OF 45-51 SOUTHFIELD PARK, NORTH HARROW</b> OUTLINE: CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE HOUSES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING	HEADSTONE SOUTH	<b>P/1943/05/COU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	60
2/12	<b>1 BUTLER AVENUE, HARROW</b> REAR DORMERS AND CONVERSION TO PROVIDE FIVE FLATS, FORECOURT PARKING	WEST HARROW	<b>P/1883/05/DFU/PDB</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	66
2/13	<b>PARK VIEW, 14 MOUNT PARK ROAD, HARROW</b> OUTBUILDING TO PROVIDE DOMESTIC STUDY	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1469/05/DFU/KMS</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	73
2/14	<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>	76
2/15	<b>83 DRURY ROAD, HARROW</b> SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION	WEST HARROW	<b>P/1882/05/DFU/RM2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	81
2/16	<b>AMBERLEY, 7 CLAMP HILL, STANMORE</b> DOUBLE GARAGE AT REAR WITH ACESS FROM ACACIA CLOSE	HARROW WEALD	<b>P/403/05/DFU/MRE</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	84

2/17	<b>LAND R/O 71-83 CANTERBURY ROAD, NORTH HARROW</b> TWO DETACHED THE STOREY BLOCKS TO PROVIDE 8 TERRACED PROPERTIES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING (REVISED ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AT ALLERFORD COURT)	HEADSTONE SOUTH	<b>P/1712/05/CFU/DT2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	88
2/18	<b>17 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE</b> SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION	STANMORE PARK	<b>P/1801/05/CFU/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	92
2/19	<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>	96
2/20	<b>74 &amp; 76 STATION ROAD, HARROW</b> REVISIONS TO PERMISSION P/2140/04/CFU TO ALLOW USE OF GROUND FLOOR RETAIL (A1), FINANCIAL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (A2), BUSINESS (B1) OR MEDICAL/HEALTH (D1)	GREENHILL	<b>P/2005/05/CFU/SC2</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	100
2/21	<b>49 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FORMATION OF ROOF TERRACE; CHANGE OF USE OF BASEMENT/GROUND FLOOR TO RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND BAR (CLASS A3 AND A4) ALTERATIONS TO REAR ELEVATION	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/817/05/CFU/CM</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	103
2/22	<b>49 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL</b> LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: GROUND FLOOR SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS TO REAR ELEVATION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1558/05/CLB/CKJ</b>	<b>GRANT</b>	103

3/01	<b>WARDS P.H. 38/40 LOWLANDS RD, HARROW</b> VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF PERMISSION E/450/02 TO ALLOW OPENING 10:00 TO MIDNIGHT MON-WED: 10:00 TO 12:30 THURS: 10:00-01:30 FRI- SAT: 11:00-12:30 SUN	GREENHILL	<b>P/1618/05/CVA/AMH</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	112
3/02	<b>147 ROXETH GREEN AVENUE, SOUTH HARROW</b> ALTERATIONS TO, AND RETENTION OF, COVERED AREA AT REAR	HARROW ON THE HILL	<b>P/1630/05/DCO/JM2</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	115
5/01	<b>SIGNAL HOUSE, LYON ROAD, HARROW</b> DETERMINATION: 6 POLE- MOUNTED ROOF TOP ANTENNAE AND 4 EQUIPMENT CABINS ADJACENT TO REAR CAR PARK	GREENHILL	<b>P/2313/05/CDT/CM</b>	<b>REFUSE</b>	120

## SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

**190-194 STATION ROAD, HARROW**

**1/01**

**P/1834/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: GREENHILL

EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE A PART  
3/PART 4 STOREY BUILDING, RESTAURANT (A3 USE) AT  
GROUND FLOOR, 13 FLATS AT 1ST, 2ND & 3RD FLOORS

DESIGN WEST ARCHITECTURAL for SCAN CORPORATION LTD

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: OS, (0901(00)-G/R-01; -G/F-02; -G/R-03 Rev.C; (0901)(20)-G/R-03 Rev.A; -  
G/F-01 Rev.D, -G/F-02 Rev.C

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

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of excessive height and bulk, prominent siting, unsatisfactory design and poor relationship with neighbouring properties, would be unduly obtrusive and overbearing in the streetscene, and would not be in keeping with the pattern of development on Bonnersfield Lane in particular, to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 2 The proposed roof amenity area, by reason of size and siting, would result in undue overlooking to the rear of the neighbouring residential properties along Station Road and Bonnersfield Lane, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of those dwellings.
- 3 The proposed rear extension at second floor level, by reason of excessive height, bulk and rearward projection, would result in loss of light, overshadowing and loss of outlook, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent flat at the second floor of the neighbouring property at 184 Station Road.

#### INFORMATIVE:

1 INFORMATIVE:

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, SH1, SH2, D4, D5, D7, T13, H4, EM17, EP25, EM15

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

- 1) Retail Policy (EM17)
- 2) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D7)
- 3) Housing Provision (SH1, H4, SH2, EM15)
- 4) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
- 5) Parking and Highway Considerations (T13)
- 6) Consultation Responses

### INFORMATION

a) **Summary**

Town Centre Harrow  
Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- three storey building on corner of Station Road, Harrow and Bonnersfield Lane
- ground floor last used for retail unit with storage on part of first floor
- remainder of first floor previously used as offices
- second floor used for flats
- building is set back from adjacent small parade of shops to north with offices at first floor and flats at second floor level
- two-storey parade adjacent on Bonnersfield Lane: solicitors office at No.10, office and flat over at No.12, 2 flats at No.14

**c) Proposal Details**

- extensions and alterations to the existing building to provide a part 3/part 4 storey building with a restaurant at ground floor level and 12 flats overhead

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1407/02/FUL	Change of use: Class A1 to A3 on ground & 1st floors with new shopfront, fume extractor duct at rear & new windows	GRANTED 14-OCT-04
P/654/05/CFU	1st, 2nd & 3rd floor extensions incorporating restaurant (A3) at ground floor, offices and 4 flats at 1st floor and 12 flats at 2nd & 3rd floors	WITHDRAWN 21-APR-05

**e) Advertisement**

Major Development

Expiry  
15-SEP-05

**Notifications**

Sent  
59

Replies  
3

Expiry  
07-OCT-05

**Summary of Responses:** No car parking provision, overdevelopment, disposal of rubbish, firmly against these proposals but would welcome a more satisfactory solution to the problem currently posed by this empty property, need for up-market restaurants

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Retail Policy**

The site is located in an area of secondary shopping frontages in Harrow Metropolitan Centre, thus Policy EM17 applies to the proposed change of use of the ground floor from retail to restaurant. A similar proposal, incorporating the first floor in addition, was approved under EAST/1407/02/FUL. The merits of the change of use are considered to be the same as in that approved scheme, and as a restaurant would be an appropriate town centre use there is no objection to the loss of retail.

continued/

**2) Character of the Area**

The proposed alterations to the building would involve extensions at the corner, greater depth at the rear on the upper levels, a roof extension to provide a penthouse flat and covered roof garden and new elevational treatments including balconies, windows and materials.

While the existing building needs updating, it is not considered that the proposed extensions and alterations to the elevational treatment would provide a positive contribution to the streetscene. While some additional height and a corner feature may be acceptable on the Station Road frontage given the important town centre corner location, the proposed bulk of the penthouse and covered roof garden is considered to be overbearing and obtrusive, and out of character with the pattern of development. However, even if the applicants were to reduce the bulk by omitting the covered roof garden, the impact of the proposed penthouse flat and staircase on the Bonnersfield Lane elevation would remain harsh and obtrusive. The additional height and bulk on that streetscene would be particularly detrimental given the smaller scale of the buildings on Bonnersfield Lane than those on Station Road. Although the relationship between the existing buildings is not ideal, it is considered that any new proposal should provide an improvement. Not only does the bulk and height present a problem, but it is also considered that the infilling of the existing gap between the application property and No.10 Bonnersfield Lane and the location of the elements on the new elevation would result in a poor design relationship. It is recommended that given the constraints offered by the applicants need to site the staircase and lift shaft to the rear of the building, the entire third floor needs to be omitted and further consideration given to improving the relationship between the building and No.10 Bonnersfield Lane.

**3) Housing Provision**

Broad policies within the adopted UDP seek to encourage and secure the provision of additional housing in a range of types and sizes. In this respect the proposal for 13 flats is considered to provide a positive contribution. While the current proposal would involve the loss of the office (proposed in the previous scheme to replace the existing office) at first floor level, this is considered to be acceptable given the previous approval for a restaurant at first floor level and the existence of good quality office accommodation elsewhere in the town centre.

**4) Residential Amenity**

With respect to the amenity of the future occupiers of the new units, the lack of amenity space on site is not considered to be objectionable given the town centre location and the range of facilities nearby.

The nearest neighbouring residential properties are located at the flat over No.12 Bonnersfield Lane, the two flats at No.14 and 14A Bonnersfield Lane and the flats at the second floor level of 184 Station Road. The size and siting of the proposed outdoor roof amenity area would allow for direct and perceived overlooking to the rear of these properties, to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers.

continued/

The rear extensions proposed would involve additional depth of 2.7m at first and second floor level. While the existing building does not meet the 45° code in respect of the corner of the neighbouring building at 184 Station Road, the proposed additional depth at second floor level would have an undue impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the nearest flat at the second floor of that building, which has habitable room windows adjacent to the corner. As well as extra depth, the height of the building would also increase from a total of 10.3m to 11.1m in order to provide a parapet around the proposed roof terrace. Given the proposed siting of the extensions south of the neighbouring residential property, it is considered that the impact in terms of loss of light, overshadowing and loss of outlook would be increased to an unacceptable degree, and thus the proposal would not safeguard residential amenity.

**5) Parking and Highway Considerations**

No parking provision is possible on site due to the size of the existing building and the location on Station Road. This is considered to be acceptable given the town centre location and the proximity to public transport routes.

**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 refusal.

---

**GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH, KENTON ROAD,  
KENTON**

**1/02  
P/1783/05/CFU/TEM  
Ward: KENTON EAST**

REPLACEMENT CHURCH WITH DETACHED SINGLE/2  
STOREY PLAYGROUP/COMMUNITY BUILDING AT  
REAR, ACCESS, PARKING (REVISED)

KOUPPARIS ASSOCIATES for TRUSTEES OF ST PANTELEIMON

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 1:1250 Location Plan, 914/97/1C, 98, 99D, 100E, 101, 102E, 103, 103A'E',  
104E, Planting Schedule (18-AUG-04), Travel Action 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), including railings on the roof of the playgroup/community building
  - (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 1/02 – P/1783/05/CFU continued.....

- 5 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 914/97/100D 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.
- 6 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 7 Trees - Protective Fencing
- 8 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
- 9 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 10 Noise Details - Buildings - Insulation - 1
- 11 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 12 Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Buildings
- 13 Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
- 14 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.
- 15 The development hereby permitted shall not be open for formal activities outside the following times:-  
(a) 09.30 hours to 21.30 hours, Monday to Friday inclusive,  
(b) 09.30 hours to 23.00 hours, Saturday and Sunday,  
without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 16 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 17 The window(s) in the first floor windows in western flank wall 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.
- 18 Water Storage Works
- 19 The applicant shall comply with the provisions of the approved Travel Plan which shall be reviewed annually to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: To ensure the provision of satisfactory modes of transport to the site and the reduction of reliance on the private motor car.
- 20 The roof of the playgroup/community building shall not be used as a balcony or for recreational use, and the access across the roof together with the adjacent external staircase shall be used for emergency escape purposes only and not as a means of access into the building hereby approved.  
REASON: To preserve the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents.

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 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 5 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
- SC1 Provision of Community Services
- ST1 Land Uses and Transport Network
- D4 Standard of Design and Layout
- D10 Trees and New Development
- T13 Parking Standards
- C10 Community Buildings and Places of Worship
- C17 Access to Leisure, Recreation, Community and Retail Facilities

---

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

- 1) Appearance and character of Area (SD1, D4, D10)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Activity (SC1, C10)
  - 4) Accessibility (C17)
  - 5) Parking and Traffic (ST1, T13)
  - 6) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	3 - 5
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	18
Site Area:	0.25ha	
Floorspace:	1858m <sup>2</sup>	
Council Interest:	None	

**b) Site Description**

- north side of Kenton Road near junction with Winckley Close
- occupied by L-shaped single storey church building facing frontage and boundary with 656 Kenton Road to west
- green open space behind church with large white poplar tree
- house of parish priest towards north east corner of site, with garden next to Winckley Close, planting along boundary

continued/

Item 1/02 – P/1783/05/CFU continued.....

- 2 crossovers onto Kenton Road
- 12 parking spaces along front boundary, plus 3 in front of house
- residential premises adjacent to western boundary, scouts building and residential abut northern boundary, Winckley Close and office building next to eastern boundary

**c) Proposal Details**

- demolition of existing church, construction of Byzantine style replacement church on western side of site
- depth of some 34m plus front lobby (1m deeper than approved), width 16.5m at front, bell tower in south-east corner, front, side and rear gable features, dome features above building and bell tower as previously approved
- 11.2m height to top of main roof, 16.5m to top of bell tower, 17.1m to top of main dome
- fairfaced brickwork and Portland stone walls, tiled main roof and copper roof to domes
- worship area on ground floor, gallery above front element of church, records store in basement
- detached single/2-storey building behind church to accommodate playgroup with ancillary facilities on ground floor with committee/youth/music/library rooms and ancillary facilities at first floor level
- 15 parking spaces shown along eastern boundary with offices at 666 Kenton Road, as previously approved
- access and egress at front, 3 spaces in between
- approved Travel Plan accompanies application with following objectives:-
  - to reduce church members' reliance on using their vehicles to attend the church
  - to promote regular use of alternative forms of travel
  - to reduce number of vehicles brought to the churchtargets in the travel plan retained and state that:-
  - the church will aim to reduce car use by 15%, through the promotion of car sharing, cycling, walking and public transport
  - the church will aim to encourage 5% of church members who regularly use their car to car share by 2005
  - the church will aim to encourage 5% of members to walk to church each week by 2005
  - the church will provide a travel plan notice board with travel information in the foyer of the church, write quarterly articles on the travel plan in the church magazine and produce leaflets to distribute to parishioners
  - the travel plan initiatives will be incorporated into sermons and the Priest will make announcements regarding these on a regular basis
  - the church will participate in National Travel Awareness events and Car Free Days each year to promote sustainable transport to church members
  - the church will manage the car park by implementing a vehicle entry system and by recruiting a Car Park Marshall
  - the church trustees also intend to nominate members to take on the responsibility of travel plan co-ordinator and liaison officer

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/331/00/OUT	Outline: two storey community cultural & educational building on Winckley Close frontage	WITHDRAWN 07-JUN-00
EAST/117/02/OUT	Outline: replacement church building including basement for Greek Orthodox Church, playgroup and community hall with parking	GRANTED 14-FEB-03
P/336/04/COU	Outline: replacement church building with basement, community hall, playgroup, parking, access (revised)	GRANTED 24-MAY-04
P/3022/04/CFU	Replacement church building with playgroup/community building at rear, access and parking	GRANTED 13-JAN-05

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- proposed 6 new rooms comprise:-
  - office which will be official Community and Parish office
  - Greek Art Room to be used for Byzantine Church Iconography, wood carving meetings and lessons, teaching traditional Greek forms of art
  - Church Music Room will be where Church Choirs will meet and will also serve as library
  - Sunday School room will also be used for regular bible study meetings
  - Committee room will be used by various Church Committees and by the Fraternal Team Clergy of the Kenton Group of Churches (an Inter-Christian Ecumenical body)
  - specific room for the youth, possible with internet facilities

**f) Consultations**

EA:	Unable to respond	
	TWU:	No objections
L.B. Brent:	No objections	

<b>Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 01-SEP-05
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 49	Replies 2	Expiry 19-AUG-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Responses:** Excessive scale, out of proportion, insufficient parking leading to obstruction of Winkley Close, details of materials and planting required, noise disturbance, incongruous

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The only change in this application to the scheme granted in January this year is the proposed increase in the height of part of the detached community building behind the church to accommodate a new first floor. This would rise to a height of some 7.2m, just under 2m higher than approved. Given the overall scale of the project this is not considered to be harmful to the appearance of the site and locality.

