SECTION 1 - MAJOR APPLICATIONS

LAND ALONG & ADJOINING EDGWARE BROOK, AT SUMMERHOUSE LAKE, SEVEN-ACRE LAKE, PRINCE EDWARD, PLAYING FIELDS

EAST/1070/00/FUL/TEM

Ward: STANMORE PARK

FLOOD ALLEVIATION WORKS; REFURBISHMENT OF LAKES, FLOOD STORAGE RESERVOIRS, WITH ANCILLARY STRUCTURES

MR A F PARSONS FOR ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

EAST/1070/00/FUL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 3781/P/GEN/01 Rev 2, 02 Rev 2, 3781/P/531/01 Rev 1, 02 Rev 3, 03 Rev 1, Rev 04, 05, 06 Rev 01

GRANTS 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. Landscaping to be Implemented
4. No development shall take place within the area indicated (this would be the area of archaeological interest) until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
   REASON: To secure the provision of archaeological excavation and the subsequent recording of the remains in the interests of national and local heritage.
5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the plans hereby approved and the details contained within the Environmental Statement submitted with the application unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
   REASON: To ensure a satisfactory form of development and that the mitigation measures outlined in the Statement are implemented.
6. The wall at Summerhouse Lake hereby permitted shall not commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the wall have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.
   The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
   REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.

continued/
Details of the footpaths at Summerhouse Lake and Seven Acre Lake shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted is occupied, and the footpaths shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

INFORMATION

These proposals form part of a flood alleviation scheme submitted by the Environment Agency comprising works to alleviate historic flooding problems in the Silk Stream catchment within Harrow and Barnet.

Within London Borough of Harrow the proposals now comprise works to Summerhouse Lake, Seven Acre Lake and Prince Edward Playing Fields. Originally proposed works to Bentley Wood High School, Wolverton Road and Whitchurch Playing Fields were deleted from the scheme earlier this year on cost/benefit grounds.

Planning applications for the scheme involving 5 sites in London Borough of Barnet were granted planning permission by that Authority in April 2001.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

SUMMERHOUSE LAKE

1) Appearance and Character of Area
2) Access
3) Consultation Responses

SEVEN ACRE LAKE

1) Character of Conservation Area
2) Residential Amenity
3) Access
4) Consultation Responses

continued/
PRINCE EDWARD PLAYING FIELDS

1) Appearance of Area
2) Residential Amenity
3) Recreational Impact
4) Consultation Responses

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E4, E6, E7, E8, E10, E21, E26, E38, E44, E46, E56
Area of Special Character
TPO
Green Belt
Conservation Area: Canons Park Estate

b) Site Description

Summerhouse Lake

- artificial lake within Bentley Priory Open Space
- registered under Reservoirs Act 1975
- within Green Belt, Area of Special Character, SSSI, and Site of Nature Conservation Interest
- maintenance access from Clamp Hill via Lower Priory Farm
- construction access from Clamp Hill or Masefield Avenue

Seven Acre Lake

- privately owned artificial lake within Canons Park Estate Conservation Area
- registered under Reservoirs Act 1975
- bounded by Rose Garden Close to south, rear boundaries of houses in Dukes Avenue and Lake View to east, N.L.C.S. to west, and woodland to north and north east
- circular path around lake for use by Canons Park Estate residents only

Prince Edward Playing Fields

- open playing fields providing pitches for football and cricket, disused since mid-1990s, now overgrown
- derelict pavilions, groundsman’s house and storage buildings within site
- vehicular access from Whitchurch Lane and St David’s Drive
- tarmac footpath along eastern boundary, flanked by residential premises in Torbridge Close, Buckingham Gardens, Bransgrove Road, St David’s Drive, together with Little Stanmore School

continued/
Item 1/01 - EAST/1070/00/FUL continued…..

- residential properties in Whitchurch Lane and Camrose Avenue abut northern and southern boundaries respectively
- Jubilee rail line adjacent to western boundary
- Edgware Brook crosses site about 250mm from northern boundary, land slopes gently down from east and towards it

c) Proposal Details

Summerhouse Lake

- construction of 700mm high dwarf wall to south-west of lake
- raising of existing wall along south-eastern bank by approximately 600mm to approximately 900mm
- works to existing control weir
- provision of new telemetry kiosk, 900mm high x 900mm wide x 350mm deep

Seven Acre Lake

- raising by 500mm maximum, part of the circular path along the eastern side of the lake, surfacing to enable disabled access
- construction of associated flow control structures
- provision of new telemetry kiosk next to control structure, 900mm high x 900mm wide x 350mm deep

Prince Edward Playing Fields

- provision of new flood storage area with capacity of 48,000m$^3$ by construction of clay bund with length of about 600m along eastern boundary adjacent to residential premises in Buckingham Gardens and Bransgrove Road, and part of Little Stanmore School
- maximum height 2.3m, 1 in 4 side slopes, 3m wide crest on top grass banks
- new tree/hedge planting proposed next to boundary
- brook to be culverted under bund for about 35m
- flood levels controlled by concrete throttle/penstock arrangement, when full floodwater will overtop structure and return to brook by use of 2 x 41m long spillways
- telemetry kiosk, 900mm high x 900mm wide x 350mm deep

continued/
Item 1/01 - EAST/1070/00/FUL continued…..

Relevant History

Prince Edward Playing Fields:

EAST/148/01/OUT Outline: Football stadium, terraces, stand and clubhouse, floodlights to ground, artificial pitch and tennis courts, health and fitness facilities, parking, vehicular access from Camrose Avenue.

APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE 02-MAY-01 SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT - NOT COMPLETED

d) Applicant’s Statement

• application accompanied by Environmental Impact Assessment describing Silk Stream Flood Alleviation Scheme problems, alternative and preferred options, planning policy framework, and appraising each site in terms of hydrology and fluvial geomorphology; water quality; aquatic ecology; terrestrial ecology; landscape and visual amenity; soils and geology; historic environment; land use planning and social issues; recreation; noise and vibration; air quality

In respect of Summerhouse Lake

• route of floodwall carefully selected to minimise loss of noteworthy trees
• floodwall to be constructed by hand, weaved between trees to minimise losses
• understorey planting to be provided along length of floodwall
• existing surfaced path along eastern boundary to be widened, where possible and upgraded
• informal path along south-western edge retained, crossover points provided where necessary

In respect of Seven Acre Lake:

• habitat loss restricted to ground flora
• small group of moderate to poor quality trees would be lost
• new footpath to be constructed by mini plant and by hand

In respect of Prince Edward Playing Fields:

• areas of ecological importance fenced during construction works
• new tree and shrub planting along eastern boundary to compensate for tree loss and provide screening

f) Advertisement

Character of Conservation Area
Major Development
Application with Environmental Impact Assessment

Expiration 14-DEC-00

continued/
Summerhouse Lake

Consultations

- English Heritage (Conservation): Low key brownish brick suggested, with low growing native shrubs and climbers
- English Heritage (Archaeology): Monitoring condition suggested
- English Nature: No objection
- Thames Water: No objection
- Sport England: No comment

Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22-NOV-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven Acre Lake

Consultations

- CAAC: No objection
- English Heritage (Conservation): No objection
- English Heritage (Archaeology): Monitoring condition suggested
- Sport England: No comment
- Thames Water: No objection

Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23-NOV-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: No objections, increase in capacity could be achieved by deepening lake, dust during construction work, threat of flooding to neighbouring houses, damage to banks of lake and habitat, destruction of trees, no guarantee that weir will operate properly.

Prince Edward Playing Fields

Consultations

- English Heritage (Archaeology): Monitoring condition suggested
- Thames Water: No objection
- Sport England: No comment

Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-NOV-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Agree proposals; danger of flooding; dirt, noise and disruption from construction traffic; loss of playing field; loss of privacy and security.

continued/
APPRAISAL

Summerhouse Lake

1) Appearance and Character of Area

Walls with a height of 700mm and 900mm would be created in order to increase the storage capacity of the lake from 22,000m³ to 34,000m³. These need not be obtrusive, provided appropriate materials are used and planting is provided to soften their impact. Appropriate conditions are suggested. Five trees only would be removed in connection with the works.

