



**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT  
COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 15 JULY 2008**

**ADDENDUM**

This page is intentionally left blank

**HARROW COUNCIL**

**ADDENDUM**

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

**TUESDAY 15<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2008**

**Section 2**

**2/02**

**g) Consultations  
Notifications**

Two bogus emails of support received via ukplanning.co.uk

**APPRAISAL**

**4) Consultation Responses:**

Delete 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point

**2/03**

**d) Relevant History**

P/0181/08/DCO - Add after

'174 Marsh Lane', contrary to Policies D4 and D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance: Extensions a Householders Guide (2003).

**g) Consultations  
Notifications**

The adjoining neighbour at No.174 Marsh Lane has submitted a second letter, enclosing a surveyor's report that raises three main issues:

The report claims that elements of the structure extend across the perceived boundary line onto the neighbouring property at No.174. However, Mr Ahmed has certified ownership of the application site and has not served notice on any other owner as part of this application. For the purposes of a planning application, this is taken in good faith. Boundary disputes are private legal matters and are not therefore material to the determination of planning applications.

The report states that the floor plan does not reflect the actual construction on site and the planning application is not valid. No details are provided as to the suggested discrepancy. The development as built was measured by the case officer during a site visit and the plans are considered to be accurate. Notwithstanding this, the application proposes alterations to the existing structure and these alterations would have to be in accordance with the submitted drawings.

Finally, the report asserts that there may be an issue with Building Regulations compliance, although this again is not a material planning consideration. The matter has been passed to the Council's Building Control service, who will investigate accordingly.

**2/04**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Plan Nos: - Amend to read

**7109-22-P3; 7109-21-P2** (Received 27.06.2008); Site Plan; Design and Access Statement

**2/06**

**RECOMMENDATION – Amend to read**

INFORM the applicant that the application is acceptable subject to:

1) The completion.....

**d) Relevant History**

P/0400/08/DVA - Add after Reason for Refusal

'area, contrary to the provisions of saved Policy C8 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

**2/09**

It is requested that this application be deferred until the next available Development Management Committee to obtain more information about this proposal and other existing temporary classrooms on the site.

**2/13**

**g) Consultations**

**Notifications:**

Sent  
7

Replies  
1

Expiry: 27-JUN-08

**Summary of Response:**

Disproportionately huge building at the back of the garden which restricts views due to its height and size.

**APPRAISAL**

**4) Consultation Responses:**

- The proposed single storey rear extension complies with the aims of the Extensions SPG and is considered satisfactory with regards to height, size and scale as discussed in the report.

**Section 3**

**3/01**

**f) Applicant Statement – Please add**

Letter received 14 July 08 from applicant referring to appeal decision in relation to No 4 in terms of overlooking; loss of light and the need for obscure glazing.

**3/03**

**g) Consultations:**

**Notifications:**

Email received from Deputy Manager of Travellers Rest, Beefeater & Premier Inn, Harrow stating:

- with regard to the article featured in the Harrow Observer dated 03/07/08 they have never been in "negotiations" with C & R to enable visitors to use the site's car park, and that Pay & Display machines were installed to ensure users of the Beefeater & Premier Inn can have a parking space and deter locals from parking here to then get the tube into town
- additionally it is likely that the use of the car park on this site other than by customers of the Beefeater & Premier Inn would be in breach of conditions on existing planning permissions relating to this site