All other aspects of the scheme remain as last approved.

### **2) Neighbouring Amenity**

To the west the proposed community building would be some 2m from the rear garden boundaries of 2 and 4 St. Pauls Avenue. These properties have rear garden depths of about 40m and new planting is shown next to the boundary. High level, obscure glazed windows are shown in this elevation and it is considered, in view of these considerations, that an acceptable relationship with neighbouring occupiers in St. Pauls Avenue would be provided.

To the east the building would be sited partly behind the Priest's house, and over 20m from the eastern boundary with Winckley Close so that no harm to amenity in this direction would result from the proposals.

To the north the proposed 2 storey element of the community building would be mostly adjacent to a building used by the Scouts – The John Wright Hall, and only marginally next to the rear gardens of 18/19 Winckley Close. It would be sited some 21m from the rear wall of those properties, providing sufficient separation distance to maintain outlook.

High level windows are shown in the first floor northern rear elevation so that overlooking of neighbouring gardens would not result.

It is considered in the light of the above that satisfactory impacts in terms of neighbouring amenity would result.

### **3) Activity**

Activity levels on the site are controlled in the most recent permission by a condition based on the start and finish times in a previously approved schedule of activities. Although this revised scheme would provide 6 additional rooms there is no change proposed to the hours of operation, and it is not considered that the additional accommodation would give rise to an overintensive use of the site.

### **4) Accessibility**

The principle of an acceptable form of ramped access is shown into the church and rear building, to be finalised by condition. Parking is shown for disabled badge holders.

continued/

**5) Parking and Traffic**

12 parking spaces are currently provided on site and this is proposed to be increased to 18. This was previously considered acceptable, and although in excess of the current standard would reduce the likelihood of parking on Kenton Road which would be undesirable.

Identical access arrangements to the existing situation and the previous approvals are shown.

**6) Consultation Responses**

excessive scale, out of proportion, - the scale of the church is unchanged from  
insufficient parking leading to the previous approval, as is parking, scale  
obstruction of Winckley Close, of detached building discussed in report  
incongruous

details of materials and planting = appropriate conditions suggested  
required, incongruous

**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.

---

**ROOKS HEATH HIGH SCHOOL, EASTCOTE LANE,  
SOUTH HARROW**

**1/03**

**P/1589/05/CLA/DT2**

Ward: ROXBOURNE

PART SINGLE/PART TWO STOREY BUILDING WITH  
GLAZED LINK AT EASTCOTE LANE FRONTAGE OF SITE

HOWARD FAIRBAIRN & PARTNERS for HARROW COUNCIL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5245/PO1; PO2; PO3; PO10; PO11

**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 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.
- 4 Disabled Access - Buildings
- 5 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound

### **INFORMATIVES:**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
- 2 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994
- 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
  - C7 New Education Facilities
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - T10 Cycling
  - T13 Parking Standards
  - C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces
- 

continued/

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

- 1) Appearance of the Proposed buildings and their setting (SD1, C7, D4, T10, T13, C16)
  - 2) Neighbouring Amenity (D5)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	)
	Justified:	) See Report
	Provided:	)
Site Area:	0.5990 ha.	
Floorspace:	1604m <sup>2</sup>	
Council Interest:	Council owned	

**b) Site Description**

- Rooks Heath High School is on the north side of Eastcote Lane and comprises a group of four main buildings with ancillary buildings and a football field towards the rear of the site
- classroom buildings are two storey London Stock brick structures with hipped roofs and tall casement windows, that date from the inter war period
- the reception building containing the main entrance to the school, is at the front of the site and is a more modern structure, having largely glazed flank walls, a red brick façade and a gabled roof
- Roxeth Manor First and Middle Schools shares the site, extending to the north and east of the application site, adjacent to the rear of houses on Tithe Farm Avenue

**c) Proposal Details**

- part single/part two-storey extension is proposed at the front of the building
- comprising a theatre and drama studio, two function rooms, a dining room, kitchen and cafeteria, a new reception area and new toilet facilities
- first floor facilities to comprise music/practice rooms, recording studio, photography/dark room, disability WC, cleaning/storage areas.
- lightweight, contemporary design; part curved aluminium curtain walls contrasting with rendered walls in the substantive structure
- glazed link to connect reception area with Block A, Roxeth School buildings at the northern end of the site
- enhanced boundary and landscaping treatment
- reconfigured off street parking layout, improved service/delivery access from Eastcote Lane and pedestrian public footpath, new repositioned cycle storage area.
- provision of a covered walkway between Roxeth Manor School and the glazed link with Block A.

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

P/1921/04/DLA	Change of Use: Caretaker's dwelling (Class C3) to Police Office (Class B1) & alterations to elevations including air conditioning units and extract flues	GRANTED 14-DEC-04
---------------	---	----------------------

**e) Applicant's Statement**

Rooks Heath High School is a mixed Comprehensive State school that has been awarded Specialist School Status and will become a Business and Enterprise College. The proposal is aimed to provide additional modern educational facilities in accommodation that is designed to a high quality that will be commensurate with this new status of the School.

The proposed building is a modern idiom that does not attempt to compete with the existing traditional School buildings. A high degree of transparency has been utilised to visual links to the existing buildings. The proposal seeks to be a welcoming focal point for the local community that will make a significant contribution to the streetscape of Eastcote Lane.

<b>f) Advertisement</b>	Major Development	Expiry 30-JUL-05	
<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 157	Replies 0	Expiry 25-JUL-05

**APPRAISAL**

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

The proposed extension would have a height of 8.4m, a depth of 43m and a width of approximately 45m.

The proposed development would occupy roughly the same footprint as the existing building. The most significant feature of the proposed extension is the octagonal shaped theatre/Drama Studio that will replace the flat roofed reception area. The provision of additional facilities within the core of the existing site means that the Horsa Huts at the northern end of the site can be demolished and the land used for replacement tennis and basketball facilities that will be removed as part of the proposal.

The proposed extension is relatively small scale in relation to the proportions of the existing school buildings. Nevertheless, the design of the building would be quite a striking addition to the locality, whose townscape is characterised largely by inter war terraced and semi detached residential development. However, the lightweight, contemporary design of the extension means that it would be subordinate to the existing buildings and the main façade of the School would still be recognisable. As such, it is considered that the proposal is commensurate with the advice in Policy D4; it stresses that "Development should achieve a "sense of place" and either complement the existing building form or provide a distinct character of its own. New buildings should set standards for future development, not necessarily mimicking what already exists".

continued/

The existing buildings are substantial structures that extend to a considerable depth and extend to a considerable width on the Eastcote Lane frontage. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed extension, having a good deal of transparency in its physical composition, would be a focal point of the School buildings as a community use, without appearing over bearing or incongruous.

It is concluded that the proposed extension would be an exciting but unobtrusive incident in the streetscene that would provide extra, modern teaching facilities for the school and the community.

**2) Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

The nearest housing to the site is immediately to the east of it on Eastcote Lane, a short terrace of two storey properties, of which the end terrace house, 272 Eastcote Lane, is the School Caretakers lodge and is within the site area of the application. There is a separation on the common boundary between the two sites of approximately 8m. It is considered that no adverse effects would arise for these neighbouring properties as a result of the proposal. Firstly, because the proposed building will be roughly of the same scale and footprint as the existing reception building that it would replace, secondly, because no increase in vehicular traffic generation or movement to and from the site is envisaged as a result of the proposal. It is concluded therefore, that the proposal respects the advice in Policy D5, which, although it is given within the context of new residential development, has validity here; it stresses that development should ensure that the amenity and privacy of existing occupiers is safeguarded. In this case it is considered that the material living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers would be unchanged.

**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.

## OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

---

**383 STATION RD, HARROW**

**2/01**  
**P/1627/05/CVA/SC2**  
Ward: GREENHILL

VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 OF PERMISSION LBH/38315 TO ALLOW OPENING 11:00 TO 02:00 SUNDAY TO WEDNESDAY AND 11:00 TO 02:30 THURSDAY TO SATURDAY

FOUR IN ONE

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Ordnance Survey

**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:- 11.00 hours to 02.00 hours Sunday to Wednesday and 11.00 hours to 02.30 hours Thursday to Saturday, without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

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:  
EM24 Town Centre Environment  
EM25 Food, Drink and Late Night Uses

---

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

1. Residential Amenity (EM24, EM25)
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

### INFORMATION

#### a) Summary

Town Centre	Harrow
Council Interest:	None

Cont...

**b) Site Description**

- West side of Station Road directly opposite its junction with Gayton Road.
- Two storey property – ground floor currently used as a take away with offices above.
- Located within a predominantly commercial area. A dry cleaners adjoins the premise to the south. An existing alleyway separates the applicant property from a restaurant and bookmakers to the north. A public house is situated directly opposite the premise to the east.
- Applicant property within both a designated secondary shopping frontage area and a district centre.
- Railway line located to the rear of the premise.

**c) Proposal Details**

- Variation of Condition 3 of permission LBH/38315 to allow opening 11:00 to 02:00 Sun to Weds and 11.00 to 02.30 Thurs to Sat.

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/38315	Change of use of ground floor from office (Class A2) to diner/snack bar (Class A3)	GRANTED 11-MAY-89
EAST/1039/98/VAR	Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission LBH 38315 to allow revised opening hours	GRANTED 26-APR-99

**e) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
6	0	26-AUG-2005

**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 applicant premise.

The premise was originally in office use prior to planning consent being granted in 1989 allowing a change of use to a diner/snack bar (Class A3). Condition 3 of this permission stated that the premise shall not be used except between 10.30hr and 23.30hrs Mon-Sat inclusive and 10.30hrs and 22.30hrs Sundays and Bank Holiday Mondays.

Cont...

A previous application granted planning consent for an extension of opening hours in April 1999 enabling the applicant premise to trade until 2am on Fridays and Saturdays and until 1am between Sundays and Thursdays. This permission was given for a trial period of one year and was not renewed by the applicant. Nevertheless, the premise appears to have continued its late night trading as a complaint was made to the Councils Planning Enforcement Team about a breach of condition regarding hours.

The presence of nearby public bars, such as O' Neills and the Fat Controller on Station Road, with late night facilities, highlights the fact that this area of Harrow is both currently used and suitable for late night trading.

Harrow Council Policy EM25 seeks to ensure that proposals for late night food uses does not harm residential amenity. The location of the applicant premise is favourable with regard to the lack of nearby residencies and as such an extension of trading hours will not result negatively on local residential amenity levels.

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.

---

**FRESHFIELDS, 12 REENGLASS ROAD, STANMORE**

**2/02**  
**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/



**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.

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING DETACHED BUILDING

URBAN LIVING DEPARTMENT for PEOPLE FIRST DEPARTMENT

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: E5312/107, 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 Completed Development - Buildings

### **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

- 2 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - C6 First and Middle Schools
  - C7 New Education Facilities
  - T13 Parking Standards
- 

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

- 1) Character of Area (SD1, D4)
  - 2) Amenity of Neighbours (SD1, D4)
  - 3) Parking/Highway Safety (C6, C7, T13)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: Council owned

### **b) Site Description**

- site occupied by First and Middle School consisting of mainly 2 storey building plus single storey prefabricated mobile classrooms

continued/

Item 2/03 – P/1711/05/CLA continued.....

- application relates to Roxbourne First School and the applicant site is situated at the northern edge of the school site, west of Torbay Road and east of Yeading Avenue
- school playing field and play yard located directly south of the site
- single storey classroom buildings surround the site to the east and west while a small car parking facility and secondary entrance adjoin the site to the north
- immediate area is predominantly residential and the applicant school is surrounded on all sides by residential units

**c) Proposal Details**

- single storey extension to the western side of an existing detached prefabricated building
- extension sought to provide an extra classroom in order to facilitate the moving of a class from the second storey of the main school building
- extension to provide an additional 120sq m (including landing) of floor space and would accommodate a store room, lobby/cloak room and a new classroom
- classroom would take up 71.25sq m of the new floor space
- the extension will include 8 windows, a ramped access and a new fire escape for both the proposed and existing buildings at the rear
- a flat roof will adjoin the flat roof of the existing building
- a new fascia is proposed for the existing building and would match the fascia of the proposed extension

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/3906	Erection of 2-storied four classroom unit	<b>GRANTED</b> 01-JAN-69
LBH/3906/1	Erection of temporary mobile classroom	GRANTED 18-DEC-72
LBH/3906/3	Erection of one additional temporary mobile classroom unit	GRANTED 16-JUL-73
LBH/3906/4	Erection of one additional temporary mobile classroom unit	GRANTED 06-DEC-73
LBH/3906/2	Erection of 2 additional temporary mobile classroom units	GRANTED 14-MAR-74
LBH/3906/5	Erection of additional temporary mobile classroom unit	GRANTED 14-MAR-74
LBH/3906/6	Continued use of 4 mobile classrooms	GRANTED 20-JAN-78

continued/

Item 2/03 – P/1711/05/CLA continued.....

LBH/3906/7	Retention and continued use of temporary classroom unit	GRANTED 01-DEC-78
LBH/22838	Retention of 2 mobile classrooms	GRANTED 14-APR-83
LBH/38018	Application under Reg.4 OF the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1976 classroom	GRANTED 04-MAY-89
LBH/41874	Application under Regulation 4 of Town & Country Planning Gen.Reg. 1976: Extension to single storey classroom building & detached single storey mobile buildings to provide 4 replacement classrooms	GRANTED 19-DEC-90
WEST/44182/92/FUL	Application under Reg.4(5) of Town & Country Planning General Regulation 1976: Double mobile classroom building	GRANTED 28-FEB-92
WEST/636/94/LA3	Retention of double mobile classroom	GRANTED 20-DEC-94
WEST/409/96/FUL	Portable storage container	GRANTED 10-SEP-96
WEST/561/01/REN	Renewal of planning permission WEST/409/96/FUL dated 10-SEP-96 for portable storage container	GRANTED 11-OCT-01
WEST/265/02/LA3	Single storey extension	GRANTED 05-AUG-02
P/843/03/CFU	Provision of single storey classroom building	GRANTED 05-AUG-02

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

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

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

The area surrounding the applicant school is predominantly residential. Residential properties are located directly north of the applicant site, approximately 25m away, while further dwellings are located to the south, west and east of the school site. The school is well established in the area and has a history of planning approval for extensions and for the provision of temporary units. Previous developments were necessary in order to accommodate increases 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 extension is sought in order to relocate a first school class from a smaller second floor classroom in the main school building so as to comply with the relevant educational standards. The proposed works would adjoin an existing single storey pre fabricated building and would provide an additional classroom along with both a store room and a cloak room.

The single storey extension proposed is relatively small scale and will not be disproportionate to the existing school. The extension would provide an additional 120sq m of floor space of which 71.25sq m would be used for an additional classroom. The design of the extension would represent a continuation of the existing building although it is proposed to extend outwards at the front. A similar flat roof is proposed for the extension while the fascia boards of the existing building are to be replaced and will match the fascia of the new extension. The existing building is not considered to be of any architectural merit. Access for the disabled is proposed and would be used in conjunction with the disabled access ramp of the existing building while the original fire escape route has been moved from the west side of the existing building to the rear. The plot of land designated for the extension is currently overgrown, vacant and under-utilised. The siting and design of the proposed extension is such that it will only be visible from the small public road at the north of the site and its construction would not detract from the residential character of the area.