The telemetry kiosk is a modest structure, and the proposed colour, green, would be appropriate in this location. Overall it is not considered that the appearance and character of this sensitive area would be adversely affected.

2) Access

The existing path alongside the wall on the eastern bank of the lake is surfaced with hoggin and is 1m wide. The proposed widening to 1.2m is acceptable subject to the use of satisfactory materials, and would facilitate access over the land.

3) Consultation Responses

None.

Seven Acre Lake

1) Character of Conservation Area

The 500mm maximum increase in the level of part of the circular footpath is proposed to increase the storage capacity of the lake from 38,000m³ to 53,000m³. A maximum of 6 trees would be lost. The telemetry kiosk is a modest structure, and the proposed colour green would be appropriate in this location.

Subject to satisfactory restoration, to be secured by conditions, the proposed works would preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed works are separated from the residential boundaries by belts of woodland which would be unaffected by the proposals. Residential amenity would not therefore be impaired.

continued/
3) **Access**

The use of appropriate materials would both enable disabled access and provide an acceptable appearance.

4) **Consultation Responses**

- increase in capacity could be achieved by deepening lake – this is a technical issue for the Environment Agency to consider
- dust during construction work – this would be a matter for the Environmental Health Division
- threat of flooding to neighbouring houses – Environment Agency confirm that higher water level would be retained within the lake boundary by existing ground levels. During extremely high flows it is possible that eastern embankment would be overtopped and design would allow for this – as is currently the case
- damage to banks of lake and habitat – Environment Agency advise that Panel Engineer carries out annual inspection under Reservoirs Act 1975 and would identify any damage to banks
- destabilisation of trees – Environment Agency consider that proposals would have least impact on trees of options considered
- no guarantee that weir will operate properly – this is a maintenance issue for Environment Agency

**Prince Edward Playing Fields**

1) **Appearance of Area**

The proposed bund would be an imposing structure. However, the grass planted finish would be appropriate, and the use of grasscrete for the necessary maintenance access tracks would soften the appearance of these areas so that overall an acceptable impact on the appearance of the area would be provided.

2) **Residential Amenity**

The 3m wide crest on top of the bund would allow for people to walk along although the existing footpath next to the eastern boundary would be retained and the vast majority of pedestrians would be expected to use this footpath. The crest for most of its length would be at least 20m from the boundary, and adequate space exists for tree and shrub planting in order to prevent overlooking, as suggested by Environment Agency, be secured by condition.

3) **Recreational Impact**

By realigning pitches in the proximity of the bund, the recreational potential of the site would be unaffected.

continued/
4) Consultation Responses

- danger of flooding – the application has been submitted by Environment Agency with the intention of preventing flooding to downstream areas adjacent to the Edgware Brook
- dirt, noise and disruption from construction traffic – these matters would be dealt with by the Environmental Health Division
- loss of playing field – discussed in report
- loss of privacy and security – discussed in report
SECTION 2 - OTHER APPLICATIONS FOR GRANT

2/01
EAST/1355/01/FUL/TEM

SCOUT HALL, SUMMIT CLOSE, EDGWARE

DEMOLITION OF HALL & CONSTRUCT 6 SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES FRONTING SUMMIT CLOSE WITH PARKING

DUNPHYS LTD FOR 1ST & 6TH EDGWARE SCOUT GROUP

RECOMMENDATION


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 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  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.
4  Landscaping to be Approved
5  Landscaping to be Implemented
6  The window(s) in the 1st floor 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.
   REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
7  PD Restriction - Classes A to E
8  Levels to be Approved
9  Highway - Approval of Access(es)
10 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces

continued/
Item 2/01 - EAST/1355/01/FUL continued....

11 No demolition or site works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall commence before:-
(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.

12 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 41 – UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E24, E27, E45, H1, H8, T13, C11) (SD1, SC1, EP29, E49, D4, D5, H5, T13, C13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Community Facilities
2) Loss of Open Space
3) Appearance of Area
4) Neighbouring Amenity
5) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION
This application was deferred from the meeting of 10th April 2002 to clarify details of the use of the new premises including community use and for a Members' Site Visit, which, due to the Borough elections did not take place until Monday 10th June. At the site visit, Members indicated that they would wish to see the submission of revised plans to indicate a widening of Summit Close on the site frontage to ease problems of on-street parking. Following discussion with the Highway Engineers who had objections, this suggestion was not acted upon. Revised plans have also now been received which have slightly reduced the footprint of the proposed houses.

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E6, E24, E27, E45, H1, H8, T13, C11
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, SC1, EP29, E49, D4, D5, H5, T13, C13
Car Parking
Standard: 10 (10)
Justified: 10 (10)
Provided: 12
Site Area: 0.182 ha.
Habitable Rooms: 24
No. of residential units: 6
EARA: Tree masses in rear gardens

continued/
b) Site Description

- west side of Summit Close extending to Pembroke Place
- comprises single storey building and lawned open space used by local Scouts group
- vehicular access via narrow strip from Pembroke Place leading to hardsurfaced parking area
- several trees along Summit Close frontage
- access strip at higher level than adjacent houses in Milford Gardens
- site bounded by 2 storied maisonettes in Summit Close, and 2 storied semi-detached houses in Camrose Avenue, Pembroke Place, and Milford Gardens

c) Proposal Details

- scheme originally included a detached house on the access strip from Pembroke Place, now deleted from the application
- 3 pairs of semi-detached houses fronting onto Summit Close
- ground floor containing single integral garage, sitting room, kitchen, 3 bedrooms on first floor
- additional parking space in driveway
- brick elevations, tiled hipped, pitched roof, front and rear projecting features
- minimum 16.5m depth rear gardens, rear garden area at least 100m$^2$

d) Relevant History

None

e) Applicant’s Statement

- 1st and 6th Edgware Scout Groups merged
- 2 premises, larger building in Dale Avenue with little open land, smaller building at Summit Close on larger site but with subsidence problems
- combined group not large enough to run both premises, need to dispose of one site
- Current uses at Summit Close comprise:
  (a) Playgroup, 4 days per week for 2 hours
  (b) Keep fit class, one evening per week for 2 hours
  (c) Occasional letting for private functions
- Playgroup has applied to relocate to Dale Avenue, OFSTED permission awaited
- Keep fit group will relocate to Dale Avenue when suitable slot is available
- Driving force behind scheme is need for Scout Group to consolidate its ongoing costs which is becoming increasingly difficult to achieve whilst running and maintaining both sites, Summit Close drain on resources
- Scouts no longer convene at Summit Close, based at Dale Avenue
- assurance from Scout Leader that Scout Group is committed to renovation of Dale Avenue

continued/
proceeds raised from sale of Summit Close entirely at group's disposal

80-85% of proceeds to be invested in building works at Dale Avenue to provide new toilets, proper disabled access, kitchen facilities and better security, surplus monies held in trust for future building works

change would enable playgroup/nursery to extend hours

new additional rooms provided to meet requirements of Scouts, Guides, nursery and playgroup, and allow two sections to meet simultaneously

improvements to heating, wiring, plumbing and insulation will reduce running costs

f) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>04-FEB-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Increase parking and traffic congestion in Summit Close, loss of open space, loss of community facility, increase in population unacceptable, overshadowing, loss of light, out of character, tree loss, detriment to wild life, noise pollution, cramped, flooding, adverse impact on character of area

APPRAISAL

1) Community facilities

Replacement UDP Policy C13 seeks the retention of existing community buildings and the proposed development of this site for housing would run counter to this policy. However, in this case the development is proposed in order to maintain and enhance the Scouts' facilities in Dale Avenue which is located less than 1 kilometre away. Such enhancement would be in accordance with policies in both the adopted and replacement plans. The provision of housing on a suitable site would also comply with the Plans and PPG3 and it is suggested that the proposed development of the site can be supported in principle on this basis.