#### Second notification

Sent:	Replies:	Expiry: 08-JUL-08
83	137 objecting 32 in support	

#### Summary of Response:

##### Objection

Original objections for refusal remain unaffected, namely parking congestion and traffic flow disruption, cooking smells, rats, mice and foxes which affect residents, noise and disturbance to residents at night, loss of yet more retail shops to bars and restaurants; Loss of retail frontage: Are over 14 food and drink outlets within 400m of proposal, would exceed the Council's policy ratio of retail to non-retail units, would reduce retail space and alter the character and appearance of Kenton, Sainsbury's has a 120 seat restaurant, there is an unoccupied A3 licensed building opposite at 177-179 Kenton Road (previously The Lancer) which has 5000sq ft of floor space and secure parking; Parking congestions and restricted access: All parking will occur along adjacent residential streets which are already congested by parked vehicles due to existing bar/restaurants which the proposal will worsen, parking often blocks driveways and restricts emergency access and impacting upon traffic flow; Sainsbury's is 300m away and the hotel is 100m away so directing drivers to these is unreasonable and contrary to their use; Disturbance to residents: Residents above and along Mayfield Avenue will be affected by cooking smells, customers wishing to smoke will have to do so on the pavement or in the service road which is part of the fire escape route and shared by the residents above; Residents have to pay for pest control when the problem is caused by the bars and restaurants; Drains have been blocked due to incorrect disposal of cooking oil; Disturbance to residents: car doors slamming, loud car stereos, rowdiness, drunkenness, flights/violence, use of gardens and entrances as public lavatories are among problems residents experience; Sainsbury's car park has been available for past 5 years but it is little used by diners and drinkers; Retail units are needed in the area and this change of use would see the local community suffer for the enjoyment of a few; Not guaranteed Sainsbury's will allow parking on their site in the future; Unlikely customers will actually use public transport; Would increase the risk of assault in the area as experienced by objector, would increase anti-social behaviour such as rowdiness, drunkenness and damage to local properties; A minority cannot control the behaviour of people leaving bars; Are there sufficient exits and fire escapes?; The 'Lancer' is a suitable alternative site; It is incorrect to say this part of Kenton Road has a low passing trade, a number of A1 units opening in the area recently; Unlikely to revert back to A1 in the future; Refuse collection during the early hours is noisy; Kenton needs more daytime and not evening uses in parades.

A plethora of support comments come from people and business not in the vicinity of the site, speculate people have been 'requested' to provide supporting comments which should be ignored.

### **Support**

Support family style restaurant, will have balanced atmosphere with young and old mixing; Objections are incorrect, late night problems were from The Lancer which has now shut, this venue will not attract jobs, will help other businesses in the parade, petitions against the development were on the basis it was to be a bar/club, should be dealt with on planning issues only; Will create jobs; Better to have an open business than empty shops, Nowhere old and young can dine together at present, There is lots of parking around the area; At present have to go to Wembley to find a decent restaurant, objections are being made on a personal not planning basis, objections have been organised to assist Pradips, will create jobs during construction; Pubs and bars are shutting down as they attract idiots and serve cheap alcohol, proposed venue would be better than others in the area; No one wants to rent an A1 unit, only this type of business has a future here due to low level of customers; Other units open late so hours of operation are okay; Parade is a ghost town after 6pm; Will be excellent venue for the community; The other restaurants in the area are out-dated and the food is rubbish; The area is very quiet in the evening and more people visiting would make it more secure; Will result in healthy competition and result in competitive pricing and good quality food, will bring better atmosphere in dull area; Good public transport; St Luke's will benefit; local residents know they live near a main road and so complaining about noise and other related issues is a contradiction in terms, Sainsbury's has threatened the existence of local shops, recent closure of The Lancer leaves room for a replacement, need to capture family trade locally; Support proposal; family-run business appropriate to Kenton Local Centre; will bring life and activity into shopping centre; letters of support should be given full weight; objections from local MP should not influence local decisions; competition is not a planning matter; applicant's parking survey shows there is sufficient parking in area; agreement reached with Sainsbury's to allow parking; applicant's will hold an annual fund-raiser event for St. Luke's Hospice; refusal of this non-contentious application will only result in a costly appeal to the Council and applicants

### **Additional Applicant's Statement sent to all members of the Committee:**

application site is one unit not three, therefore concentration argument is inaccurate; parking surveys are not a snapshot – two surveys undertaken on 1 April 12pm -1pm and 20 May 6.30-7.00pm show there is satisfactory parking space; Sainsbury's car park is free and the Travel Plan confirms any paid parking will be refunded by Blue Zoo management; overall scale significantly reduced yet Council has increased number of notifications; PPS6 revisions place a greater emphasis on economic growth and encourage investment in disadvantaged areas and create new employment opportunities – fundamental elements of this proposal; premises could be sold to a business with lower standards than as currently proposed; applicant would accept a personal permission

**DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – 15 JULY 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 2/02  11 Norman Crescent, Pinner, HA5 3QQ	Alan Trisk	

This page is intentionally left blank