### **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, at the northern edge of the large site, and its small scale mean the proposed development can only be viewed from the rear of properties approx 25m north of the proposed site. A small car park, road way and boundary wall would separate the extension from the rear garden of these properties. The elongated rear gardens of these properties (13m) further minimises the affect of the scheme. Furthermore, as the extension will be single storey, no overlooking, overbearing or loss of privacy issues would be encountered.

continued/

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 in order to relocate a first school class from the second floor of the main building to a new classroom in order to comply with the relevant education standards. 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.

**3) Parking / Highway Safety.**

Policy C7 of the 2004 UDP seeks to ensure that appropriate education facilities are provided while it also encourages the expansion of existing facilities. In such cases, certain issues must be taken into consideration. These issues include the local population and need for educational facilities, site accessibility, proximity to public transport and the availability of safe setting down and picking up points within the school.

The works proposed in the current application adhere to all the issues outlined. The application does not appear to facilitate an increase in pupil numbers at Roxbourne First School as the extension is necessary for the relocation of existing students. The proposal to improve existing accommodation would not result in an increase in either car or pedestrian traffic above current levels. The works will also not result in a loss of existing school parking facilities and the schools existing setting down and picking up points would be unaffected.

**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.

---

**15-21 HEADSTONE DRIVE, HARROW**

**2/04**  
**P/1917/05/CFU/CM**  
Ward: WEALDSTONE

CHANGE OF USE OF 1ST, 2ND & 3RD FLOORS TO ALTERNATIVE, EITHER OFFICES (B1) OR HEALTHCARE (D1). ALTERATIONS TO PARKING & ACCESS RAMP AT REAR

PEARSON ASSOCIATES for VALUETIMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Location Plan, BH10, L1147 14 Rev 1, L1147 15 Rev 1, L1147 16.

**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 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 and the amenity of neighbouring residents.
- 3 The existing parking spaces shall be available and used only for the parking in connection with the development hereby permitted and for no other purpose.  
REASON: To ensure satisfactory provision of parking areas, to safeguard the appearance of the locality and in the interests of highway safety.

## **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  
C8 Health Care and Social Services  
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces  
T13 Parking Standards  
H15 Hostels  
EM8 Enhancing Town Centres  
EM22 Environmental Impact of New Business Development
- 

Cont...

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

1. Employment Policy (EM8, EM22, T13, C16)
  2. Healthcare Provision (C8, C16, H15, T13)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, EM22, C8)
  4. Parking/Highway Issues (T13)
  5. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Listed Building:	Not Listed	
Conservation Area:	None	
Town Centre	Wealdstone - Sec	
Car Parking	Standard:	4/2.3
	Justified:	See Report
	Provided:	19
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- Former hotel building currently used for offices/hostel on northern side of Headstone Drive within secondary retail frontage of Wealdstone District Centre.
- Servicing area and car park to rear accessed from the shared service road running between this property and the parade of shops to the east, off Headstone Drive, other car park for use in conjunction with Holy Trinity Church.
- The adjoining site has recently been redeveloped to provide a four storey housing block, rear gardens of residential properties on Gordon Road abut the rear of the site.
- Main access to building at side off pavement on access road.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- Change of use of first, second and third floors from offices (first floor) and hostel (second and third floors) to healthcare offices and clinic for NHS or offices in the alternative.
- Disabled access ramp at rear for emergency access to car park from existing stairway landing.
- Alterations to car parking arrangements resulting in loss of 3 spaces in order to provide 2 disabled spaces and disabled access ramp

Cont...

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/1017/97/FUL	Alterations, staircase & roof extensions to form new floor & change of use from office to hotel (Class B1 to C1)	GRANTED 24-MAR-1998
EAST/185/99/FUL	Change of use of ground floor - showroom to hotel in conjunction with upper floors	GRANTED 21-MAY-1999
EAST/893/02/CON	Continued use as hostel (1 year permission)	GRANTED 13-SEP-2002
P/2160/03/CCO	Continued use as hostel (1 year permission)	GRANTED 07-NOV-2003
P/2880/04/CFU	Continued use of 2nd and 3rd floors as a hostel & use of ground & first floors as offices (Class B1) with alterations to outbuildings	GRANTED 11-FEB-2005

**e) Applicant's Statement**

- NHS Trust envisage using the first floor as a clinic, in which 8 staff will be based, with 20 patients attending.
- 40 staff would be based on the second floor, only 8 of these would be based there permanently and the other 32 would use it as a base to deliver a community service in the area.  
The third floor would be used by Ayurveda Kendra UK Ltd (homeopathic clinic) with 6 staff and 12 patients per day.
- The ground floor will remain in office use, and the hostel accommodation on the second and third floors will cease to be provided as the utilisation of this use is now virtually defunct due to changes in the council and government regime in this matter.
- The original use of the building was for offices.
- The site is located in a central accessible part of the town centre, close to public transport and with adequate car parking facilities.
- The B1 alternative use will enable the premises to be used for B1 purposes should either of the covenants not be fulfilled.

**f) Notifications**

Sent	Replies	Expiry
52	1	26-AUG-2005

**Summary of Responses:** broadly in support of the application as either option would seem to be more beneficial to the locality than the present usage of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floors, urge that sufficient parking is provided for either use.

Cont...

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1. Employment Policy**

Policy EM8 (Enhancing Town Centres) of the UDP encourages development that contains mixed uses as they help bring diversity to town centres and can help increase their vitality. The current application proposes a mix of offices and healthcare facilities, both of which are considered to be acceptable district centre uses. The ground floor has recently been converted to office use and this would remain.

Policy EM22 (Environmental impact of new business development) has regard, inter alia, to the suitability of the site for the proposed use in terms of the potential impact on neighbouring amenity and the character of the area together with the ability of surrounding roads to accommodate the generated traffic and the accessibility of the site. Loss of the land from another use is also considered. The site is suitable for office use by virtue of its location within a district centre together with good accessibility and proximity to public transport. Given the previous use of the site for office use and the recent permission for offices at ground and first floors, it is not considered there would be any adverse impacts on neighbouring amenity or the environment. The loss of hostel use is not considered objectionable given the temporary permissions relating to that use and the change in need identified by the applicant. The provision of a disabled access ramp is considered to be beneficial to the future users of the property, in accordance with Policy C16.

### **2. Healthcare Provision**

Policy C8 has regard for the provision of health care and social services, which will normally be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity, the premises are well served by a range of transport options, there would be no loss of a satisfactory residential unit unless there is an overwhelming need for such a development, and the development provides the levels of car parking appropriate to the use and would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. The proposed clinic and associated offices are not considered to present any additional impacts on residential amenity over the existing hostel use and the existing and proposed office use. The site is well served by public transport options associated with the district centre location, and the level of car parking and highway safety issues are considered to be acceptable. The loss of hostel use is not considered objectionable given the temporary permissions relating to that use and the change in need identified by the applicant. The provision of a disabled access ramp is considered to be beneficial to the future users of the property, in accordance with Policy C16.

Cont...

**3. Residential Amenity**

There are no external physical alterations proposed to the front elevation and therefore no effect on the visual amenity of the streetscene. Likewise it is not considered that the provision of a disabled access ramp to the rear of the building would have any detrimental impacts on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

As discussed above, it is not considered that the use of the use of the upper floors for a healthcare/offices would have an adverse effect on local amenity given the historical use of the site for offices and a hostel, and its location in a district centre.

**4. Parking/Highway Issues**

The car park at the rear of the site currently provides 22 spaces, however this would be reduced to 19 spaces following the construction of the disabled access ramp and the provision of 2 disabled spaces. The number of spaces exceeds the 4 required for office use and 2.3 required for healthcare use. The level of parking provided is considered sufficient, and furthermore given the proximity of the site to transport links there is no objection raised on grounds of parking.

**5. 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.

REAR CONSERVATORY WITH RETRACTABLE ROOF

ABE HAYEEM for B & M ISAACS

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS, Location Map, Site Plan (LC/1), Drawing Nos. LC/2 - LC/7 (inclusive)

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until 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 flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

## **INFORMATIVES**

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

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

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

Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SEP5 Structural Features

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

EP31 Areas of Special Character

EP33 Development in the Green Belt

EP34 Extension to Buildings in the Green Belt

Cont...

Item 2/05 - P/1770/05/CFU Cont...

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - SD2 Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Sites of Archaeological Importance and Historic Parks and Gardens
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D12 Locally Listed Buildings
  - D14 Conservation Areas
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - D16 Conservation Area Priority
- 

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

1. Green Belt and Area of Special Character (EP31, EP33, EP34, SEP5, SEP6)
  2. Character and Appearance of Listed Building and Conservation Area (D12, D14, D15, D16, D17, SD2)
  3. Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
  4. Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Listed Building:	Locally Listed
Conservation Area:	Stanmore: Little Common
Area of Special Character:	Special Character and Adv
Council Interest:	None

**b) Site Description**

- two-storey property in locally listed terrace on Little Common.
- dwelling situated in Metropolitan Green Belt and Little Common Conservation Area.
- Small patio to rear with 3m high rendered wall at end of garden.
- Two storey wall of No.22 Little Common to north of patio area, 2m close boarded fence on boundary with similar patio area rear of No.20 Little Common to south.
- Door and window serving kitchen at No.20 in rear elevation.
- High window in flank wall of two-storey rear projection at No.22, serving landing only.

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of rendered walls at either side of rear patio area, with part retractable roof over extending to the existing rear boundary wall.
- provision of WC with glazed roof and dining area with retractable roof

**d) Relevant History**

None.

Cont...

**e) Consultations**

**CAAC:** No Objections

**Advertisement:** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
15-SEP-2005

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	2	0	02-SEP-2005

**APPRAISAL**

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

Policies within the adopted UDP seek to restrict extensions to houses within the Green Belt in order that they should not represent disproportionate additions or impact on the openness of the area.

The property is a small terraced house that has, in common with the rest of the terrace, no rear garden but only a small patio area. The house relies for its Green Belt setting on the open land of the common opposite, and not on the rear patio area which is enclosed by flank fencing to the south, the two-storey wall of No.22 to the north and a 3m high-rendered wall to the east. Thus while the proposal would infill the only open area of the site apart from the strip of planting at the front, its loss would not be significant in terms of setting. Furthermore the proposed retractable roof would allow for flexible use of the majority of the area, and thus it would not result in the total loss of an outdoor amenity space.

Thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable and would not detract from the character or openness of the Green Belt or the Area of Special Character.

**2. Character and Appearance of Locally Listed Building and Conservation Area**

The property is located in Little Common Conservation Area and is part of the locally listed terrace of properties. The roof of the conservatory will be retractable and therefore provide an indoor/outdoor area that can be used in a flexible way. As it would be at the rear of the property and furthermore the existing two-storey rearward projection of No.22 to the north largely obscures the proposed siting from view, it will have minimal impact on the character of the conservation area and the locally listed terrace. Conditions regarding materials should be attached to ensure the best possible quality of materials is used, in particular for the details of the retractable roof.

Thus the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would not detract from the appearance of the locally listed building.

Cont...

### **3. Residential Amenity**

The extension would project for a depth of 3.6m from the main rear wall of the house, to meet the existing 3m wall that runs along the rear boundaries of the gardens in this terrace. While the depth of the extension would exceed that normally considered to be acceptable in accordance with the Council's SPG for householder development, there are circumstances relating to this site which merit special attention. First, while the adjacent property to the south (No.20) has a door and window in the rear elevation that serve the kitchen, the main habitable living area on the ground floor is to the front of these properties. That room benefits from light coming through the main door and relatively large front window facing the common. Also, the rear elevations of Nos.20 and 21 are already partially obscured and overshadowed by the existing 3m high rear boundary wall, at a distance of 3.6m, and the two-storey rearward projection of No.22 to the north. The proposed extension would be sited at the best possible orientation, to the north, in relation to No.20. It is considered that there would be no benefit in requiring the applicant to reduce the proposed depth to the normal 2.4m requirement for terraced houses, as the impact of the additional 1.2m would be negligible in these circumstances.

### **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.

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. It was deferred from the meeting of 7th September 2005 for a Committee Site Visit on 27th September 2005.

### **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 its 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 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 its 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.

ALTERATIONS AND CHANGE OF USE FROM PAVILLION (CLASS D2) TO POLICE OFFICE (CLASS B1)

T P BENNETT for METROPOLITAN POLICE, HARROW

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Ordnance Survey and Plan nos. A8974 - 100, 200 (Rev P2) and 201.

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Completed Development - Use
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) The Redland 'Regent' concrete tiles
  - (b) The PPC aluminium windowsThe development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 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:  
D4 Standard of Design and Layout  
EM22 Environmental Impact of New Business Development  
C2 Provision of Social and Community Facilities  
C12 Community Protection and Emergency Services

---

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

1. Character of Area (D4)
2. Amenity of Neighbours (EM22)
3. Council Policy (C2, C12)
4. Consultation Responses

Cont...

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

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

### **b) Site Description**

- site located on the mid eastern edge of Centenary Park, directly west of Park High School.
- applicant building situation on an elevated grass bank, facing westwards and overlooking the centre of the park.
- Park High School surrounds the property to the north and east while Centenary Park bounds the applicant building to the south and west.
- the area surrounding Centenary Park is predominantly residential.
- approx 1m high steel fence currently surrounds the property.
- the building is currently vacant and boarded up but was previously used as a sporting pavilion with sports changing facilities.

### **c) Proposal Details**

- alterations and change of use from pavilion (Class D2) to police office (Class B1).
- removal and erection of partition walls to provide new internal layout.
- removal of existing timber windows and replacement with PPC aluminium windows.
- roof to be re-tiled with Redland 'Regent' concrete tiles.
- bricking up some existing door and window openings.
- installation of 4 no. condenser units at the rear of the building.

### **d) Relevant History**

<b>LBH/3552/1</b>	Erection - electricity substation	<b>GRANTED</b> 30-OCT-1968
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

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

- Building was previously used for changing and showering purposes.
- Harrow Council has provided alternative accommodation for these activities elsewhere in Centenary Park.
- The provision of a B1 Metropolitan Police Office would form part of the Government's Safer Neighbourhoods initiative. This is key to bringing the police force closer to local communities, ensuring their enhanced ability to deal with those local issues that affect people's quality of life.

Cont...

Item 2/07 - P/1942/05/CFU Cont...

- The police office will allow police officers to spend more time actually 'on the beat' and less time commuting between larger police stations.
- It will also provide the police with a valued presence in the community, with space provided for meeting with local representatives.
- The scheme complies with Harrow Council Policies C2, C16 and EM23.
- No loss in recreational provision will be incurred due to alternative facilities being provided by Harrow Council.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	21	0	23-AUG-2005

## APPRAISAL

### 1. Character of Area

The applicant premise is situated within Centenary Park, an outdoor leisure and sporting area. The area surrounding Centenary Park is primarily in residential use although Park School surrounds the applicant property to the North and East. The building was previously used as a sports pavilion and accommodated changing and showering facilities for local sports clubs. At present the building is currently vacant and boarded up while new changing facilities are being provided elsewhere in the park by Harrow Council. The applicant property has a floor space of 270 sq m with 2 pitched sections at either end of the buildings façade overlooking the park. Access is via a timber door located at the centre of the façade.

The existing timber windows and roof tiles are to be both replaced by new aluminium PPC windows and Redland 'Regent' concrete tiles respectively, details of which are to be approved by the Council. The proposal also includes the blocking up of some existing window openings and the installation of 4 air conditioning units at the rear. At present the building is somewhat of an eyesore with its boarded up windows. Its conversion to a police office will ensure the buildings potential is maximised while the external works proposed will enhance the property's visual amenity and as such will benefit the character of the local area.