2) Loss of open space

This area of open land is not shown on the Proposals Maps as a structural feature requiring special protection. However, its openness does contribute to the character and appearance of the locality.

Policies E24 and EP49 of the adopted and Replacement UDP's set out 5 identical criteria in relation to considering proposals for an area of informal open space such as the application site.

In terms of (A) the development of the site to improve the other Scouts facilities in Dale Avenue would comply with the UDP as discussed above.

The land does not provide a focal point or provide a necessary setting for adjacent buildings as required by criteria (B) and (C).
The land provides a pleasant amenity for immediate neighbours but does not provide significant wider visual relief within the area (D).

The site is mainly laid to lawn and does not have significant nature conservation value (E).

The site is not within an area of open space deficiency (Criterion F in Replacement Plan).

It is concluded that the site does not justify protection as open space.

3) **Appearance of area**

The proposed houses would relate satisfactorily to neighbouring houses. They would be set far enough back from the street to enable retention of most existing frontage trees on the site to the benefit of the appearance of the area, although they are not worthy of TPO protection. Additional planting can be required by condition.

The proposed density of 141 hrph which is within the specified range in the Replacement Plan and comparable to the surrounding area.

4) **Neighbouring amenity**

The S.P.G. rear garden depth, back-to-back distance, and amenity space requirements would be met in full by the proposals. The flank wall of the southernmost house would be at 21m from the nearest rear wall of houses in Camrose Avenue, again complying with S.P.G. No 45° codes would be breached by the proposals.

Both adopted and Replacement UDP parking standards would be met, and the scheme should not therefore give rise to material on-street parking demands.

Overall it is considered that acceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity would be provided.

5) **Consultation responses**

A condition regarding on-site water storage is suggested. Otherwise, objections are discussed in the report.
5-9 WORPLE CLOSE, HARROW

DEMOLITION OF NOS.5 & 7 AND OUTBUILDING OF NO.9 AND REPLACEMENT WITH 3 PAIRS OF 2 STOREY 4 BED SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES WITH ACCOMMODATION IN ROOFSPACE, INTEGRAL AND DETACHED GARAGES AND FORECOURT PARKING (REVISED)

HOWARD FAIRBAIRN & PARTNERS FOR MR T A DANIEL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 4820-02 Rev.C, 03 Rev.C, 04 Rev.D

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 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:
   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.
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 plan nos.4820-03C, 04D 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 Highway - Approval of Construction
6 Landscaping to be Approved
7 Landscaping to be Implemented
8 Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
9 Trees - Protective Fencing
10 Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling
11 Levels to be Approved

continued/
12 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the car parking, turning and loading area(s) shown on the approved plan number(s) 4820-02C 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.

13 Parking for Occupants - Garages/Parking Spaces

14 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

15 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.

16 Water - Disposal of Sewage

17 Water - Disposal of Surface Water

INFORMATIVES:
1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
3 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E45, T13) (SD1, D4, D5, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Impact on neighbouring occupiers
2) Character of the area/amenity space/density
3) Parking/access
4) Trees/landscaping
5) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

At the meeting of the Committee on 10th April 2002, consideration of this item was deferred for a Members site visit. This was delayed because of the Borough elections and finally took place on Monday 10th June.

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E45, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, T13
Car Parking
   Standard: 12 (11)
   Justified: 12 (12)
   Provided: 12 (12)
Item 2/02 - WEST/71/02/FUL continued.....

Site Area: 0.18h.
Habitable Rooms: 30
No. of residential units: 6

f) Site Description

- roughly rectangular plot currently occupied by nos. 5 and 7 Worple Close and part of the garden of no. 9
- Worple Close is a residential cul-de-sac characterised by semi-detached dwellings
- the site is bounded to the north and west by other dwellings in Worple Close and to the south and east by the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Worple Way

g) Proposal Details

- demolition of nos. 5 and 7 and an outbuilding of no.9 Worple Close and the erection of 3 pairs of semi-detached dwellings
- the two storey element of the dwellings would extend to 9.3m in depth by 5.6m in width
- each of the houses would have a small rear conservatory 2.7m in depth
- the first four houses would have an integral garage and one driveway parking space each, while the last pair would have a detached garage with forecourt parking

h) Relevant History

None

e) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13-FEB-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Loss of value to existing houses, loss of privacy/overlooking, out of character, visually obtrusive, loss of views, overdevelopment, excessive height, inadequate parking, increased congestion, disruption during construction, detrimental to trees/wildlife, noise and disturbance, create a precedent, inadequate sewerage/drainage

APPRAISAL

1) Impact on neighbouring residents

In terms of the impact of the proposed dwellings on No. 9 Worple Close, the proposed house adjacent to the property would more than meet with the Council's 45° guidance both at the front and rear of the dwelling. No. 9 has no protected flank windows and no loss of light nor overshadowing would therefore result. There are no flank windows facing No. 9 on the main part of the first house, and the proposed conservatory would be set away from the common boundary and would only face the flank wall of a rear extension at No. 9. As such there would be no overlooking nor loss of privacy to the occupiers of No. 9.

continued/
In relation to No.3 Worple Close, each of the six houses proposed would have habitable room windows facing the flank boundary of that dwelling. These however would be set between 16.5 - 14.7m from that boundary. Of the six houses, only the sixth, located furthest from the rear elevation of no. 3, would fail to meet the Council's normal requirements of 15m. In addition, any overlooking of this small area would be mitigated by an intervening garage and the existing trees/proposed planting along the boundary. In light of central government advice and PPG3 and the Council's own revised policy in the deposit UDP, a reason for refusal on the grounds of overlooking could not be sustained.

In relation to the impact on the rear gardens of dwellings in Worple Way, again there would be only a very marginal deficiency in rear garden depth in terms of dwelling six with a distance of 14.7m being provided to the rear garden boundaries. The "back to back" distance however would more than comply with the Council's guidelines with a distance of 39m being provided (i.e. 9m in excess of the Council's SPG). Again, additional planting is proposed along the rear garden boundary of all of the dwellings.

In conclusion the proposal would not detract from the amenities of any of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings and is considered acceptable.

2) Character of the area, amenity space, density

PPG3 indicates that in considering applications for new residential developments, a density of between 30-50 units per hectare should be encouraged. Below this figure the guidance states that the proposal would represent an inefficient use of land which could amount to unsustainable development. The proposed scheme would just meet the criteria in PPG3 with a density of 32.2 units/hectare. Any reduction in the number of units, would represent an under-development of the site. In terms of making a more efficient use of land, the proposal is therefore to be welcomed. The proposal would also comply with the Council's density range in terms of habitable room per hectare with the equivalent of 167 habitable rooms per hectare being provided.

In terms of the rear garden areas, these would vary between $88.1m^2$ (house 5) to $122m^2$ (house 6). In terms of the rear garden depth these vary from a minimum (behind the conservatory of house 6) of 12m to 16.5m behind part of house 1. While each house would fail to meet the rigid standards which were previously applied (i.e. $120m^2$ in area and 15m in depth), both PPG3 and the Council's revised policy under the deposit UDP advise against adopting such a rigid approach. In these circumstances and bearing in mind the density criteria, it is considered that the proposals would not detract from the character of the area.
3) **Parking**

Each of the dwellings would have two off-street parking spaces (12 spaces in total). This would meet the Council's requirements under the adopted UDP but would exceed the maximum standard of 11 spaces under the deposit UDP standards. It is not however considered that a reason for refusal on the over provision of 1 space should justify the refusal of planning permission.

4) **Trees/landscaping**

None of the trees on the site are the subject of a TPO. The applicant has however revised the original layout in an effort to retain several of the trees. The final comments of the Council's Landscape Architect are awaited. The applicant has however indicated significant planting around the perimeter of the site along the boundaries to No. 3 Worple Close and to the rear boundaries of properties in Worple Way. Subject to the suggested conditions relating to landscaping the proposal is considered acceptable.

