



**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 2 APRIL 2008**

**ADDENDUM**

This page is intentionally left blank

**HARROW COUNCIL**

**ADDENDUM**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 2<sup>ND</sup> APRIL 2008**

**Section 2**

**2/02 RECOMMENDATION**  
Add Condition 8

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used until all the works detailed in the application, to include the subdivision of the rear garden into two parts and the provision of the rear bin stores, have been completed in accordance with the permission granted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

**2/03 Amend Ward to Wealdstone**

**2/04 DEFER at Officers' request to await revised plans**

**2/05 g) Consultations:**

**The Pinner Association** (summarised):

- We have opposed previous applications for flat development on this site as being, inter alia, out of character with the locality and being over-intensive use of the site.
- The Planning Inspector who determined an appeal in respect of one of the applications did not share our fundamental objection to flat development here and considered it acceptable in principle.
- If this form of development cannot be objected to as such we would prefer a two flat scheme to a three flat scheme to keep the additional activity created to a minimum.
- Should you be minded to grant the present application we would ask that you deal with the vexed questions of the carriageway and footpath elements of Oakhill Avenue wither by conditions or S106 Agreement as appropriate.
- The applicant has incorporated the part of the footpath co-extensive with the property into its front garden. It should be re-instated and properly maintained thereafter.
- The applicant should also be required to make up and thereafter maintain the carriageway of Oakhill Avenue co-extensive with his property.

- Thought should also be given to the best route for any construction traffic so as to cause minimum disturbance to neighbours and minimum damage to the carriageway and the applicant should be required to enter into a routing agreement with the Council as a pre-condition of any consent.

**Notifications:**

**Summary of Response**

Letter received from agent, in response to the objections raised against the proposed development by local resident, the applicant would like to clarify some of the points raised by objectors: (summarised)

- The applicant unsuccessfully attempted to actively participate in the road resurfacing, irrespective of his proven willingness to contribute financially and administratively, the applicant was not invited to contribute to the road surfacing which finally went ahead.
- Damage to Road – the applicant reassures local residents that there will be no damage to the resurfaced road as per the ‘Design and Access statement’
- Subsidence, drainage, Basement, Flooding, Parking and Traffic are not either relevant to planning or will comply with relevant planning or buildings regulations.
- Footpath – The Design and Access statement confirms that the applicant will renew the footpath after the building works are completed in line with the rest of the landscaping for the site.
- High Court Case – This relates to a boundary issue and has nothing to do with current application.
- The height of the proposal is lower in height than ‘Lingwood’
- Number of Bedrooms – existing Stella Maris has 7 bedrooms on the first floor and a further bedroom on the ground floor. This makes a total of eight bedrooms which is one fewer than contained in the current proposals.
- New Build at 41 Rushdene Road, Eastcote – The reference to this project is entirely irrelevant to the current application.
- Tree – the silver birch removed from the front of the house was only felled after planning permission was granted – the approval confirms that the tree was dead/ dying and that the remedy was to fell the birch tree.

2/06

**g) Consultations:**

**Notifications:**

**Summary of Response**

Letter received from agent, in response to objections raised against the proposed development by local residents – The applicant would like to clarify some of the point raised by objectors:

- Applicant wishes to make it clear that he was always ready to participate in the resurfacing of Oakhill Avenue.
- Objection has been raised about forward encroachment of the site boundary into the public realm by the placement of the post and chain boundary marker.
- The applicant has provided the Land Registry plan for the property, ref. NGL 82025, which he claims shows that the boundaries are as officially recorded. A copy of this document is attached.
- My client has no objection to a mutually third acceptable third party assessing the position of the existing boundary marker and adjusting it if

necessary, such as in the case of the road surfacing being completed to Barrow Point Lane.

**2/07 RECOMMENDATION**  
Add Condition 8

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used until all the works detailed in the application, to include the subdivision of the rear garden into two parts and the provision of the rear bin stores, have been completed in accordance with the permission granted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development.

**2/08 RECOMMENDATION**  
Add Condition 14

WASTE\_BG\_M

**2/10 DEFER** at Officers' request to await revised plans

Add in **INFORMATION**

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

**2/11** Please amend to read  
**g) Consultations**

**Notifications:**

Sent:  
13

Replies:  
6

Expiry: 01-APR-08

**Summary of Response:**

The proposed replacement house would reduce the size of the property's garden and increase the bulk of the building; Overdevelopment of the site; Overlooking of 5 Aylwards Rise would result in a loss of privacy and amenity at both the property and its rear garden, particularly from the proposed rear dormers and if shrubbery/trees along the rear boundary were to be removed; Lower ground level at 5 Aylwards Rise to the rear; Proposed house closer to the rear of 5 Aylwards Rise; Problems with development at 4 Aylwards Rise; House is three times the size of the existing property; 5 Aylwards Rise is overlooked due to a development at 4 Aylwards Rise, the screening (5 trees) between these two properties was removed to build a large garage, are concerned this will happen again but this time on higher ground.

**2/13 DEFER** at Officers' request to await EA clearance

This page is intentionally left blank

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 2 APRIL 2008**

**AGENDA ITEM 10**

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

Application	Objector	Applicant/Applicant's Representative (who has advised that they would wish to reply)
Item 2/01 17 Winscombe Way, Stanmore, HA7 3AX	Mr Nigel Bender	Mrs Emma Simons

This page is intentionally left blank