The change of use from a D2 sports pavilion to a B1 Metropolitan Police Office will also prove beneficial to the local character of the area. A police office would provide a valuable service to the nearby residential area, while no recreational uses will be lost as the Council are replacing the sports changing facilities previously accommodated by the building elsewhere in the park.

### 2. Amenity of Neighbours

The proposed works are not considered to have a negative impact on local residential amenity levels. Harrow Council Policy EM23 when considering applications for B1 development takes into account, amongst other factors, the potential impact on amenity. The Council feels that a change of use to a police office will have a positive impact on residential amenity by providing additional security for the area.

Cont...

The 4 air conditioning units proposed for the rear of the building should not cause excessive noise levels that may result in a reduction of local residential amenity levels. The presence of Park High School to the rear of the property means that there are no residential units within the immediate vicinity of the proposed air condenser units.

### **3. Policy Context**

Harrow Council Policy C2 encourages the provision of social and community facilities especially in areas identified to be in need of such facilities. The provision of a police office in the Centenary Park area complies with Council policy in this regard. Policy C12 seeks to ensure that appropriate facilities for community protection and emergency services are conveniently located to meet the needs of the population and are designed to minimise any adverse effect on the locality. The current application proposes to meet a community need for greater security and as such complies with Harrow Council Policy

### **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. 05/2340/1A & 05/2340/2A

**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.

continued/

- 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  
16 PD Restriction – Classes A - E

**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
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

This application was reported to the Planning Committee on 7th September 2005 as a petition against the proposal has been received. The application was deferred to allow for a Members Site Visit which took place on 27th September 2005.

### **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 Road)

### **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

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.

continued/

Item 2/08 - P/1591/05/DFU continued.....

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.

**f) Consultations**

TWU:	No objections
EA:	No comments

continued/

<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.

### **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.

continued/

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 polices 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.

**6) 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.

---

**3RD FLOOR, PREMIER HOUSE, 1 CANNING ROAD,  
WEALDSTONE**

**2/09**

**P/1749/05/CFU/DT2**

Ward: MARLBOROUGH

CHANGE OF USE OF 550 SQ.M. OF 3RD FLOOR FROM  
OFFICES (CLASS B1) TO OFFICES/EDUCATIONAL  
USES (CLASS B1/D1c)

ADRIAN SALT AND PANG LTD for LONDON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: Unnumbered Floor Plan dt. 11-JUL-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 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 patrons outside the following times:
  - a) Monday - Sunday 8.00am to 9:00pmREASON: 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:  
2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:  
C7 New Education Facilities  
C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces  
EM11 Regeneration Areas  
SEM3 Proposals for New Employment Generating Development  
T13 Parking Standards

---

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

- 1) Change of Use (EM11, SEM3)
  - 2) Residential Amenity, Parking and Accessibility (C7, C16, T13)
  - 3) Consultation Responses
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Site Area: 0.1285 ha.  
Floorspace: 550m<sup>2</sup>  
Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- site is on the eastern side of High Street just south of the junction with Canning Road
- Premier House is a building of 2-5 storeys that was constructed in the early 1980's and comprised a supermarket on the ground floor with offices above
- B1 offices occupy the upper three floors of the building
- the building is accessible to people with disabilities
- 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

### **c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of 550 sq.m. of 3rd floor from offices (Class B1) to offices/educational uses (Class B1/D1c)

### **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
EAST/1264/05/CFU	Change of Use of first floor to offices (Class B1) and/or medical/educational services (Class D1)	GRANTED 07-SEP-05

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

The authorised use for this part of the building is B1 (offices). However, it is understood that part of the floor space is used by the Harrow Association For Disabled People for educational purposes. The proposed use would conform to both the part of the floor area that is in its existing use and the uses of the building as a whole. The applicants are proposing a dual use for the building. To permit such a use would allow the portion of the floor space that is the subject of the application 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.

continued/

Should the applicants vacate the building it could be marketed with a B1 use and delays in securing a new occupier could be minimised. Planning permission has only just been given for a similar arrangement on the first floor of the building.

The proposal is consonant with UDP policy for the regeneration of Wealdstone Town Centre and with strategic policies for Harrow as a whole. The change of use would provide greater opportunities for local people to make use of the educational and training facility that would be available. The site is in a Town centre location that has good car parking provision and good public transport services.

f)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 76	Replies 0	Expiry 12-AUG-05
----	----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Change of Use**

The proposed user of the 3rd floor of the premises is the London Institute of Technology and Research (LITR). It is a training and research consultancy that provides vocational, graduate and research courses in business management and management information systems for specific companies. Their current premises in the SE1 district are no longer suitable. The previous occupier was Harrow Association of Disabled People. The proposal relates to 550sqm of the gross external area of the 3rd floor, which is 66% of the total floor area. Age Concern occupies the remainder of the floor.

The proposal to introduce a D1 non-residential education and training facility in the third floor of the building is considered to be acceptable. The proposed use shares many of the characteristic activities of an office and would be compatible with the predominant office use of the building. The planning history for the site reveals that other parts of the building are in D1 use and permission has only just recently been given for a similar dual use on the first floor of the premises.

### **2) Residential Amenity, Parking and Accessibility**

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. It 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.

continued/

The Premier House site already provides levels of car parking that are considered appropriate to the use of the building and would not have an adverse effect on highway safety. As such therefore, the proposal accords with the advice in UDP Policy SEM3. It advises that proposals for employment-generating activities will be encouraged in suitable locations with good access by modes of travel other than the car. Similarly, the proposal is also consistent with the advice in Policy T13, as it will not generate a need for additional parking. As such it meets the guidance in that Policy, which seeks to promote sustainable development and transport choice.

The proposal is also consonant with the advice in Paragraph 7.22 of the Employment, Town Centres and Shopping Chapter of the UDP. It states that an objective of the policies in the chapter is “To encourage fewer journeys to work by car in established locations to which employees can easily travel by walking, cycling or using public transport”.

No external alterations or extensions are proposed for the premises; therefore, no alterations to the existing access arrangements will be necessary. The building has a ramp leading to the main entrance, which is also level. Accessible lifts connect each floor of the building. In this respect the proposal is in line with the advice in Policy C16, on the need for all public buildings to be readily accessible to all.

**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.

---

**GREEN VERGES, 22 PRIORY DRIVE, STANMORE**

**2/10**  
**P/1802/05/CFU/CM**  
Ward: STANMORE PARK

2 STOREY SIDE TO REAR EXTENSION AND  
ALTERATIONS (REVISED)

THE DRAWING ROOM for MR & MRS ROSENBERG

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 050117/01 Rev.D; /02

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plan no. 050117/01 Rev.C 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 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:

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

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

continued/

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

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

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Green Belt

Council Interest:

None

**b) Site Description**

- two-storey detached property with triple gable frontage, various single storey and first floor side and rear extensions, flat roof over parts of main house on front elevation
- mature trees on the boundaries with 'Dormers' and 'Barlogan'
- existing window in flank wall facing 'Dormers' serving utility room at ground floor level

**c) Proposal Details**

- two storey side to rear extension with balcony on rear elevation at first floor level

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/17161/A	Extension to house	GRANTED 12-AUG-64
LBH/3484/1	Erection of a conservatory	GRANTED 18-APR-69
LBH/3484/3	Extension to existing boiler room	GRANTED 14-NOV-74
EAST/44212/92/FUL	First floor side extension	GRANTED 27-MAY-93
P/535/05/CFU	Two storey side to rear extension and alterations	REFUSED 27-APR-05

Reason for refusal:

"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 and the Area of Special Character."

CURRENT APPEAL LODGED 12-JUL-05

continued/

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

It is understood that in principle the design of the proposal is acceptable, however due to the increase in volume the previous scheme was refused. We have removed the proposed pitch roof element from the original proposal thereby reducing the increased volume significantly. The increase in volume on the existing dwelling is now only 166 cubic metres (12.5%). The increased footprint and floorspace would be 23m<sup>2</sup> and 52m<sup>2</sup> respectively, representing an increase of 9.8% and 11.8% over the current building. It would infill an area to the side and rear of the house and would not be visible from the street, there would be no loss of openness of Green Belt, it would constitute ‘appropriate development’ within the terms of PPG2: Green Belts by virtue of its modest nature. In design terms, it would give the property a more balanced view from the rear. There would be no impact on adjacent properties and no effect on their amenities.

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent 4	Replies 0	Expiry 18-AUG-05
-------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**APPRAISAL**

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

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

	<b>Original</b>	<b>Existing (%inc.)</b>	<b>Proposed (%inc.)</b>
Footprint (m <sup>2</sup> )	175.85	235.97	258.97 (47)
Floorspace (m <sup>2</sup> )	295	395.5	447.5 (51.7)
Volume (m <sup>3</sup> )	1005	1321	1487 (48)

The calculations above indicate that the property has been significantly extended in the past. The previous refusal P/535/05/CFU was refused due to the combination of the side to rear extension with the volume of proposed roof extensions at the front of the property, which would have resulted in disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. However, the officer’s report suggested that one of these elements in isolation might be acceptable.

While the previous scheme proposed an increase in volume of 60%, the current proposal relates to only a 48% increase. This would be more proportionate to the existing house and to the property as originally built. The proposed extension would be relatively well-screened from neighbouring properties by mature trees on the boundaries, it would not be perceived from the road, and the actual increase in depth and footprint would not be significant in terms of impact on the open Green Belt land to the rear of the house. The extension would be designed in keeping with the existing house.

continued/

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

**2) Visual and Residential Amenity**

In terms of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, the proposal is considered to be acceptable. Due to the distance of the proposed side to rear extension from the nearest point of the house at 'Dormers', no loss of light or overshadowing would occur. The proposed new windows in the flank wall would be obscure glazed and would serve only a utility room and en-suite. The proposed balcony off the master bedroom would extend for a depth of only 1.4m and due to the considerable screening offered by trees on the boundary with 'Dormers' and the distance to the boundary with 'Barlogan', no undue overlooking would occur.

**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 REAR OF 45-51 SOUTHFIELD PARK, NORTH HARROW**

**2/11**

**P/1943/05/COU/CM**

Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

OUTLINE: CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE HOUSES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING

CHRISTOPHER PRING for MR DREW, DR & MRS MARSDEN,

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: KP060604, Tree Survey rec'd 29-JUL-05, 861/1, OS

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

- 1 Time Limit - Outline Permission
- 2 Approval of the details shown below (the "reserved matters") shall be obtained from the local planning authority in writing before any development is commenced:
  - (c) external appearance of the building(s)
  - (d) means of access
  - (e) landscaping of the siteREASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces noted below have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:
  - (a) the extension/building(s)
  - (b) the ground 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.
- 4 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.

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/1943/05/COU continued.....

5 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 authority

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.

6 Highway - Approval of Construction

7 Landscaping to be Approved

8 Landscaping to be Implemented

9 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained

10 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved

11 Trees - Protective Fencing

12 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling

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

(a) The storage and disposal of refuse/waste

(b) and vehicular access thereto

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

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

14 Disabled Access - Buildings

15 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.

16 Levels to be Approved

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

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

18 Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces

19 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

20 Water Storage Works

INFORMATIVES:

1 Standard Informative 23 – Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

2 Standard Informative 27 – Access for All

continued/

Item 2/11 – P/1943/05/COU continued.....

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

4 Standard Informative 35 – CDM Regulations 1994

5 INFORMATIVE:

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

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

D10 Trees and New Development

T13 Parking Standards

C16 Access to Buildings and Public Spaces

---

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

1) Housing Provision (SH1, SH2)

2) Character of the Area (SD1, D4, D5, D10)

3) Residential Amenity (SD1, C16, D4, D5)

4) Access and Parking (T13)

5) Consultation Responses

---

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

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

Council Interest:

**b) Site Description**

- land to rear of detached and semi-detached properties 45, 49 and 51 Southfield Park, which extends to rear of gardens at 39-43 at end of gardens
- detached garage to side of No.49, which has a double width plot
- recent development of 4 flats to the rear of No.33, with access from Yewtree Close

**c) Proposal Details**

- outline application for the development of 5 houses (pair of semi-detached houses to the rear of No.45 and a terrace of 3 houses to the rear of Nos. 49 & 51)
- access to the side of No. 49 once garage is demolished
- all houses with integral garages and 2 spaces to the rear of No. 45
- design, external appearance and landscaping to be submitted as reserved matters

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

P/624/04/COU	Outline: redevelopment, 3 storey block of 17 flats, 2 bungalows and garages at rear	REFUSED 24-MAY-04 APPEAL WITHDRAWN
--------------	---	--

**e) Applicant's Statement**

The access would be via a shared driveway with a bell mouth in accordance with 'Residential Road and Footpath' guidance; 6.5m has been allowed for access to the integral garages; the carrying out of a tree survey and the commissioning of an arboriculturalist shows the client's respect for trees; the scheme is sited on rear gardens of the applicants homes so good landscaping will be very important to their amenities; the wheelie bin enclosure siting would meet the limits for collection and proximity to houses

**f) Consultations**

EA:	Unable to respond
TWU:	Awaited

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	88	21	29-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Overlooking, impact on the peace and enjoyment of gardens, security risk, poor sight lines from access road and would be dangerous, width of driveway insufficient for emergency vehicles, integral garages often used for storage and will increase parking problem, tree felling will have detrimental environmental impact, bin store too far from houses, cramped distribution of buildings, lack of green space, lack of parking provision, traffic, overdevelopment, would set a precedent, impact on preserved trees, depth of rear gardens inadequate, strain on existing drainage and sewerage system, flooding, threat of terrorism to capital, hazard to pedestrians, already a high degree of infill housing, Harrow is committed to Agenda 21, inadequate amenity space, congestion on refuse collection day, light pollution, increased strain on services, loss of parking for and in front of No.49, established emergency route for fire station, anti-social behaviour, impact combined with Safeway development

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Housing Provision**

Policies within the adopted UDP, in accordance with PPG3, seek to promote the provision of new housing to meet the needs of prospective occupants. As such the proposal would provide much needed relatively affordable housing in an area in close proximity to North Harrow district centre and its associated services and facilities.

continued/

**2) Character of the Area**

The proposed development would be generally in keeping with the pattern of development found in Yewtree Close and Hazelwood Close to the west, with the formation of a small terrace and a pair of semi-detached houses. The siting in relation to the boundaries with the properties fronting Southfield Park would provide sufficient separation, and although the design of the houses would be dealt with as a reserved matter, the size of the dwellings would be similar to nearby recent close developments.

There is an area Tree Preservation Order for the site, however a tree survey has been prepared and the proposed scheme for retention is considered to be acceptable. Thus the character of the area will not be unduly affected.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The siting of the new houses would provide an acceptable relationship with the neighbouring properties on Southfield Park and Hooking Green. The location of new boundaries would provide rear gardens of 13.5m in depth for Nos.45, 49 and 51, which is considered to be adequate. The new houses would have rear garden depths of 9m, the smallest garden providing amenity space of 54m<sup>2</sup> which is considered to be acceptable. The nearest property would be sited a distance of 18.5m from the nearest dwelling at Hooking Green, with the opportunity for new planting on the boundary. No habitable room windows would be allowed in the flank walls, and the distance to the rear boundaries is considered to be sufficient given the considerable depth of the rear gardens along Southfield Park. As there is significant tree cover on site and the majority of the trees on the boundaries would be retained, the proposal would not result in undue overlooking. Given the existence of garages accessed by a shared driveway to the rear of nearby properties on Southfield Park, the proposed 2 visitor parking spaces would not result in any further undue impact in terms of amenity.