5) **Consultation responses**

Out of character/visually obtrusive/overdevelopment/excessive height/bulk - see above
Inadequate parking/increased congestion - see above
Disruption through construction - an informative relating to the Considerate Contractors Code is suggested
See above and there is no identified tree mass or tree spine
Loss of trees/shrubs/tree mass/tree spine/detrimental to wildlife - it is not considered that the level proposed would be excessive
Noise, fumes from vehicles - it is considered that its location is appropriate
Location of refuse store visually obtrusive and create noise and disturbance - the access is adequate
Inadequate vehicle access - the proposal would not create a precedent - each application would be considered on its merits
Create a precedent - comments from the Council's Drainage Engineer awaited
Inadequate sewerage, drainage problems/increased flooding - the proposal would not result in loss of light
Loss of light - there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would increase crime
Increased crime - this in itself is not a material planning consideration
Loss of value to existing house - see above
Loss of privacy/overlooking
CHANGE OF USE OF BASEMENT FROM STORAGE/PLANTROOM FOR FORMER OFFICES TO BANQUETING FACILITIES WITH PARKING AT REAR (CLASS B1 TO SUI GENERIS)

BUILDING DESIGN CONSULTANTS FOR SENSEMOVE PENSION SCHEME C/O

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Site plan, BDC-200-2 Rev A, E1, 202/1, 97252/A/10

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

1. Time Limit - Full Permission
2. The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:-
   (a) 18.30 hours to 23.30 hours, Monday to Friday inclusive,
   (b) 10.30 hours to 23.30 hours on Saturdays,
   (c) 12.00 hours to 22.30 hours, Sundays,
   without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
   REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3. Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Use
4. Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
5. Noise from Music and Amplified Sound (replace 'residential' with 'other; Reason - replace 'residents' with 'occupiers')
6. Noise Details - Use - Insulation - 2
7. The use 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.
8. The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until adequate access for disabled persons has been provided at the front entrance of the building in accordance with details which shall be first submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.
   REASON: To ensure satisfactory disabled access in accordance with Harrow Unitary Development Plan Policy A4.

continued/
9 The use hereby permitted shall not be commenced until measures to prevent access to the upper floors of the building by users of the basement have been implemented in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure satisfactory security for other users of the building.

INFORMATIVES:
1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Employment
2) Town Centre impact
3) Neighbouring amenity
4) Parking
5) Disabled access
6) Consultation responses

INFORMATION
At the meeting of the Planning Committee on 10th April 2002 this application was deferred for a Members Site Visit. Due to the Borough elections this had to be delayed and was finally set for Monday 10th June. On that date, however, access to the premises could not be gained.

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: EM1, T13, R2, A4, E51, E45
Town Centre
Car Parking
Standard: 30 (6-9)
Justified: See report
Provided: 4 (4)
Floorspace: 520m²
CCA: 350m²
EARA: None

b) Site Description
• south side of Church Road, near junction with Stanmore Hill/The Broadway, within Stanmore District Centre
• 9 storey building
• application site comprises
  - basement which contains plant and storage accommodation, mainly ancillary to the original office use
  - ground floor mainly used for retail
  - 1st and second floors comprising office suites
  - 3rd to 8th floors recently converted to residential from offices and plantroom

continued/
entrances at front and rear of building
service road at rear
parking provided on upper deck of Sainsbury's car park
c) Proposal Details
conversion of basement from ancillary office storage/plantroom area to provide banqueting facilities (Class B1 to Sui Generis)
submitted plan shows stage, dance floor, 32 x 10 seater tables
ancillary facilities comprising kitchen, WC's, store
4 parking spaces on upper deck of Sainsbury's car park
main entrance from front, via lift and staircase, secondary entrance at rear
d) Relevant History
EAST/1166/00/FUL Change of use of basement from office to fitness centre (Class B1 to D2) GRANTED
09-FEB-2001
e) Applicants Statement
Proposed opening hours:- Monday - Friday 18.30 - 23.30
Saturday 10.30 - 23.30
Sun/Bank Holidays 12.00 - 22.30
at end of each residential corridor is 'Fire Door' with Yale lock giving easy exit in case of fire, and authorised access only to flats and offices
rear lift begins travel from ground floor, front lift goes to basement to give disabled access
f) Consultations
CEHO: Awaited
Notifications
Sent 41
Replies 17
Expiry 15-MAR-2002
Response: lack of parking, security threat to other tenants and residents, noise and disturbance, pedestrian congestion outside premises, accumulation of garbage, vandalism, smells; Yale locks prevent access by emergency services, all main services and drainage conducted through vertical ducts
APPRAISAL
1) Employment
The basement has been vacant for at least 6 years and this application is a further proposal to bring it back into a beneficial use. There is no direct loss of office employment arising from this proposal as the basement area was used for ancillary plant and storage purposes to the remainder of the building. Given that 5 of the original 7 floors of offices have been converted to residential, the basement area is no longer required for B1 purposes, and its loss therefore can again be accepted in principle, as it was at the time permission was granted for the fitness centre.
2) **Town Centre Impact**  
The UDP encourages the provision of new entertainment facilities within the Borough, and town centres such as Stanmore are the preferred location for such uses as they would enhance variety and vitality.

3) **Neighbouring Amenity**  
Residential uses start on the 3rd floor, i.e. 4 floors above the basement. Impact on residential amenity can be controlled by conditions relating to opening hours, noise prevention, fume extract system and refuse.

4) **Parking**  
4 spaces for staff would be provided on the upper deck of Sainsbury's car park during worktime hours (08:00 - 18:00 hours). This complies with the standard requirement for staff in the Replacement UDP. Parking for customers could be accommodated in the public area within that car park and by the other public car parks and spaces within the Centre. The proposed opening hours would coincide with the availability for public parking of most of the private worktime spaces within the Sainsbury's car park. The availability of public transport within this town centre location would reduce dependence on access by car. In addition, other modes of transport such as taxis and mini buses would be likely to be used by customers of this type of use.

5) **Access**  
A step at the entrance requires to be removed to enable access by disabled people to the lift, and an appropriate condition is suggested. A condition is also recommended to prevent access by basement customers to the upper floors of the building to address occupiers’ concerns about security, although the applicant advises that such measures are already in place.

6) **Consultation responses**  
No additional issues raised.
88-90 HIGH STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL 2/04
WEST/418/02/FUL/TW
Ward: HARROW ON THE HILL

CHANGE OF USE: DOCTORS SURGERY TO OFFICES (CLASS D1 TO B1) IN PART OF BASEMENT

WHITE ASSOCIATES FOR VAN DE BERG MANAGEMENT LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 02/485/01, 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

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E38, T13), (SD1, D4, D16, D17, D18, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Car Parking
3) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E38, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D16, D17, D18, T13
Special Char & Adv
Grade II Listed Building
Conservation Area: Harrow on the Hill Village
Car Parking
  Standard: 3 (max. of 1)
  Justified: 0 (0)
  Provided: 0 (0)

b) Site Description

• part of the ground floor of building accessed from Byron Hill Road
• the building is Listed Grade II and lies within the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details

• proposed change of use from a Doctors Surgery to use as offices (D1 to B1)

continued/
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Item 2/04 - WEST/418/02/FUL continued.....

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/1315/1</td>
<td>Use 2 rooms in basement as surgery</td>
<td>GRANTED 05-JUL-67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Consultations

CAAC: Regret loss of surgery facility. Query the extent of planning control over loss of surgery

Advertisement Character of Conservation Area Expiry
30-MAY-2002

Notifications Sent Replies Expiry
16 0 20-MAY-2002

APPRaisal

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
The remainder of the building is used by various businesses as offices within Use Class B1. It is considered that the use of this small element of the building for B1 offices would be consistent with the character of this part of the Conservation Area. The character of the Conservation Area would therefore be preserved.