Thus the amenity of neighbouring and future occupiers would be safeguarded.

**4) Access and Parking**

The proposal involves integral garages for the 5 houses and 2 additional visitor spaces. The Council's standards require a parking provision of 7 spaces for such a development, thus the provision would be acceptable. While the scheme would involve the loss of the garage for No.49 Southfield Park, the impact on the area is not considered to be unacceptable given the existence of on-street parking and the proximity of North Harrow District Centre.

**5) Consultation Responses**

These are largely dealt with in the appraisal above. Drainage and flooding issues are technically not planning issues, although a condition has been attached to ensure water storage/attenuation works are provided. Similarly, the strain on services in the area is not a planning consideration.

continued/

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**1 BUTLER AVENUE, HARROW**

**2/12**

**P/1883/05/DFU/PDB**

Ward: WEST HARROW

REAR DORMERS AND CONVERSION TO  
PROVIDE FIVE FLATS, FORECOURT PARKING

DAVID R YEAMAN & ASSOCIATES for MR V IBRAHIM

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 010, 002B, site plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Materials to Match
- 3 Noise - Insulation of Building(s) - 4
- 4 No development shall take place until there has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority details of a scheme of hard and soft landscaping for both the rear amenity area and the front forecourt which shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any part of the converted building is occupied, or by such other time as the Local Planning Authority may agree in writing. Details shall include measures to reinforce existing screening by means of enclosure of the bin storage area and those parts of the rear amenity area designated for the occupants of the ground floor flats as indicated on submitted drawings No. 002B dated July 2003.  
REASON: To enhance the appearance of the property in the streetscene and to protect the amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.

### INFORMATIVES:

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

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - SH1 Housing Provision and Housing Need
  - SH2 Housing Types and Mix
  - EP25 Noise
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy
  - D9 Streetside Greenness and Forecourt Greenery
  - H9 Conversions of Houses and Other Buildings to Flats
  - T13 Parking Standards
- 

continued/

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

- 1) Rear Dormer (D4, D5)
  - 2) Conversion Policy (H9, T13)
  - 3) Character of Area (D4, D5)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

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

### **a) Summary**

Site Area:	447m <sup>2</sup>
Floorspace:	214m <sup>2</sup>
No. of Residential Units:	5
Council Interest:	None

### **b) Site Description**

- two-storey detached Edwardian dwelling on south side of Butler Avenue, Harrow; building has existing two storey side extension with integral garage and hardsurfaced forecourt; original single/two storey projection and ground floor bay window at rear
- neighbouring building to east is two-storey former stables forming a block of three garages; site beyond forms car park to no. 44 Bessborough Road (Drug Advice Centre)
- neighbouring building to west no. 3 Butler Avenue is two-storey detached Edwardian building converted to two flats; facing flank wall contains windows as follows: stair/landing, ground floor kitchen (and door) clear glazed, first floor bedroom and bathroom
- rear garden of application site abuts gardens of nos. 44-54 (evens) Bessborough Road
- Butler Avenue characterised by single dwellings and flat conversions; however 2A & 2B opposite purpose built flats with adjacent parking area
- on-street parking in Butler Avenue and surrounding West Harrow roads not controlled; adjacent part of Bessborough Road stopping/waiting restricted and designated London distributor road

### **c) Proposal Details**

- conversion to five self-contained flats and rear dormers; accommodation as follows:
  - ground floor: 1 x one-bed flat with private garden area of 22m<sup>2</sup> and 1 x two-bed with private garden area of 44m<sup>2</sup>
  - first floor: 1 x one-bed flat and 1 x two-bed flat with internal & external access to communal garden area of 216m<sup>2</sup>
- ground and first floor flats allowed on appeal 2005; proposed additional flat would comprise studio unit within extended roofspace
- rear dormers would be sited 1.4m from west flank wall, 1.2m from east flank wall and 1m from eaves measured externally along the roofslope; dormers would be 4.1m and 4.6m wide each and partially separated by 1m gap (but linked by dormer section set further back up roofslope)

continued/

Item 2/12 - P/1883/05/DFU continued.....

- submitted drawing shows two forecourt spaces (parallel to building frontage) and bin storage at rear

**d) Relevant History**

LBH/6664/1	Erection of two storey extension to side of dwellinghouse	GRANTED 06-OCT-78
P/1779/03/DFU	Conversion to provide 5 flats with rear dormers, front rooflight and forecourt parking.	REFUSED 06-OCT-03

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The number of converted properties in this road is already in excess of that considered appropriate, and additional conversions would result in the further loss of character of the road, and an imbalance in the mix of dwelling types and sizes, contrary to the adopted conversion policy of the local planning authority.
2. The proposal does not make adequate provision for parking within the curtilage of the property and given the present highway and traffic conditions in this road, is likely to have an adverse effect on highway safety and movement; the proposed thus conflicts with the adopted conversion policy of the local planning authority.
3. The proposed roof extension, by reason of excessive size and bulk, would be unduly obtrusive and overbearing, would detract from the appearance of this, and adjacent properties, and be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties.
4. The proposed hard-surfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the street-scene and would give rise to unacceptable access to the highway.
5. The proposed development would give rise to a poor level of amenity for future occupiers of the flats due to the layout, with a poor vertical relationship of rooms throughout and directly facing windows on the ground floor.”

P/676/04/DFU	Conversion to provide four flats with forecourt parking.	REFUSED 07-MAY-04 APPEAL ALLOWED 27-JAN-05
--------------	--	---

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed conversion from a single family dwellinghouse would result in an over-intensive use of the site, a further loss of character of the road, and an imbalance in the mix of dwelling types and sizes detrimental to the amenity of residents and the locality.
2. The proposal does not make adequate provision for parking within the curtilage of the property and given the present highway and traffic conditions in this road, is likely to have an adverse effect on highway safety and movement; the proposal therefore conflicts with the adopted and revised conversion policy of the local planning authority.

continued/

3. The proposed hard surfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and the streetscene and would be detrimental to highway safety.”

**e) Applicant's Statement**

In view of the conclusions reached by the Inspector and the need for small units in Harrow permission is now sought for five flats by the addition of a studio unit.

Letter from Philip Acoustics Ltd. (Consultants in Noise & Vibration): Experience has found that without exception the achieved sound insulation performance of loft conversion flats is better than the insulation of normal separating floors between flats. They significantly exceed the minimum requirements of the Building Regulations 2000 (revised 2003) Part E: airborne sound insulation is in the range 12-20dB better and impact sound 14-24dB better. In acoustic terms these are very large improvements. The reason for this is that doing a loft conversion involves putting in a new structural floor such that the floor and ceiling are supported off separate structures; this is essentially the same as new build Building Regulations (Type 4).

<b>f) Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	20	4	22-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Area already over-developed, add to existing parking pressure (due to commuter/shopper parking, abandoned vehicles, houses in multiple occupation, visitors to surgery and drug advisory clinic), space for only two cars on forecourt, contrary to conversion policy/imbalance in dwelling mix, parking demand from five flats would exceed two spaces provided/likely to be at least 10 cars, notification inadequate/pointless, forecourt parking would be impossible with 10 bins, bins unsightly, loss of character to Victorian street, conversion to five flats an overdevelopment, forecourt parking & bins block pathway - pedestrian hazard.

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Rear Dormer**

The roof margins of the proposed rear dormers would exceed the Council's minimum requirements as set out in householder guidance, and it is considered that as two separate structures the dormers would not appear unduly bulky or overbearing when viewed from the garden of this and neighbouring property. The small 'link' between the dormers is sited sufficiently back up the roofslope as not to detract from the perception of the dormers as independent elements. This arrangement differs from the dormer refused under application P/1779/03/DFU which had proposed a single structure across the roofslope and, although with 1m margins to the sides and part from the eaves, also incorporated an element rising directly up from the eaves. Subject to the use of matching hanging tiles, it is considered that the dormer now proposed would be of no detrimental to the visual amenity or character of the locality and therefore overcomes the earlier reason for refusal.

continued/

The kitchen and bedroom windows in the facing flank wall of no. 3/3A Butler Avenue are considered to be 'protected', for the purposes of the Council's guidelines, as they constitute the only source of light to, and outlook from, the rooms that they serve. However these windows face the application site further back in the plot, such that the nearest dormer side would not of itself interrupt an upward 45° line from the cill of the ground floor window (the existing two storey rear projection already does so). In these circumstances and notwithstanding the location of the application property to the east of these windows, it is not considered that the affect of the dormer on light to, or outlook from, these windows would be sufficient to warrant refusal.

Overlooking of immediately adjacent properties would be at a conventional oblique angle, whilst a distance of 25m would be maintained to the rear boundary. In these circumstances it is not considered that there would be any detriment to the privacy amenity of any neighbouring occupiers.

Two rooflights in the front roof plane would have no significant impact on the appearance of this property in the streetscene.

**2) Conversion Policy**

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

The size and layout of the ground and first floor flats remains as allowed on appeal and to which no objection was previously raised. Specifically, the flats would be accessed via a communal front door and stair/landing areas which would also provide an internal route through to the rear garden. Broad vertical alignment of bedroom and non-bedroom uses between the ground and first floors would be maintained. All rooms would have a satisfactory outlook to the front or rear and a source of natural light.

The proposed additional studio flat would span the width of the loft and would be accessed by accessed via the communal areas described above. The studio room would incorporate a kitchen area but would have separate bathroom and storage; these are considered to be satisfactory. The dormers would, it is considered, provide adequate standing room/circulation space within the unit and would enable the unit to benefit from natural light/outlook via conventional windows.

The nature of the flat is such that it spans the footprint of the first floor flats below, leading to its bathroom and the studio room over bedrooms. In view of the specialist opinion supplied by the applicant, advising that the sound insulation qualities between the loft rooms and the first floor would be likely to be higher than the minimum requirements for a flat conversion, it is not considered that there can be any objection on this basis.

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

Further to the above, it is recommended that details of sound insulation be reserved by condition to ensure that the finished development achieves the higher than usual standard that justifies it.

continued/

**The level of useable amenity space**

Again, the subdivision of the garden and the size of the resulting private/communal areas are as allowed on appeal. The report on the previous application concluded that amenity space provision for the flats was adequate and the Inspector, in allowing the appeal, agreed with this. It remains therefore to consider whether the addition of one studio flat would detract from the adequacy of the space provided.

The area of 216m<sup>2</sup> would, as approved, serve 1 x two habitable room unit and 1 x 3 habitable room unit. Had the Council's former supplementary planning guidelines been applied this would have generated a minimum requirement of 90m<sup>2</sup> – very significantly exceeded by the area of the communal space within the site. The proposed unit would have generated a requirement for a further 30m<sup>2</sup> – also well within the area provided. In qualitative terms the garden area is considered to be good and increased use by the occupiers of the additional flat – likely to be a single person or couple – would not be detrimental to the privacy/amenity of the occupiers of the other flats within the development or surrounding neighbours.

**Traffic and highway safety**

Application of the replacement UDP maximum parking standards to the five flats generates a ceiling (including visitor provision) of 6.4 spaces, of which 1.2 is attributable to the maximum requirement in respect of the additional studio unit. As allowed on appeal, the proposal would involve the conversion of the existing garage to a habitable room and the provision of two parking spaces on the forecourt. Specifically, the Inspector concluded:

“On-site parking would comprise two spaces on the existing forecourt, which would be below the Council's standard although this is stated to be a maximum. I also acknowledge that there is considerable parking pressure on the street which currently is not subject to restrictions. However Replacement Policy T13, which is a proposed further modification to that in the draft UDP, refers to the need to promote sustainable development and transport choice, and to factors including the nature and location of the scheme and the proximity of other modes of transport. The appeal site is in this case 30 to 40 metres from frequent bus services, and a short walk from the Town Centre. In those circumstances, I consider the proposed on-site parking to be adequate and that it would not have an adverse effect on highway and safety movement, as the Council claims” (paragraph 5).

In view of the Inspector's clear direction on the application of the Council's maximum parking standard in respect of this site, because of its locational advantages, it is not considered that the potential of the studio flat to generate modest additional parking demand is sufficient to warrant refusal.

continued/

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

The Inspector also rejected the Council's objection to the use of the forecourt for parking, concluding that this is a common feature of the road and therefore that there would be no loss of character. Whilst the arrangement of the spaces would require vehicles to cross the pavement at an oblique angle and it use - to some limited degree - for manoeuvring, this is an existing situation and one which the Inspector implicitly accepted. In these circumstances it is not considered that refusal based on pedestrian safety/convenience would be justified.

Refuse storage would take place at the rear and would therefore avoid visual intrusion into the streetscene. Again this arrangement was shown on the drawing considered and approved by the appeal Inspector.

The Inspector imposed a condition requiring landscaping and screening of both the forecourt and rear bin/garden areas; a replica condition to this effect is therefore suggested.

**3) Character of Area**

In terms of development character, the Inspector concluded that the balance of dwelling types in an area so close to the centre would be prejudiced to an unreasonable extent. It is not considered that the addition of the studio flat proposed would materially alter this conclusion, nor that the degree of additional occupation would lead to an over-intensive use of this property.

**4) Consultation Responses**

All matters as dealt with in the Inspector's decision letter and/or the assessment 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.

---

**PARK VIEW, 14 MOUNT PARK ROAD, HARROW**

**2/13**

**P/1469/05/DFU/KMS**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

OUTBUILDING TO PROVIDE DOMESTIC STUDY

PAUL ARCHER DESIGN LTD for BOBBY ANAND

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 326.201 to 209; site plan

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
- 3 The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse as such.  
REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality, and limit development of Metropolitan Open Land.
- 4 The materials proposed for the building shall not be altered without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.  
REASON: The design of the proposed building depends for its acceptability on the materials used.
- 5 The building hereby approved shall not be used/occupied until the existing sheds noted on drawing No. 326.206 are removed from the site.  
REASON: To safeguard the appearance 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:

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
  - D14 Conservation Areas
  - D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas
  - EP44 Metropolitan Open Land
  - EP45 Additional Building on Metropolitan Open Land
  - D10 Trees and New Development
- 

continued/

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

- 1) Residential Amenity
  - 2) Character of Conservation Area (SD1, SD2, D4, D5, D14, D15)
  - 3) Development on Metropolitan Open Land (EP44, EP45)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

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

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Locally Listed Building

Conservation Area: Mount Park

TPO: No. 399

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- semi-detached property with extensive grounds to side and rear
- rear gardens form part of Metropolitan Open Land and contains protected trees
- site of proposed outbuilding screened by protected trees and currently occupied by 2 wooden sheds
- levels fall to south and west

**c) Proposal Details**

- proposed outbuilding in rear garden of Park View
- maximum height of proposed building would be 5.5m
- outbuilding would be screened by existing mature trees (all subject to TPO) and would be mounted on pads requiring min-pile foundations
- structure would be clad in mirrored glass to reflect surrounding foliage
- outbuilding would form domestic study ancillary to existing residential use of Park View

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections in principle, some concern about overall height but good to see something different

<b>Advertisement</b>	Character of Conservation Area	Expiry 18-AUG-05
----------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 3	Replies 1	Expiry 24-AUG-05
----------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** Concerned with height, materials and possible use for small business

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Residential Amenity**

The proposed out building would be located in the back garden of Park View in Mount Park Road close to the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling known as Ravensholt. Although the outbuilding would have a maximum ridge height of 5.5m, it would be sheltered and surrounded by trees, screening it from public view. The site for the outbuilding is also set down in a slight dip, although the structure would be propped up on poles, it would be largely hidden in the landscape. It is therefore considered acceptable in terms of its impact on the neighbouring dwelling as it would be screened by mature trees which are subject to TPO protection. It would also be located sufficiently far from the dwelling (minimum 10m) to avoid a visually overbearing impact and problems of overshadowing or loss of light.