2) Car Parking
The lawful use of the premises would generate a greater requirement than the proposed use. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

3) Consultation responses
There is no control that can be exercised to prevent loss of surgery facility.
VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION LBH/21147/W, CONDITION 2 OF PLANNING PERMISSION LBH/F/21321/W AND CONDITION 7 OF PLANNING PERMISSION E/1072/02/FUL TO PERMIT OPENING HOURS UP TO 02.00 HOURS TUESDAY - FRIDAY MORNINGS INCLUSIVE & 02.30 HOURS ON SATURDAY AND SUNDAY MORNINGS & 01:00 HRS MONDAYS

ROBIN BRETHERRICK ASSOC for MR A C PIERRE

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos:  RAB/VIP/01

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

1. The premises shall not be open to customers outside the following times:
   10.30 hours to 02.00 hours the following morning on Mondays to Thursdays,
   10.30 hours to 02.30 hours the following morning on Fridays and Saturdays,
   10.30 hours to 01.00 hours the following morning on Sundays
   REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

2. The variation hereby permitted shall discontinue within one year of the date of this permission.
   REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and to permit reconsideration in the light of circumstances then prevailing.

INFORMATIVES


MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Residential Amenity
2) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E51
Deposit UDP Key Policies: EP25
Town Centre Harrow
b) Site Description
- 3 storey terraced unit on northern side of College Road, within secondary retail frontage of Harrow Metropolitan Centre
- currently used as wine bar/public house on ground and first floor with self-contained flat on second floor accessed from the rear
- rest of terrace to west includes mix of commercial uses on ground and first floors as well as residential use on second floor and some first floors
- adjoining unit to west includes residential flats on first and second floors
- adjoining unit to east comprises retail use on ground floor with solicitors offices above rear yard used as beer garden in summer, with rear store
- the unit has no off-street parking though unofficial use is made of waste ground at rear of adjoining parade

c) Proposal Details
- permission is sought to vary condition 7 of planning permission EAST/1072/01/FUL granted in December 2001. The condition states:
  "The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times: 10.30 hours to 23.00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive, and 10.30 hours to 22.30 hours on Sundays, without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
  REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents."
- current proposal seeks to amend the hours to 10.30am to 02.00am the following morning on Mondays to Thursdays, 10.30am to 02.30am the following morning on Fridays and Saturdays, and 10.30am to 01.00am the following morning on Sundays

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/21147</td>
<td>Change of use of ground floor from restaurant to wine bar</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>19-APR-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/21146</td>
<td>Section 94 - Established Use Certificate: Use of first floor as restaurant</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>28-APR-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/21321</td>
<td>Change of use of 1st floor from restaurant to wine bar</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>27-MAY-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST/1073/01/ADV</td>
<td>Illuminated fascia sign</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>20-NOV-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST/1072/01/FUL</td>
<td>Two storey rear extension and alterations with staircase and shopfront</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>14-DEC-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST/160/02/CLE</td>
<td>Certificate of Lawful Existing Use: Wine Bar/Restaurant without complying</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>16-APR-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item 2/05 - EAST/546/02/VAR continued.....

This Certificate established that the ground floor of the premises has remained open for customers until midnight on Thursdays to Saturdays and that the first floor of the premises has remained open until midnight on Fridays and Saturdays, for a period in excess of 10 years and does not now require the express consent of the Local Planning Authority.

e) Applicant’s Statement
• various extensions to the licensing hours have enabled specific events to continue at the premises until at least 01.00am and sometimes later
• the Certificate of Lawfulness has established the regular midnight closing time
• late night opening is generally encouraged by Central Government
• PPG6 points to the importance of the evening economy
• the site is an appropriate location for late night entertainment being immediately adjacent to public transport
• Kebabland at 36 College Road was allowed to open until 02.30am on Friday and Saturday nights and 01.00am on Sundays on appeal
• other late night opening premises include Time nightclub which opens until 02.00am on Mondays - Thursdays and 02.30am on Fridays and Saturdays. Trinity Bar opens until a similar time and O'Neil's opens until 02.00am on Fridays and Saturdays
• O'Neil's was allowed on appeal with no planning restrictions on opening hours
• the 2nd floor flat above the premises is owned by the applicant and will be occupied by the manager and his staff
• the premises are being fully soundproofed and a technical report is enclosed with the application
• bedrooms of adjoining premises are at the rear and thus not likely to be affected
• there are regular late-night traffic movements along College Road including taxis, night buses and postal vans as well as commercial delivery vehicles and pedestrians from other late night uses
• applicant is Secretary & Communications Officer for ‘Harrow Town Pub Watch’. Premises will be linked into Civic Centre system and CCTV cameras installed at front, rear and internally

f) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>03-JUN-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Tenants above adjoining unit have complained frequently about noise over the years - proposal will make this worse and lead to an increase in drunken behaviour; town centre is also a residential area providing convenient accommodation for hospital staff.

continued/
APPRAISAL

1) Residential Amenity
The previous application made provision for soundproofing and proposed the deletion of a former open beer garden at the rear of the premises. These would serve to improve the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. The additional hours of use now proposed would clearly extend the activity at the site until later hours however it is not considered that this should detract from the neighbours residential amenity. The site lies within the town centre and on a road where there is a high level of background noise until a late hour. The applicants have undertaken an acoustic survey which has identified measures necessary to reduce noise emissions from the site and these are to be implemented. The hours proposed are in keeping with other late night uses in the town centre. In granting the appeal for no.36 College Road the Inspector stated:-

"I recognise the need to strike a balance between the functioning of commercial activities in the centre and the environmental quality of local living conditions experienced by residents, particularly between the hours of 23.00 and 07.00 when they would normally expect to sleep. However, it is clear that the appeal premises is located close to the heart of a strategic town centre and adjacent to major rail and bus services, including late rail and night buses, where it would be reasonable to expect vibrant evening activity and perhaps even the "24 hour city" to which government policy is far from opposed."

The Inspector also noted that 'O'Neills' was permitted on appeal in April 1997 with no planning conditions restricting hours of operation.

In these circumstances it is considered that the extension of hours would be unlikely to have a detrimental effect on residential amenity. A one year temporary permission would be appropriate to assess the situation.

2) Consultation Responses
The previously approved application for the site involves physical alterations to the building with improved soundproofing. Conditions were also imposed regarding noise transference and once the permission is implemented there should be an improvement in the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. It is not considered that the increased hours of use now proposed would alter this.
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1418/065; 066A; 067;100

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

1. Time Limit - Full Permission
2. Fume Extraction - External Appearance - Use
3. Noise from Music and Amplified Sound
4. Noise and Odour/Fume from Plant and Machinery
5. Restrict Hours on A3 Uses
6. Shop Window Display
7. 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.
8. Restrict Storage to Buildings

INFORMATIVES:

1. Standard Informative 21 - Bottle Recycling
2. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3. Standard Informative 36 - Measurements from Submitted Plans
5. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted plans this application does not apply to the shopfront and a separate application will be required for this together with advertisement consent for the signage indicated.

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Retail Policy
2) Car Parking
3) Residential Amenity
4) Consultation Responses

continued/
INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E6, E46, E51, S14, T13
             SD1, EP25, D4, T13, EM18
Town Centre         South Harrow
Car Parking Standard: 8 (2)
                   Justified: 3 (no additional)
                   Provided: 2 (2)
CCA: 90m²

b) Site Description
• ground floor retail units within secondary shopping frontage of South Harrow District Centre
• comprises two separate units with own entrance doors but which have been linked internally
• 2 upper floors in residential use
• service road at rear
• uses in the parade 297-321 defined by Wargrave Road and Scarsdale Road comprise (starting at 297): cheque cashing office (unauthorised use, authorised use is A1), restaurant (A3), video hire shop (double frontage, A1), health and beauty salon (A1), clothes shop (A1), hardware/bric a brac (application site, double frontage, A1), fish and chips take-away (A3), haberdashers (A1), hot food take-away (A3), newsagents (A1), clothes shop (A1); 10 x A1, 3 x A3

c) Proposal Details
• change of use of ground floor from retail to restaurant (A1 - A3) with customer circulation area of 90m² and tables for 80 diners

d) Relevant History
None

e) Notifications
Sent 21
Replies 9 + petition of 75 signatures
Expiry 30-MAY-2002

Response: Object to loss of further retail units; noise and disturbance late at night; smells; sufficient restaurants in area already; will add to parking in area; loss of property value; will jeopardise success of other A3 uses in area; will add to inconvenience from delivery vans; extra traffic; loss of business for adjacent restaurant; will add to fire risk in area.