### **2) Character of Conservation Area**

The site for the proposed outbuilding is currently occupied by several timber garden sheds, which are in varying states of repair and would be removed. This is considered to be acceptable as the sheds are of neutral value to the conservation area and would be replaced by a structure of significantly better quality and design.

The proposed outbuilding would be single storey in height and clad in mirror panels to reflect the surrounding trees. This type of material would reflect the surrounding trees and therefore appear to blend into the landscape. Although the type of materials to be used is unusual for an office/outbuilding, it is considered that the quality of the design and the contemporary style would enhance the character of the conservation area.

### **3) Development on Metropolitan Open Land**

In terms of the sites designation as Metropolitan Open Land, the proposals are considered to be acceptable as the proposals involve replacing existing buildings with a structure which due to the use of reflective materials would be significantly less obtrusive.

### **4) Impact on Protected Trees**

It is considered that the proposed outbuilding would be acceptable in terms of its impact on the protected trees, none of which would require felling or pruning. The use of pads requiring mini-pile foundations is considered acceptable subject to these foundations avoiding major tree roots. For this reason, a condition requiring details of all underground works to be submitted and approved prior to construction commencing is recommended.

### **5) 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.

---

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

**2/14  
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
- 

continued/

## **INFORMATION**

This application was deferred from the meeting of 7th September 2005 for clarification of why the flats are unsuitable for possession by an RSL. In response the applicant has supplied a letter dated 16th September 2005 from Warden Housing Association which states that they withdrew because the affordable units are small and fall below their required space standards. There was also concern over the internal layout which contained a room off a room, and the means of escape, and in addition the access to the units from the main road was not adequate. No responses have been received from other RSL's which were approached.

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **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.

continued/

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;
- (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

continued/

f)	<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 97	Replies 4	Expiry 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.

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 £130,000 based on the Council's estimated valuation of the properties when complete. The Council's Property and Valuation Division states that, bearing in mind the current state of the market, the suggested contribution represents a reasonable return to the Council as an alternative to the provision of 4 social housing units as required by the grant of planning permission.

continued/

Item 2/14 – P/1701/05/CVA continued.....

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.

---

**83 DRURY ROAD, HARROW**

**2/15**

**P/1882/05/DFU/RM2**

Ward: WEST HARROW

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

MR K DESAI

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: RD/1-3

**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 Materials to Match

### **INFORMATIVES**

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

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

SD1 Quality of Design

D4 Standard of Design and Layout

D5 New Residential Development - Amenity Space and Privacy

---

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

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

## **INFORMATION**

Details of this application are reported to Committee as one petition objecting to the development has been received.

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- mid-terrace dwelling located on east side of Drury Road
- dwelling features a rear dormer and large detached store at the bottom of the garden; this spans the width of the plot and is 4m deep and 2.5m high
- rear garden of the house is small, 5.4m wide and 7m deep, enclosed by a 1.8m high brick wall on the south side and a 1.6m wooden fence on the north side

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/1882/05/DFU continued.....

- the adjoining dwelling located to the south, No. 85, features a rear dormer, a 2.4m wide rear extension and detached store at the bottom of the garden of similar size to that described above and the rear extension also spans the full width of its plot with a mid-pitch height of 3m
- the adjoining dwelling to the north, No. 81, is not extended
- No. 85 is slightly higher in level than No. 83, by 0.1m, but No. 81 is at the same level as No. 83, otherwise the terrace is in a uniform line

**c) Proposal Details**

- construction of a single storey rear extension, 2.4m into the rear garden and spanning the width of the plot

**d) Relevant History**

ENF/580/02/WEST	Complaint of large building in rear garden under construction.	CASE CLOSED 05-NOV-02
P/3025/04/DCP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: Loft conversion incorporating rear dormer roof extension and front roof lights	GRANTED 02-DEC-04

<b>e) Notifications</b>	Sent 2	Replies 2 + petition of 5 signatures	Expiry 22-AUG-05
-------------------------	-----------	--	---------------------

**Response:** Overdevelopment, insufficient size garden, height is too great, extension will unduly enclose rear of No.81, loss of light, loss of outlook

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Character of Area**

The application site is within a row of terraced houses. There is a similar situation on the neighbouring property at No. 25. This property has a single storey rear extension and a garage to the rear, near mirroring what is proposed at No. 83.

Due to site circumstances it is not considered that the proposed extension will have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

**2) Residential Amenity**

It is sought to construct a single storey rear extension, 2.4m deep, which spans the width of the plot. The extension will have a pitched roof with a mid-pitch height of 3m. One rear window and a pair of patio doors are present in the rear elevation.

continued/

Item 2/15 – P/1882/05/DFU continued.....

The extension complies with the Council's guidelines for single storey extensions on terraced houses as set out in the SPG. The depth is the recommended maximum depth, 2.4m, and the height is the recommended maximum height, 3m. The extension will match and will abut into the existing rear extension to the south at No. 85 Drury Road. The proposal will not project further forward than the rear elevation of the adjoining extension and therefore it is considered it will have no impact upon levels of light or detriment to the outlook from the rear of this dwelling.

The extension will impact the light levels and outlook from the adjoining dwelling to the north, No. 81 but it is not considered the effects will be unreasonable or unduly detriment the amenity of neighbouring residents.

**3) 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.

---

**AMBERLEY, 7 CLAMP HILL, STANMORE**

**2/16**

**P/403/05/DFU/MRE**

Ward: HARROW WEALD

DOUBLE GARAGE AT REAR WITH  
ACCESS FROM ACACIA CLOSE

JAK DESIGN for SHAILESHBHAI PATEL

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 7020.01; .02; .03

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

- 1 Time Limit - Full Permission
- 2 Landscaping to be Approved
- 3 Parking for Occupants - Single Family Dwellinghouse
- 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) 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) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

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

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

continued/

**b) Site Description**

- two-storey, detached dwelling situated on the southern side of Clamp Hill
- approximate 28m rear garden depth
- Acacia Close consists of detached dwellings of relatively new build
- No.52 Acacia Close has a double garage immediately adjacent to site
- partial shrub screen across rear boundary line, affronting Acacia Close

**c) Proposal Details**

- the applicant gained a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development in September 2000 for hard surfacing and access at the rear
- the proposed garage, accessed from Acacia Close, would be sited approximately central to the rear garden depth, spaced 13m from the slanted rear boundary and 15m from the rear of the dwelling
- the garage would span the entire plot to 10.8m and have a depth of 6.6m.
- a ridged roof is proposed to a height of 4.4m.

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/442/00/FUL	Double garage at rear with access from Acacia Close	REFUSED 24-JUL-00 APPEAL ALLOWED 01-MAY-00
EAST/884/00/CLP	Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development: Hardsurfacing and access at rear	GRANTED 29-SEP-00

**e) Notifications**

Sent 18	Replies 7 + petition of 25 signatures	Expiry 21-MAR-05
------------	---	---------------------

**Response:** Increase in traffic congestion in Acacia Close, potential for future conversion of garage to self contained residential unit, loss of parking, potential block of access to driveways of opposite dwellings; out of character, loss of trees/soft landscaping, increase in noise from additional traffic, potential obstruction to emergency vehicles, result in depreciation in property values

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The applicant has already gained permission, in the form of a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development (Sept 2000), for hard surfacing at the rear and access from Acacia Close. Previous to obtaining this certificate, the applicant successfully appealed against a refusal of planning permission for a double garage at rear with access from Acacia Close.

continued/

The main issue arising from notification responses from residents on Acacia Close was increase in traffic arising from the proposed development. It must be acknowledged that the construction of the garage with access from Acacia Close would increase the traffic in this quiet cul-de-sac. Nevertheless, the council has accepted that the provision of a hard surface at 7 Clamp Hill and the formation of an access into Acacia Drive would be lawful. Hence, it is considered that the provision of a double garage would not, therefore, involve any increase in traffic over and above that resulting from the formation of an access and a hard surfaced area that could be used for parking. Nor should it lead to an increase in on street parking on in Acacia Close.

The proposed garage, accessed from Acacia Close, would be sited approximately central to the rear garden depth, spaced 13m from the slanted rear boundary and 15m from the rear of the dwelling. The garage would span the entire plot to 10.8m and have a depth of 6.6m. A ridged roof is proposed to a height of 4.4m. While the proposed ridge height is 0.4m above what would be acceptable if the proposal was being determined under a Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development, it is considered that its design sufficiently reduces the perceived bulk of the structure as viewed from both adjacent neighbouring gardens. This is achieved by way of a hipped design with the roof pitching away from both flank boundaries, from a height of 2.6m, with arrival at the ridge peak being set in 3.3m from each boundary.

The proposed garage of the previous application (EAST/442/00/FUL) of which the appeal was allowed proposed a mono pitched roof to a height of 4m. The 4m-ridge line abutted both flank boundary lines. Although the ridgeline of the roof in this application is proposed to a height of 4.4m, by only being to a width of 4.3m, central to the garden width, the impact is considered to be less than that of which has already gained planning permission.

Regarding potential impact on both the adjacent rear gardens of No's.6 & 8 Clamp Hill, it is considered that the garage would not impose an unreasonable level of overshadowing on each garden which are both reasonably wide, or would not appear unreasonably obtrusive when viewed from both gardens. The proposed siting of the garage is considered to be sufficiently down the garden to avoid any adverse impact on the rear of both adjacent properties

A driveway would lye between the property's rear boundary and the garage.

Being set back so substantially from the rear boundary with Acacia Close, at 13m, it is considered that the proposed garage would not make any impact on the character of Acacia Close. In any case there is already a double garage immediately adjoining the appeal site, serving No.52 Acacia Close, which does not impact significantly on the character of the area.

continued/

**2) Consultation Responses**

Increase in traffic congestion in Acacia Close/increase in noise from additional traffic/potential obstruction to emergency vehicles – proposed double garage would not involve any increase in traffic over and above that resulting from the formation of an access and a hard surfaced area that could be used for parking, which is allowed under permitted development.

Potential for future conversion of garage to self contained residential unit – a condition is placed on the permission forbidding this use. A planning application would therefore be required for this change of use

Loss of parking – the development would have no unreasonable impact on on-street parking.

Potential blocking of access to driveways of opposite dwellings – it is considered that this would not occur

Out of character, loss of trees/soft landscaping – the shrub screen on the rear boundary would be removed in any case to allow for access, which is already allowed. It was considered that the garage is sufficiently set away from Acacia Close so as not to affect its 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.

---

**LAND R/O 71-83 CANTERBURY ROAD, NORTH HARROW**

**2/17**  
**P/1712/05/CFU/DT2**  
Ward: HEADSTONE SOUTH

TWO DETACHED THE STOREY BLOCKS TO PROVIDE 8 TERRACED PROPERTIES WITH ACCESS AND PARKING (REVISED ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS AT ALLERFORD COURT)

GILLETT MACLEOD PARTNERSHIP for CLEARVIEW HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 04/2307/1C; /2A; /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 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 treatment

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 Highway - Approval of Construction
- 4 Landscaping to be Approved
- 5 Landscaping to be Implemented
- 6 Levels to be Approved
- 7 Water Storage Works

### **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

### **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

---

continued/

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

- 1) Principle of Development
  - 2) Character of the Area
  - 3) Residential Amenity
  - 4) Highway/Parking
  - 5) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Car Parking	Standard:	max. 12
	Justified:	max. 12
	Provided:	12
Site Area:	0.21 ha.	
Habitable Rooms:	32	
No. of Residential Units:	8	
Density - hrph:	40 dph 160 hrph	
Council Interest:	None	

### **b) Site Description**

- land formed by parts of rear garden of 71-83 Canterbury Road
- the site is irregular in shape and measures approximately 58m in width and varies in depth from 24m to 48m

### **c) Proposal Details**

- construction of 8 two storey houses in one terrace of 5 and one terrace of 3
- access would be via Allerford Court
- the houses would be of traditional design with pitched, tiled roofs
- rear gardens would vary in depth from 14m to 15m

### **d) Relevant History**

P/2652/04/CFU	Two detached two-storey blocks to provide 8 terraced properties with access and parking	REFUSED 14-JAN-05 APPEAL DISMISSED 17-JUN-05
---------------	---	--

### **e) Consultations**

EA:	No comments are necessary
TWU:	The applicants should make proper provision for the surface water drainage of the development to ground, watercourses or surface water sewers, ensuring that it does not drain to a foul water sewer, as this is a major source of flooding.

continued/

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	144	20 + 2 petitions	05-AUG-05

**Response:** Loss of privacy, parking problems, access difficulties, flooding

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Principle of Development**

The application site is not given any statutory protection in the adopted UDP. It comprises previously developed land as defined in PPG3 as it falls within the curtilage of existing buildings. In these circumstances consideration of the application depends upon the detailed impacts of the proposal.

### **2) Character of the Area**

Allington Road and Allerford Court are made up of terraces of two storey houses. The form of the proposed buildings would be entirely in keeping with adjacent houses on Allerford Court. The garden areas of the proposed development would be more generous than those on Allerford Court. There would be sufficient space around the buildings to provide a good setting and adequate areas of amenity space.

The proposal would result in a density that is consistent with PPG3 and the 2004 Harrow UDP.

### **3) Residential Amenity**

The proposed flank walls of Plots 1-5 of the development would be sited at a distance of 21m and 33m respectively from the rear elevation of houses on Canterbury Road and Kingsfield Avenue, and would be sited at a distance of between 2m and 4.5 from the rear garden boundaries. Proposed plots 6-8 would be sited in order to continue the run of houses on Allerford Court and would have little or no effect on the amenity of neighbours.

It is considered that the very limited additional number of vehicles entering the site would not prejudice the amenity of residents on the neighbouring roads.

### **4) Highway/Parking**

A satisfactory level of car parking is proposed in a form that would not result in an excess of hardsurfacing nor would it impact on the amenity of neighbours.

NB: The previous application proposed the same development that is being considered in this application. It was dismissed on appeal; the only reason that the appeal failed was because the proposed access arrangements would have been harmful to highway safety.

The site is approached along Allington Road via Allerford Court, which is an open plan cul de sac that has a block of purpose built garages on the southern side of the site close to the entrance to the proposed development. The Inspector identified this block as a blind spot that could cause accidents if children are playing on street and in view of the fact that residents park their cars on street and not in the garages or on their driveways.

continued/

Item 2/17 – P/1712/05/CFU continued.....

The Inspector recommended that this problem could be overcome by appropriate traffic calming measures. The applicants have therefore submitted revised plans in which the access road will have speed humps at either end of the road that would be tarmac surfaced, painted red and marked with the direction 'slow', three centre markings, a pedestrian guard rail adjacent to the highway and a manoeuvring area, hatched in white, in front of the existing off street parking bays, dedicated for residents.

**5) Consultation Responses**

Loss of privacy	-	addressed above
Parking problems	-	“ “
Access difficulties	-	“ “
Flooding	-	see conditions

**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.

---

**17 LITTLE COMMON, STANMORE**

**2/18**  
**P/1801/05/CFU/SC2**  
Ward: STANMORE PARK

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:

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
- 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

---

continued/

**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)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

**INFORMATION**

**a) Summary**

Area of Special Character

Conservation Area: Little Common, Stanmore

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

**d) Relevant History**

P/2746/03/CFU Two storey side extension

REFUSED  
21-APR-2004

continued/

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) Consultations**

CAAC: No objection

<b>Notifications</b>	<b>Sent</b>	<b>Replies</b>	<b>Expiry</b>
	3	0	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 70m<sup>2</sup>) 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.

continued/

**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.

**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.

---

**18 BROOKSHILL AVENUE, HARROW**

**2/19**  
**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/2812/3

**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 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**

This application was deferred at the Development Control Committee on 7th September 2005 to seek amendments.