APPRAISAL

1) Retail Policy
Policy S14 of the adopted UDP allows for changes of use in the secondary frontages of District Centres provided that a harmful concentration of non-retail uses is not created or added to and an appropriate window display/frontage is maintained. Taking into account other uses in the parade it is not considered that a concentration would occur. Of the 13 units in the parade, 8 would retain Class A1 use.
The revised draft UDP Policy includes an additional criterion that no more than 50% of the total length of the secondary frontage should be in non-retail use. The secondary frontage as defined in the revised draft UDP would have 29% non-retail if the application were to be allowed, within the policy tolerance.

In the above circumstances it is not considered that there would be any conflict with the Council's retail policy.

2) Car Parking
The adopted UDP standard for a unit with the customer circulation area proposed of 90m² is 8 spaces. The justified provision, allowing for the existing deficiency is 3 spaces. There are presently 2 spaces available at the rear of the premises suitable for staff. The revised draft UDP does not have a specific standard for Class A3 uses but equates them to Class A1 uses. There would therefore be no additional parking required for the proposed use.

The site is within an area where there is high accessibility to public transport and there are pay and display parking spaces directly outside. It is not considered that a parking reason for refusal could be substantiated in this instance.

3) Residential Amenity
Whilst there is a residential use directly above the unit, this is a common arrangement within town centre locations and no different to the other restaurants and hot-food take-aways within the centre. Conditions relating to noise, fumes and hours of use are recommended in order to protect local residential amenity.

4) Consultation Responses
These are largely dealt with above. Loss of property value and competition are not planning considerations. Conditions regarding noise and odours are proposed to protect the amenities of neighbours. There are no planning grounds for the proposal being considered a ‘fire risk’ any more than a Class A1 retail use.
CHANGE OF USE: OLD PERSONS HOME TO DENTAL CLINIC AND LABORATORY (CLASS C2 TO D1)

SCHOENITZ DENTAL & DR J SCHWARZMAN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Unnumbered plans received 19-MAR-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 The use hereby permitted shall not be open to staff or customers outside the following times: 08:00 hours to 18:00 hours, Monday to Saturday inclusive, not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays without the prior written permission of the local planning authority. REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.
3 The use hereby permitted shall be for no more than one dentist and one dental nurse operating from the premises at any one time. REASON: To prevent an overintensive use of the site.

INFORMATIVE:
1 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E38, T13), (SD1, D16, D17, D18, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Amenity of Neighbours
2) Character of the Conservation Area
3) Car Parking
4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E38, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D16, D17, D18, T13
Conservation Area: Waxwell Lane
Car Parking
Standard: 8 (max. of 2)
Justified: 7 (max. of 1)
Provided: 4 (4)

continued/
Item 2/07 - WEST/298/02/FUL continued.....

b) Site Description
- detached two storey building with accommodation in the roof
- the property is vacant and was last used as a nursing home
- the property is located adjacent to the entrance of the Waxwell Lane car park and is within the Waxwell Lane Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details
- change of use to a dentists surgery with associated laboratory for denture manufacture
- the proposed use would employ 1 dentist, 1 nurse, 1 receptionist and 2 in the denture manufacturing element

d) Relevant History
WEST/976/00/FUL Single storey rear extensions and rear dormers GRANTED 04-MAY-01
WEST/669/01/FUL Change of use: Old persons home to residential dwelling GRANTED 03-OCT-01

e) Consultations
CAAC: No objection

Advertisement Character of Conservation Area Expiry 18-APR-02
Notifications Sent Replies Expiry 7 5 12-APR-02

Response: Increased traffic, increased activity, noise, contrary to character of area

APPRAISAL

1) Amenity of Neighbours
The submitted drawings show the ground floor to be used as a dentists practice with one consulting room. The remainder of the property would be used for laboratory uses and staff rooms. Taking into account the recent use as a nursing home, it is considered that any increase in activity would be modest and unlikely to have an impact on neighbours.

2) Character of the Conservation Area
The proposal does not include any changes to the external appearance of the property. The previous use of the premises as a nursing home established a non-residential presence in this part of the Conservation Area. It is concluded that the proposed use would have no detrimental effects and would preserve the character of the Conservation Area.

continued/
3) **Car Parking**  
The forecourt of the premises can accommodate 4 cars. Additionally there is a public car park adjacent to the site and car parking would not therefore be a problem.

4) **Notification Responses**  
   - Increased traffic  
   - Increased activity  
   - Noise  
   - Contrary to character of area

   Addressed in Appraisal
TWO STOREY TEMPORARY CLASSROOM BUILDING

KENNETH W REED & ASSOCIATES FOR THE JOHN LYON SCHOOL

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1297/1

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

1. Time Limit - Full Permission
2. 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. The proposed development shall be removed from the site by 30th June 2005 and the land reinstated to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.
   REASON: In the interest of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

INFORMATIVES
1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E46), (SD1, D4, C7)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
   UDP Key Policies: E38, E46
   Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, C7
   Area of Special Character TPO
   Conservation Area: Roxeth Hill

continued/
b) Site Description
- grounds of "Oldfield House" which is part of The John Lyon School
- to the north are playing fields which are with Metropolitan Open Land
- to the west is the main school and to the east are residential properties which front Crown Street
- the site is within the Roxeth Hill Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details
- 21m x 8.4m two storey temporary classroom unit
- located adjacent to the northern boundary of the site
- the building is required for a four year period

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/32000</td>
<td>Two single storey temporary classroom buildings</td>
<td>GRANTED 03-SEP-87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Applicant’s Statement

The proposal is required to allow alterations to the internal layout of the school, essential remedial works and future redevelopment of the Music school. A schedule of works over the 4 year period commencing August 2002 has been submitted. There would be no increase in pupil/staff number.

f) Consultations

CAAC: Acceptable for 4 years subject to a legal agreement to secure removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advertisement</th>
<th>Character of Conservation Area</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-MAY-2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notifications</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13-MAY-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Five year period is excessive and has not been justified, possible overlooking.

APPRAISAL

1) Character and appearance of the Conservation Area

Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough’s Conservation Areas. The proposed classrooms are of a design which would clearly be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area if they were to be permanently retained. The school has however submitted a schedule of works spanning a four year period and it is clear that temporary accommodation is required. The final phase of these works (June 2005 - August 2006) specified as "Complete development of Music School". No application or details have been submitted for this redevelopment and it is uncertain at this stage whether permission would be granted. It is therefore considered that a temporary consent should only be given for a three year period. The school could of course seek an extension of this period at a later date when or if planning permission is granted for the Music School development. continued/
2) Consultation Responses
   Time period of 5 years is excessive and has not been justified - see above
   Possible overlooking - the building would be sited 22m from the garden boundary to
   56 Crown Street and 38m from No. 60 and no overlooking or
   loss of privacy would occur.
ALTERATIONS TO ROADS AND PATHS AND PROVISION OF GATES AT ENTRANCE

MR A W REED FOR KENNETH W REED & ASSOC.

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos:  1260/A401, /13, /C11-02 Rev.A, /C11-06 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. 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:
   (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. Landscaping to be Approved
4. Landscaping to be Implemented
5. Landscaping - Existing Trees to be Retained
6. Trees - Underground Works to be Approved
7. Tree - Protective Fencing
8. Trees - No Lopping, Topping or Felling

INFORMATIVES
1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E46), (SD1, D4, D16, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character of Conservation Area
2) Loss of Trees
3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
   UDP Key Policies: E38, E46
   Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D16, D17
   Area of Special Character: Grade II Listed Building
   Conservation Area: Roxborough Park/Grove

continued/
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b) Site Description

- Harrow College is located on the north side of Lowlands Road
- To the west is Lowlands Recreation Ground and to the east are the rears of commercial properties in Grove Hill Road
- The frontage of the site is part of The Roxborough Park and The Grove Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details

- Provision of new block paved footpaths
- Provision of metal railings and lamp posts
- Resurfacing of existing vehicular access and car parking areas in tarmac including a speed hump
- Provision of vehicular and pedestrian gates on Lowlands Road frontage
- Provision of timber bollards around entrance to Hair and Beauty block

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/21341</td>
<td>2 Mobile classrooms</td>
<td>21-JUN-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/26118</td>
<td>Application under Reg.4 of T &amp; CP Regs. 1976 alterations and three storey</td>
<td>13-SEP-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extension of Lowlands VI Form College with 3 mobile classrooms to provide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tertiary college with parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/25756/84/LBC</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Alterations to existing rooms and demolition of</td>
<td>08-JAN-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>external store</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/27072</td>
<td>Application under Reg.4 of T&amp;CP Gen.Regs. 1976 Meter House at gate</td>
<td>25-FEB-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/34023</td>
<td>Illuminated signs</td>
<td>03-DEC-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST/384/02/FUL</td>
<td>Installation of electrical sub-station with landscaping and installation of</td>
<td>PENDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>electrical mains housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Consultations

CAAC: No objection but would like any trees to be replaced.

Advertisement

Character of Conservation Area

Expiry 13-JUN-2002

continued/
APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of Conservation Area
Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. The proposed gates and gate posts would be of a simple design and painted magenta to match the existing college colour scheme. The proposed materials for the pathways, parking areas and driveways would be appropriate to this part of the Conservation Area and would improve the appearance of the site frontage.

In conclusion the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) Loss of Trees
The proposal would result in the loss of six trees, two of which are only saplings. The comments of the Council's Landscape Architect are awaited.

3) Consultation Responses
None
LAND IN FARMSTEAD RD, (r/o 17-23 WHITEFRIARS DRIVE), HARROW WEALD

TWO, 2 STOREY DETACHED BUILDINGS TO PROVIDE SIX, 2 BED TERRACED PROPERTIES WITH FORECOURT PARKING

ROBIN BRETERICK ASSOCIATES FOR SLATEMERE LTD

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: RAB/02/121A, 122A, 123A, 124A.

GRANTS 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 The window(s) in the 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 plan no RAB/02/122 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 PD Restriction - Classes A to E

6 Landscaping to be Approved

7 Landscaping to be Implemented

8 Levels to be Approved

9 Parking for Occupants - Single Family Dwellinghouse

10 Water Storage Works

continued/
Item 2/10 - EAST/409/02/FUL continued…..

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc Act 1996
3 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E30, E45) (S1, SD1, D4, D5, D9)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1. Contribution to housing supply and density
2. Impact on Amenity and Character
3. Parking and access
4. Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E30, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, D4, D5, D9
Car Parking
  Standard: 10 (9)
  Justified: 6 (6)
  Provided: 6 (6)
Site Area: 870m²
Habitable Rooms: 18
No. of Residential Units: 6

b) Site Description

• site fronting Farmstead Road between Enderley Road and Whitefriars Drive, Harrow Weald
• situated on land to rear of existing properties: 1-7a (odds) Enderley Road and 17-23 (odds) Whitefriars Drive – rear garden depths exceed 15m
• detached double garage to rear of no. 1 Enderley Road
• site frontage formerly occupied by block of seven single garages (now demolished)
• opposite side occupied by garage and off-street parking
• on-street parking not controlled
• site levels fall north-west to south east
• within 170m walking distance of High Road local shops and bus services

continued/
Item 2/10  -  EAST/409/02/FUL continued…..

c) Proposal Details

- six 2 bed dwellings in two 2 storey blocks
- three habitable rooms per dwelling (total 18); average 62m² amenity space per dwelling and rear garden depths between 13 and 13.6m
- one parking space per dwelling
- each block 13m (w) x 10m (d) with the first floor of each outer end unit reduced to 8.5m deep
- hipped roof over to height 9m falling to 5.3m at the eaves

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/12479</td>
<td>Erection Of A Block Of 7 Replacement Lock Up</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>29-APR-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/12103</td>
<td>Erection of 3 Terraced Cottages</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>16-SEP-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site with inadequate rear amenity space for the proposed units.
2. The proposal represents a peacemeal development likely to prejudice any comprehensive development of the larger site between Farmstead Road and High Road.
3. The proposal would also give rise to a loss in existing garaging facilities giving rise to additional parking in the highway.

1 Enderley Road

EAST/1056/00/FUL  Replacement Double Garage At Rear  REFUSED  12-DEC-00

Reason for Refusal:

The proposed garage does not provide adequate forecourt and/or manoeuvring area, and the development would be likely to give rise to conditions prejudicial to the safety and free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway.

continued/
e) Applicant’s Statement

- Brownfield and suited to residential development
- Housing supply in the Borough falls below demand
- Accessible location
- Proposal reflects local townscape
- Sufficient gap between the proposal and existing houses
- Density complies with policy
- Amenity space provision exceeds guidelines
- Adequate space to ensure suitable amenities for residents of existing and proposed units
- Accessibility to shops and public transport justifies lower parking provision

f) Consultations

Thames Water Utilities Ltd: No comments
Environment Agency: No comments

Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25-APR-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: not brownfield land, existing services in area over stretched, trees cut down prior to application, proposal will generate more cars & additional parking pressure, land registry records not updated, terraced houses out of context, increased road safety hazard, housing balance argument spurious, part of larger development, previous refusals set precedent, too dense, impediment to emergency vehicles, flood risk, loss of sunlight/overshadowing, overdevelopment, noise.

APPRAISAL

1. Contribution to housing supply and density

The proposal would contribute to the general supply of homes in the Borough, consistent with UDP policy. The supply of smaller homes on the open market is to be particularly welcomed.

The proposed development equates to a density of 68 homes per hectare and, in relation to PPG 3 advice, can therefore be considered to be a highly efficient use of land in this more accessible location. Revised deposit draft UDP Policy H5 permits residential development within the range 125 to 200 habitable rooms per hectare; the proposed development would equate to a density of 171 habitable rooms per hectare.

continued/
2. Impact on Amenity and Character

By providing two storey houses rather than flats, the proposal is in keeping with the form of development in the immediate locality. Neither is it considered that terraced units are out of character with the wider locality.

The first floor depth of the outer end units in each block has been reduced to reduce the perceived bulk of the blocks and the ridge height of the buildings. Similarly, as two blocks of three units rather than a continuous terrace, it is considered that the size and bulk of the proposal has been contained and would not have an unacceptable visual impact when viewed in the streetscene or from the gardens of neighbouring residential property.

To the front of the proposed dwellings, forecourt greenery has been maximised consistent with the competing need for a reasonable amount of off-street parking and access to the units. It should also be recognised that in this regard the proposal represents an improvement over that which previously existed when garages occupied the site. Conditions requiring the submission and implementation of an acceptable scheme of landscaping are suggested.

The proposal exceeds the Council’s supplementary planning guidelines for the provision of usable amenity space and is considered to be acceptable in this regard.

In view of central Government advice, the over-riding need to secure housing provision and the minimal extent of the shortfall below the Council’s 15m guideline, it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of inadequate rear garden depth is justified nor could be sustained.

Conditions controlling the form of the windows in the outer flank walls of the blocks and future openings/extensions, and requiring the submission and approval of details relating to levels and materials are suggested. Subject to these conditions, it is not considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers or the character of this residential locality.