### **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
- revisions to scheme include 1m setback, subordinate hipped roof, rear roof bulk reduced

### **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.

continued/

	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%

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 revised scheme incorporates a 1m setback at first floor level, a subordinate hipped roof and the bulk of the new roof at the rear has been reduced. Thus the proposal complies with the SPG and is in keeping with the existing house.

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.

continued/

**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.

---

**74 & 76 STATION ROAD, HARROW**

**2/20**  
**P/2005/05/CFU/SC2**  
Ward: GREENHILL

REVISIONS TO PERMISSION P/2140/04/CFU TO ALLOW USE OF GROUND FLOOR RETAIL (A1), FINANCIAL & PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (A2), BUSINESS (B1) OR MEDICAL/HEALTH (D1)

TRY HOMES LTD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: OS, WO/636/P202 & P201

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

- 1 Completed Development - Use
- 2 Time Limit - Full Permission

### **INFORMATIVE:**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

- SD1 Quality of Design
  - SD3 Mixed-Use Development
  - D4 Standard of Design and Layout
  - EM19 Change of Use of Shops in Non-Designated Parades
- 

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

- 1) Retail Policy (SD3, EM19)
  - 2) Appearance and Character of Area (SD1, SD3, D4)
  - 3) Neighbouring Amenity (SD1, D4)
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- northern corner of Rosslyn Crescent's junction with Station Road
- situated outside designated centre
- surrounding area is primarily mixed use
- commercial premises with residential above situated both opposite the applicant site and adjoining the site to the North

continued/

Item 2/20 – P/2005/05/CFU continued.....

- commercial units with residential above also located south of Rosslyn Crescent's junction with Station Road
- residential properties located at the rear of the applicant site
- site within Controlled Parking Zone

**c) Proposal Details**

- revisions to previous permission (ref. P/2140/04/CFU) for use of the ground floor as retail, restaurant, health, financial/professional business (uses A1, D1(a), A2 + B1)
- previous application was granted planning permission for redevelopment to provide a 2/3 storey building with tunnel to rear parking area to provide retail floor-space on ground floor and 10 flats.

**d) Relevant History**

HAR/107/L	Erect covered vehicle park	GRANTED 03-JUL-64
P/2141/04/CFU	Redevelopment: part 3, part 4 storey building with tunnel to rear parking to provide 135 sq m of commercial/retail floorspace and 11 flats	WITHDRAWN 28-SEP-04
P/2140/04/CFU	Redevelopment: 2/3 storey building with tunnel to rear parking area to provide retail floorspace on ground floor and 10 flats	GRANTED 14-OCT-04

**e) Applicants Statement**

- The applicant wishes to widen the potential permitted uses for the ground floor space approved for Class A1 (shop) use, whilst recognising the need to retain an employment generating and mixed use form of development on the site.
- The applicant believes that Class A1, A2, B1 and D1(a) uses would be employment generating and fulfil the Council's aspiration to have a mixed use development on this site.
- Any of these ground floor uses would complement the existing commercial/retail characteristics of this part of Station Road and would not unduly affect the residential amenities enjoyed by those occupying the proposed flats or existing nearby residential properties.

**f) Consultations**

TWU: No objection  
EA: Unable to respond

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent	Replies	Expiry
	82	0	02-SEP-05

continued/

## **APPRAISAL**

### **1) Retail Policy**

A ground floor commercial use for the property has been established in the recent permission for a mixed use development on the applicant site. The provision of new residential units above a ground floor commercial premise complies with Policy SD3 of Harrow Councils UDP. The previous application sought a retail only use for the ground floor commercial space currently under construction while the current application wishes to expand the permitted ground floor retail use to also encompass Class A2 (financial and professional services), Class D1 (non-residential institutions – part (a) only – for the provision of any medical or health services) or Class B1 (Businesses). All the above uses would still form part of a mixed-use development and as such, still comply with Policy SD3.

The surrounding area is primarily mixed use with ground floor commercial premises situated to the north, west and south of the applicant site. The commercial ground floor units opposite 74 + 76 Station Road include a newsagents, recruitment centre and accountants with residential above. The commercial premises to the north consist of a phone/internet centre, dry cleaners and estate agents while a specialised store for people with disabilities is located to the south of the applicant site. These existing uses highlight the diversity of ground floor units that currently exist along this part of Station Road. The Council considers that an expansion of the permitted ground floor use to the uses sought in this application would complement the existing commercial mix of the area.

The proposal will comply with the criteria outlined in Policy EM19 of the Councils UDP for changes of use from retail outside of designated town centres. The site was originally a tyre fitting premise prior to permission being granted to redevelop it. The current application to expand the permitted use of the ground floor will not therefore, result in a loss of any existing retail space. Furthermore an expansion of the retail use will comply with Council parking standards as established in the previous permission while existing public transport links ensures that the unit will be adequately serviced without causing harm to highway safety and convenience.

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

The redevelopment of the site including the use of its ground floor for retail purposes and its positive impact on the appearance and character of the area has been established in the previous application. An expansion of the permitted use as sought in the current application is not considered to change the developments overall impact on the appearance and character of the area.

### **3) Neighbouring Amenity**

The impact of an expansion of the permitted ground floor use is not envisaged by the Council to change the positive impact of the overall scheme on local residential amenity as established in the previous application.

continued/

**4) Consultation Responses**

None

**CONCLUSION**

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

---

**49 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/21**

**P/817/05/CFU/CM**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FORMATION OF ROOF TERRACE; CHANGE OF USE OF BASEMENT/GROUND FLOOR TO RESTAURANT/CAFE AND BAR (CLASS A3 AND A4) ALTERATIONS TO REAR ELEVATION

JRA DESIGN ASSOCIATES for MR T J HARRISS

---

**49 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL**

**2/22**

**P/1558/05/CLB/CKJ**

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: GROUND FLOOR SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS TO REAR ELEVATION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS

JRA DESIGN ASSOCIATES for MR T J HARRISS

---

P/817/05/CFU

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5110/01B; /02B; 03, OS

**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)
  - (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 works required for ventilation and fume extraction shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with details approved in WEST/878/00/LBC. The use shall not commence until these internal and external works have been completed in accordance with the approved details. The works shall thereafter be retained.  
REASON: To safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring residents and the appearance of the Listed Building and character of the Conservation Area.
- 4 Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
- 5 Noise from Plant and Machinery

continued/

Items 2/21 & 2/22 – P/817/05/CFU & P/1558/05/CLB continued.....

6 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 5110/03 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.

7 No activity associated with the A3/A4 use hereby permitted shall take place outdoors at the rear of the property, with the exception of the car parking areas.

REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

8 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 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 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

D7 Design in Retail Areas and Town Centres

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D14 Conservation Areas

D15 Extensions and Alterations in Conservation Areas

D16 Conservation Area Priority

T13 Parking Standards

EM20 Change of Use of Shops outside Town Centres

EM21 Long Term Vacancies

---

continued/

P/1558/05/CLB

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 5110/01B; /02B; 03, OS

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

- 1 Time Limit - Listed Bldg./Cons. Area Consent
- 2 Listed Building - Making Good
- 3 Detailed drawings, specifications, or samples of materials as appropriate in respect of the following shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority before the relevant part of the work is begun:
  - a) windows
  - b) external doors and fanlight
  - c) screen A
  - d) air conditioning/kitchen extraction

The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To protect the special architectural or historic interest of the listed building.

## **INFORMATIVES**

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**

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

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

2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan:

D11 Statutorily Listed Buildings

D13 The Use of Statutorily Listed Buildings

---

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

- 1) Retail Vitality (EM20, EM21, T13)
- 2) Character and Appearance of Listed Building and Conservation Area (D11, D14, D15, D16, SD1, D7)
- 3) Residential Amenity (SD1, D4)
- 4) Car Parking (T13)
- 5) Consultation Responses

---

continued/

## INFORMATION

### a) Summary

Area of Special Character:

Grade II Listed Building:

Conservation Area:

Car Parking

Harrow on the Hill Village

Standard: 6

Justified: See Report

Provided: 4

Council Interest:

Applicant is related to Councillor

### b) Site Description

- 3 storey terraced building with rooms in the roof
- situated on the eastern side of High Street opposite the triangular green
- ground floor and basement were last used as retail but currently vacant
- patio area to rear at ground floor level set down below parking area off rear service road, accessed by steps
- first floor used as an office
- second floor/roofspace last used as residential
- site lies within Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area and is Grade II Listed
- adjacent building to north occupied by clothes shop on ground floor with storage overhead
- adjacent building to south occupied by restaurant/bar on ground floor with three floors of flats (Carlton House) overhead (flats with roof gardens over single storey rear extension of restaurant kitchen)

### bb) Listed Building Description

- 3 storey Victorian terrace, shopfront to ground floor, facing the Green in Harrow on the Hill
- listed as part of a terrace of three Neo-Gothic properties: Nos 45 and 47 by W Woodman of Reading, 1868, no 49 by William Woodbridge, 1868, each 3-storeys with attic dormers to Nos 45 and 47
- two bays with paired windows to right under gable having fretted bargeboard, the gable to no 49 half-hipped
- tiled roofs and bracketed eaves. Red brick and blue brick drapering
- Gothic windows and delicate tracery bars to Nos 45 and 47. Good shopfronts to Nos 45 and 47, partially altered
- No 49 High Street is also known as "Hill View" and has a Harrow Heritage Trust Brown plaque at first floor level. The property is currently vacant at basement and ground floor and office use at first floor and residential at second and third floor levels.

continued/

Items 2/21 & 2/22 – P/817/05/CFU & P/1558/05/CLB continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- change of use of ground floor and basement from retail to restaurant/café/bar
- four parking spaces proposed to the rear of the site
- construction of single storey rear extension for restaurant, with roof serving first floor flat as roof terrace with railings around
- rear staircase for access to landing at first floor level
- external alterations to rear elevation of building including alteration of windows at first floor level to doors for access to roof terrace and staircase

**d) Relevant History**

WEST/851/00/FUL	Change of use: Retail to financial & professional services(Class A1 to A2) at basement and ground floor. use of first floor as offices (Class B1), parking at rear and extractor flue on roof	REFUSED 10-JUL-01
P/1449/03/CFU	Change of use: retail to A3 (food and drink) on ground floor and basement, with parking at rear	GRANTED 12-DEC-03
P/138/04/DLB	Internal alterations	GRANTED 26-APR-04
P/100/04/CFU	Change of use: mixed use residential/office (C3/B1) to residential (C3) to provide flat on first floor	GRANTED 24-MAY-04

P/817/05/CFU

**e) Consultations**

CAAC: No objections to change of use. No objections to physical alterations but need to see details of extraction flues etc. Concerns about traffic and parking impact.

**1st Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
18-AUG-05

**2nd Advertisement** Character of Conservation Area Expiry  
06-OCT-05

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

**Summary of Response:** Notes alterations between layouts of previous and current applications, no objection to principle of restaurant and the enclosure of the patio area to the rear overcomes previous objections about commercial activity at the rear, conditions should be attached in respect of parking and extraction flues, but waste provision should be dealt with at this stage rather than relying on a condition, provision should also be made for air conditioning, the application appears to be incomplete as it stands

continued/

P/1558/05/CLB

<b>Advertisement</b>	Extension/Alteration of Listed Building	Expiry 06-OCT-05
----------------------	---	---------------------

<b>Notifications</b>	Sent 73	Replies 1	Expiry 05-OCT-05
----------------------	------------	--------------	---------------------

**Summary of Response:** Concerns regarding detailing of previous application (P/138/04/DLB) regarding bathrooms in the basement, objections for use of terrace for commercial/restaurant activity, parking, storage/recycling bins, concerned about lack of provision for air conditioning and extraction.

## APPRAISAL

### 1) **Retail Vitality**

Policy EM20 of the HUDP states that the Council will normally permit changes if use from retail outside town centres if the proposal would not result in the loss of necessary local retail provision, parking is provided in accordance with the Council's standards, and the premises can be adequately serviced without causing harm to highway safety and convenience. The property is currently vacant, would benefit from the proposed four parking spaces and service road to the rear.

Policy EM20 also states that due to its special circumstances, such proposals in Harrow on the Hill will be subject to additional considerations contained in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. At its meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> October 1996 the Development Services Committee agreed to define a shopping core area and 2 new related policies to replace Policy 2 in the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area Policy Statement. The agreed policies are as follows:

'Policy 2A: Within the defined shopping core area the following will normally be acceptable:

- (A) Changes of use between any of the uses in Class A
- (B) Changes of Use from other uses to use classes A1, as Financial and Professional Services and as Food and Drink uses;  
subject to the following considerations:
  - (i) The appropriateness of the use to the physical layout and appearance of the building
  - (ii) The appearance of any advertisements and signs'

'Policy 2B: Within the defined shopping core area there will be a presumption against the change of use from use classes A1 shops, A2 financial and professional services and A3 food and drink, to uses outside these classes'.

continued/

The change of use to A3 has already been accepted in these circumstances by permission P/1449/03/CFU, where it was considered that the proposal would be appropriate to the core area and would maintain the character of this part of the Conservation Area. Although the use classes order has been amended in the intervening period and this proposal involves a slight increase in floorspace due to the proposed extension, it is considered that the merits of the proposal remain the same and the circumstances in the area have not changed. Thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable in respect of retail vitality.

**2) Character and Appearance of Listed Building and Conservation Area**

The proposals are for a single storey rear extension with alterations to the rear elevation and a small number of internal changes so that the basement and ground floor of the property can function as a restaurant.

The single storey rear extension has been designed to preserve the character of the listed building. The proposed rear elevation will incorporate an extension that will fill in the lowered section at the rear of the property and as there are already a number of rear extension in this row of terraces, this is not felt to have a detrimental impact on the character of the building, nor on the character of the adjacent listed and locally listed buildings. The proposed timber windows match in terms of design, materials and opening method to those on the remainder of the rear elevation, however a condition has been attached to the Listed Building consent regarding the details of these new windows.

The proposed railings at first floor level are to be similar in appearance to those shown in the photograph of the railing detail submitted and similar designs are found throughout Harrow on the Hill, and other historic buildings of the Victorian period. Therefore they preserve the character of the listed building.

The existing brick arch at first floor is to be retained and the window converted into a door for access to the roof terrace. It is considered that as long as the door is of traditional materials and design, then this alteration has little impact on the character of the listed building. The alteration of the window between ground floor and first floor level into a door is also considered to have a neutral impact on the character of the listed building, providing materials and design are traditional to the Victorian period. Condition 3b of P/1558/05/CLB has been attached regarding the materials and design of these external doors.

The internal alterations are will have a preserving nature on the character of the listed building. On the ground floor, so to give some separation between the ground floor restaurant and first floor residential, a door/screen is proposed by the staircase to the basement. The banisters and cornicing in this area have been restored and screen A is the subject of condition 3c of P/1558/05/CLB as to the exact design and materials, so that it will not interfere in these elements. However the principle of a screen in this area is acceptable and will have little impact on the character of the listed building.

continued/

The proposed new shower room at first floor level will also have little impact on the character of the listed building, as there is currently a bathroom in this area. A small extension to the bathroom to provide a shower cubicle is not seen as detrimental to character of the building. The new landing between ground floor and first floor level with a door opening to the rear is a small simple addition to the rear of the listed building and as they are appropriately detailed with a traditional door, fan light, and railings, will have a neutral impact on the character of the listed building.

Upon inspection of the property and previous application drawings, it was felt that the changes were minor and did not affect the character of the listed building.

With respect of air conditioning and extraction from the kitchen of the restaurant, conditions have been attached regarding the placing, design and material of the air conditioning. Details of extraction were previously granted Listed Building Consent under WEST/878/00/LBC.

The impact of the proposed change of use on the character of the conservation area has been discussed above and is considered to be acceptable.

**3) Residential Amenity**

The principle of the change of use was considered to be acceptable under permission P/1449/03/CFU, and in general the merits of the application have not changed. Conditions have been attached to limit any impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents (most notably the residents of the three flats over the café to the north) in respect of noise from music and the impact of ventilation and the use of the rear of the site for outdoor commercial area.

Given the modest size and siting of the proposed extension between the deep extension of the café to the north and the rear of the clothes shop to the south, no impact on amenity would result. The proposed roof terrace is considered to be acceptable as the relationship with the only nearby residential properties in the flats at Carlton House over the café to the north would not be unneighbourly – there are existing roof gardens on the roof of the adjacent single storey extension for those flats which are screened from the application site by a high (approx. 1.5m) parapet wall, and the proposed extension at 49 High Street would be set down from the top of that wall given the drop to the patio area. Thus no undue overlooking would occur between the amenity space for the new and neighbouring units.

**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.

---

**WARDS P.H. 38/40 LOWLANDS RD, HARROW**

**3/01**  
**P/1618/05/CVA/AMH**  
Ward: GREENHILL

VARIATION OF CONDITION 6 OF PERMISSION E/450/02 TO ALLOW OPENING 10:00 TO MIDNIGHT MON-WED: 10:00 TO 12:30 THURS: 10:00-01:30 FRI-SAT: 11:00-12:30 SUN

PATRICK WARD

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: 011204/1; Site Plan.

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

- 1 The proposed variation of condition to allow extended opening hours would give rise to additional activity, noise and disturbance at unsocial 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, D16, T13, EM25.

---

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

1. Residential Amenity
  2. Consultation Responses
- 

## **INFORMATION**

### **a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

### **b) Site Description**

- site to southern side of Lowlands Road at junction with Whitehall Road.
- site comprises two units in parade of locally listed single storey buildings.
- within Roxborough Park and the Grove Conservation Area.
- site within controlled parking zone.
- Harrow Strategic Centre boundary runs along centre of Lowlands Road.
- peripheral town centre location adjacent to predominantly residential area.

Cont...

**c) Proposal Details**

- the application seeks the variation of condition 6 of planning permission EAST/450/02/FUL to permit the extension of opening hours to 10:00-Midnight Mon-Wed, 10:00-12:30 Thurs, 10:00-01:30 Fri-Sat and 11:00-12:30 Sun.

**d) Relevant History**

EAST/450/02/FUL	Change of use: retail to wine bar/bistro (Class A1 to A3), replacement single storey side/rear extension and basement storage	GRANTED 05-JUN-02
-----------------	---	----------------------

**e) Consultations**

CAAC

No Objections

**Notifications**

Sent  
22

Replies  
10  
inc petition with  
2 signatures

Expiry  
04-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** Present opening hours are sufficient for the area, woken up by noise and rowdy behaviour, original plans were for wine bar, not informed about application for outside seating, residential area - not desirable to have customers drinking outside, intimidating when walking past, heavy frosted glass means it is difficult for staff to see problems outside, surrounded by residential housing, current hours already cause problems for residents, extension to hours will exacerbate this, residential area not centre of Harrow, noise at night, property down valued, increase in number of cars parked in road since Wards opened, increase noise in latter part of evening, road already disturbed by traffic, residential area and conservation area, impact on quiet character, already noisy late at night, extension of hours will extend this further into night, unable to open windows in summer due to noise, noisy cliental on phones outside, litter and rubbish from pub, parking after 6.30 difficult, threatening behaviour of cliental, car hit by passing traffic, residents cars could be damaged, evening can be quite lively, customers will have longer drinking time and become more intoxicated, fences used as toilets, fights could break out, tables outside mean noise not contained in building.

**APPRAISAL**

**1. Residential Amenity**

Policy EM25 of the adopted HUDP (2004) requires that the Council seek to ensure that proposals for food, drink and any late night uses do not have a harmful effect on residential amenity. The policy requires, inter alia, that the location of the premises, the proximity of residential properties, and hours of operation be taken into consideration when assessing applications for the above.

Cont...

The location of the premises in a peripheral town centre location immediately adjacent to a predominantly residential area. It is considered that the proposed variation of condition to allow extended opening hours would give rise to additional activity, noise and disturbance at unsocial hours and would detract from the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

Harrow Council Policy EM25 seeks to ensure that proposals for late night food uses does not harm residential amenity. The location of the applicant premise is favourable with regard to the lack of nearby residencies and as such an extension of trading hours will not result negatively on local residential amenity levels.

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 refusal.

---

147 ROXETH GREEN AVENUE, SOUTH HARROW

3/02

P/1630/05/DCO/JM2

Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

ALTERATIONS TO, AND RETENTION OF,  
COVERED AREA AT REAR

NILESH PANKHANIA for JOSEPH GOMES

---

## RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 147 Rox 001, 002, Site Plan

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

- 1 The retention of the covered area at the rear, with the proposed alterations, would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by reason of its discordant, obtrusive appearance and overlooking, and would be at odds with the character and pattern of development in the established residential locality.

INFORMATIVE:

- 1 INFORMATIVE:

The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, D4, D5, C16

2. The Director of Legal Services be authorised to:-

- (a) (i) Issue an Enforcement Notice Pursuant to Section 172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:-
- (b) (ii) reduce the height of the flank walls to 2m (measured externally), and remove the rear walls
- (iii) remove the canopy roof
- (iv) remove the raised floor and make good the surface to natural ground level
- (c) [(b)] (i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of three (3) months from the date on which the Notice takes effect
- (d) Issue Notices under Section 330 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control

continued/

(e) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to:-

(a) supply the information required by the Director of Legal Services through the issue of Notices Under Section 330 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990;

and/or

(b) comply with the Enforcement Notice

---

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

- 1) Visual and Residential Amenity (SD1, D4, D5)
  - 2) Needs of a Disabled Occupier
  - 3) Character
  - 4) Consultation Responses
- 

### **INFORMATION**

This application is reported to Committee as it includes a recommendation seeking authorisation for an Enforcement Notice.

#### **a) Summary**

Council Interest:

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

- two storey terraced dwelling, with a 2.8m single storey rear extension
- a covered patio projects a further 2.8m from the rear extension which is walled on both shared party boundaries and has a partial wall at the rear and has a clear polycarbonate roof, which protrudes a further 0.6m.
- the floor of the patio has been raised by approximately 700mm and has 3 steps down into the garden.
- a large outbuilding and detached garage are sited at the rear, and are accessed by a rear access lane
- No 145 has a rear extension that measures approximately 2.8m deep, with a protected glazed door and window serving a kitchen at the rear elevation
- No 149 has not been extended
- the rear garden of the site is to an approximate depth of 10 metres with a 2m high breezeblock wall enclosing the entire area
- the area is residential in character, typified by semi-detached and terraced dwellings

#### **c) Proposal Details**

- the proposal is for the retention of, and alterations to, the covered area at the rear of the existing single storey rear extension
- the only change between this application and P/451/05/DCO is that the side walls of the structure would be reduced to equal the height of the boundary walls
- it measures 2.8m deep, and abuts both shared boundaries
- the clear polycarbonate pitched roof would be retained and supported by a post at each corner, both measuring 2.9m high from external ground floor level. The height of the roof at midpoint is 2.5m.

continued/

**d) Relevant History**

P/451/05/DCO Retention of covered area at rear

REFUSED  
16-MAY-05

Reasons for refusal:

- “1. The proposed extension, by reason of excessive bulk and unsatisfactory design, would be unduly obtrusive with inadequate space about the buildings and would detract from the established pattern of development in the street scene and the character of the locality.
2. The proposed rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, result in loss of light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property.”

**e) Applicant’s Statement**

The applicant’s son has a rare medical condition and prefers to have space for his comfort.

This application has been made on the basis of the applicant’s son’s medical circumstances. The applicant’s agent has submitted a letter from the patients consultant paediatrician which outlines the symptoms of the condition: Son has a history of several reflex anoxic spells, some causing seizures, but can find no features in history to suggest that child may have epilepsy. Possibly a result of iron deficiency.

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
2

Replies  
2

Expiry  
09-AUG-05

**Summary of Responses:** No objection; daylight would be affected, concerned that house will devalue

**APPRAISAL**

**1) Visual and Residential Amenity**

The development that is the subject of this application is as that was considered and refused under P/451/05/DFU, but in an attempt to overcome the refusal reasons, it is now proposed to make alterations to the unauthorised structure. These comprise the reduction in height of the flank walls to heights of 2m (measured externally) consistent with the existing garden walls.

The subject structure, in conjunction with the existing 2.8m extension, produces a solid rearward projection of 5.6m beyond the original rear main wall of No. 149, and 2.8m beyond the existing extension at No. 145. The resulting impact of the amenity of the occupiers of No. 149 – in terms of loss of light as well as visual bulk – is particularly pronounced, because of the siting of the structure, to the south side of that property.

continued/

In so far as the proposal would reduce the bulk and light impact of the flank walls to a level consistent with the boundary walls, (the height of which falls within the permitted development thresholds for enclosures), it is considered that there would be some amenity improvement. However, the canopy roof would remain an obtrusive and discordant feature when viewed from the adjacent gardens, adding to the perception of rearward projection, and would also have its own loss of light/overshadowing affect.

Taking into account the raised floor level within the structure, it is also considered that the proposed alterations would permit overlooking down onto the adjacent gardens. For these reasons it is considered the retention of, and proposed alterations to the structure would be detrimental to the privacy and amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

**2) Character**

A canopy structure with suitable safeguards to protect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring occupiers itself need not necessarily be at odds with the character of development in a suburban locality such as this. However the cumulative rearward projection of 5.6m which would remain, enclosed by the roof and with the raised floor level, would detract from the pattern of long rear gardens in the area, and would disproportionately extend the original terraced dwelling, to the detriment of the locality.

**3) Needs of the Disabled Occupier**

It appears that the applicant's son is not a registered disabled person. However, a letter from the applicant's consultant paediatrician details the medical condition suffered by the applicant's son, but it does not explain how the subject development would assist or enhance his comfort/living conditions at home. The applicant's agent states, however, that the applicant's son prefers to have space for his comfort.

Policy C16 of the replacement UDP seeks to ensure that buildings are readily accessible to all. The unauthorised structure does provide a covered external space for the occupiers, but its retention would be significantly detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. In accordance with the councils guidelines, it is not considered that the needs of the disabled occupier justifies detriment to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, and refusal is therefore recommended.

**4) Consultation Responses**

Addressed in report.

**ENFORCEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

Alleged Breach of Planning Control

Without planning permission, the erection of a covered area including raised floor at rear.

continued/

Item 3/02 – P/1630/05/DCO continued.....

Reasons for issuing the notice

It appears to the Council that the above breach of planning control occurred within the last 4 years.

Requirements of the Notice

Reduce the height of the flank wall to 2m (measured externally) and remove the canopy over and rear walls. Remove the raised floor and make good the surface to natural ground level.

Time for Compliance

Three months

**CONCLUSION**

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

## SECTION 5 - PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS

---

**SIGNAL HOUSE, LYON ROAD, HARROW**

**5/01**  
**P/2313/05/CDT/CM**  
Ward: GREENHILL

DETERMINATION: 6 POLE-MOUNTED ROOF-TOP ANTENNAE AND 4 EQUIPMENT CABINS ADJACENT TO REAR CAR PARK

MARCONI APT

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: X18000/60808/APT01/101 Rev.A; /201 Rev.A; /202 Rev.A; /203 Rev.A; /204 Rev.A; /301 Rev.A

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

- 1 Prior approval of siting and appearance IS required.
- 2 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 street scene and the area in general.

### INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE:**  
The following policies in the 2004 Harrow Unitary Development Plan are relevant to this decision: SD1, D24
- 

### MAIN CONSIDERATIONS AND POLICIES (2004 UDP)

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

### INFORMATION

**a) Summary**

Council Interest: None

**b) Site Description**

- proposed siting of poles and antennae on roof of Signal House, a four storey office building in Lyon Road
- existing tank room and plant on north end of building
- neighbouring buildings include the 7 storey office block Congress House to north, 7-storey office building Lyon House to the northeast, 2-storey pub The Junction opposite, and the rear of 2 and 3 storey commercial buildings facing Station Road to the west

continued/

Item 5/01 – P/2313/05/CDT continued.....

**c) Proposal Details**

- three 3G and three 2G pole-mounted antennae on the southern end of the rooftop
- 4 equipment cabinets in the rear car park, adjacent to the external staircase

**d) Relevant History**

None

**e) Applicants Statement**

existing building used so as to minimise visual impact; the possibility of erecting face mounted antennae on the tank room has been investigated but there would be problems with radio clipping (the signal would be blocked by the main roof); as the antennas do not exceed the height of the building by more than 4.0m they could be erected without the need for a planning application, an application is only required as the volume of the equipment cabinets exceed 2.5m<sup>3</sup>; telecommunications installations are common features in commercial areas, effort has been made to ensure that it does not appear as an alien feature in the urban landscape; the equipment cabinets would not be visible from neighbouring properties and would utilise a dead area of the car park; there is a need for the development; there are no existing installations in the area that could be shared; the development would comply with ICNIRP

**f) Notifications**

Sent  
56

Replies  
Awaited

Expiry  
14-OCT-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 coverage and for reasons of environmental and visual acceptability. No alternative structure was available.

Consideration should also be given to siting equipment on existing buildings or structures or to sharing facilities. The subject site goes some way to complying with these criteria by using the roof of a building rather than a streetworks option.

The site is not located in a conservation area or is not a listed building, and would not impinge on local views, landmarks or other structural features as identified in Policy SEP5. The issue of residential amenity will be assessed separately below.

continued/

The proposed installation should be sited and designed to minimise visual impact and where practicable to accommodate future shared use. The proposal involves the erection of six poles and antennae on the rooftop to provide 2G and 3G coverage, and four associated equipment cabinets in the rear parking area. The equipment cabinets would be obscured from view from the majority of neighbouring buildings and the street due to the siting to the rear of the building, and thus would not represent a problem in terms of visual amenity. They would be located in a part of the parking area that is not used for parking spaces, adjacent to the external staircase, and would not result in the loss of parking. While it is accepted that telecommunications installations are relatively commonplace in commercial areas such as Harrow Town Centre, it is considered that due to the proposed siting on the southern end of the building, the siting of the building as the first building on this side of Lyon Road and the relative small scale of the other buildings to the south, east and west, the structures would be unduly obtrusive. The subject building Signal House is four storeys in height, and has an existing tank room providing additional height adjacent to Congress House to the north. While the poles and antennae would not be perceived from the north due to the height of the neighbouring buildings (7 storeys +) at Congress House, Lyon House, Equitable House and Platinum House and the street trees, the building heights to the south are considerably smaller in scale (2 – 3 storeys). The southern end of Signal House is quite open and visible, and is viewed more in the context of the buildings facing onto Station Road and the pub on the corner of Gayton Road than in conjunction with the larger office buildings to the north. It is considered that the erection of face mounted antennae on the tank room would be likely to be more favourably considered as this part of the site is less visible and sensitive, however this has been discounted as an option for technical reasons by the applicant.

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

**2) Residential Amenity**

The proposal would not be perceived from any residential property given the siting in a commercial area and due to the heights of the neighbouring buildings. The nearest dwellings on Lyon Road are at Platinum House, however the intervening Congress House would block any views from this building. There are also some residential properties on Gayton Road, but given the distance and the pub in between, there would be no loss of residential amenity.

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

**3) Consultation Responses**

None

continued/

**CONCLUSION**

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