3. Parking and access

The proposed units generate a combined parking requirement of 10 spaces as per the adopted UDP, and 9 spaces as per the revised deposit draft UDP. The proposed level of provision, of 1 space per unit, therefore represents a shortfall of 4 spaces and 3 spaces respectively.

continued/
On-street parking in this locality is not controlled and it is considered that some overspill from the development can be accommodated in this way. In these circumstances and in view of central Government advice, which dissuades local authorities from requiring developers to provide more off-street parking than they themselves would wish, it is not considered that a refusal on the basis of inadequate parking provision is justified nor could be sustained.

The alignment of the proposed spaces has been amended to avoid the creation of a long, continuous run of dropped kerb and is now considered to be acceptable.

4. Consultation responses

- brownfield land: PPG 3 includes within the definition of brownfield land any curtilage of previously developed land
- existing services in area over stretched: a matter for utility companies
- trees cut down prior to application: trees were not protected
- land registry records not updated: not material
- increased road safety hazard: it is not considered that the proposal would be give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway safety
- part of larger development: not material
- previous refusals set precedent: UDP and central Government advice provide more relevant framework for decision
- impediment to emergency vehicles: unlikely
- flood risk: condition suggested
- loss of sunlight/overshadowing: not unduly detrimental to amenities of neighbouring occupiers
- noise: not unreasonable
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos:  SML.1/1, SML.1/2, SML.1/3 and Location Plan

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

1  Time Limit - Full Permission
2  Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved drawings 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  Materials to Match
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:
   a: before the use hereby permitted is commenced
   The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
   REASON: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the locality.
5  Landscaping to be Approved
6  Landscaping to be Implemented
7  Parking for Occupants - Parking Spaces
8  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 development which would otherwise fall within Classes A to E in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out at either the original dwelling or that created with the implementation of this permission without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
   REASON: To safeguard the character of the area by restricting the amount of site coverage and size of dwelling in relation to the size of the plot and availability of:
   a: amenity space
   b: parking space
   and to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents.

continued/
Item 2/11 - EAST/332/02/FUL continued.....

INFORMATIVES
1 Standard Informative 20 - Encroachment
2 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
4 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45, H1, H2, T13), (D4, D5, SH1, SH2, M4, T13)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character and Appearance of streetscene
2) Residential Amenity
3) Parking
4) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION
Details of this application are reported to Committee as a petition objecting to the proposal has been received.

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E6, E45, H1, H2, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: D4, D5, SH1, SH2, M4, T13
Car Parking
Standard: 2
Justified: 2
Provided: 2
Site Area: 0.02ha.
Habitable Rooms: 6
No. of Residential Units: 1

b) Site Description
• semi-detached house with a hipped roof and a single storey rear extension
• plot is some 7.5m wide and some 33m deep, rear gardens in the area range between some 17m and 19m in depth
• vehicular access at site frontage
• Berridge Green open space at rear (a grassed area some 45m by 25m)
• similar house to current proposal was constructed at No. 13, i.e. the opposite corner of no. 11 to the west, on a plot whose width is some 6.5m.

c) Proposal Details
• two storey side extension, with rearward projections beyond original rear elevation of no.11, to form a two storey dwellinghouse (6 habitable rooms)
• rearward projections would take form of a single storey component abutting the present single storey extension at no. 11 (2.5m deep by 2.85m wide) and a two storey component adjoining this single storey extension (same depth but 3.5m wide). Behind the two storey component there would be another single storey extension (3m deep and 3.5m wide)
• two parking spaces, one at front and one at rear (latter would have adjacent space to north-east, to serve the present house: does not need planning permission)
• rear garden at least 120m² with minimum depth of 15m
• areas of planting possible at front, side and rear; with refuse bin location specified

continued/
Item 2/11 - EAST/332/02/FUL continued.....

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAR/6318</th>
<th>Erection of ground floor bedroom</th>
<th>GRANTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13-MAY-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR/6318/B</td>
<td>Extension to kitchen and dining room at rear</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31-DEC-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Applicant’s Statement

- This development is a mirror image of development at 13A Camrose Avenue
  (approved 19/11/1999 - ref. EAST/895/99/FUL)
- Site has advantage of being marginally wider than 13A and abuts a full pavement at
  its south-western side
- Existing house has a parking space at the rear
- New property retains forecourt parking with a second space at rear
- Change of Government policy supporting such housing gains as this in-fill
- current works on foundations and services do not require planning approval

f) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 + petition of 20 signatures</td>
<td>03-MAY-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Would create a terrace effect; adverse impact on visual amenity; out of
character; does not incorporate a set-back at its upper facade and does not propose
a subordinate roof, i.e. contrary to relevant guidelines; out of scale; over
development; inadequate parking; concerned about "cross linkages" with No. 9;
ownership declaration (Certificate A) is not correct; would reduce value of No. 9;
construction works are being pursued without the necessary permissions;
insufficient information on present works of construction; objection to access
parking; inconvenience

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of streetscene

The proposed development is similar to a house constructed at 13 Camrose Avenue
during the last three years. Such schemes are compatible with planning policies and
 guidance that seek to provide more dwellings.

2) Residential Amenity

The proposed building has been designed to comply with the relevant guidelines in
terms of its relationship to the adjoining house. It is not considered that it would harm
the amenities of the existing house at No.11. Its associated open amenity space is
satisfactory; its rear garden would meet the Council's standards.
3) Parking
Proposals are satisfactory; they incorporate space for forecourt landscaping and satisfactory access.

4) Consultation Responses
The issues of character have been addressed above. Design 'set-backs' at the upper façade of corner houses are not required normally. The present works of construction are being monitored by the Council's Planning Enforcement Officers and the matter of the ownership Certificate has been 'corrected' by the applicant's agent.

The linkages to no.9 are Building Control matters. The parking issue has been addressed above. The informative relating to the ‘Considerate Contractor’ code of practice is being recommended in the context of matters concerned with inconvenience. There is sufficient information to determine this application.
BROOKSLEE, 7 BROOKSHILL DRIVE, HARROW

TWO STOREY SIDE/REAR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS TO ROOF WITH REAR DORMER, FRONT PORCH, WALL AND GATES AT FRONT (REVISED)

KJM TODD ASSOCIATES LTD FOR MR M HARRYMAN

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 2708-JM-02D; 06 and site plan rec'd 18-APR-2002

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. 2708-JM-02D 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. Landscaping to be Approved
5. Landscaping to be Implemented
6. 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 development which would otherwise fall within Class E in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
   REASON: To safeguard the character and appearance of the Green Belt.

INFORMATIVES:

1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3. Standard Informative 36 - Measurements from Submitted Plans
4. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E4, E6, E8, E10 (Revised), E11 (Revised), E45), (SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4, D5)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character
2) Residential Amenity
3) Consultation Responses

continued/
INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E4, E6, E8, E10 (Revised), E11 (Revised), E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SEP5, SEP6, SD1, EP32, EP33, EP34, D4, D5
Area of Special Character: Green Belt

b) Site Description
- detached house on southern side of Brookshill Drive with flat roofed two storey side/rear extension (recently demolished) and part crown roof
- Newlands, a detached house to the immediate east, has a recessed building line and projects beyond the rear of Brookslee
- the front of the site abuts the boundary of the Brookshill Drive Conservation Area
- within the Green Belt and Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character

c) Proposal Details
- replacement two storey side/rear extension with pitched roof over and raising of main roof to remove crown and rear dormer
- front porch
- wall and gates at front a maximum of 1m high
- some works have commenced on site, including the demolition of the two storey flat roofed side/rear extension and internal alterations to the property together with resurfacing of the front garden in accordance with the previous permission
- the table below sets out changes to footprint, floorspace and volume compared to the original, existing and recently approved building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Approved Scheme</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Total % increase of proposed over original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Footprint (m²)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floorspace (m²)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (m³)</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Relevant History
HAR/4194 Erection of garage with bedroom over GRANTED 15-NOV-50
HAR/4194/B Erection of first floor bathroom and store GRANTED 07-MAY-56
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APPRAISAL

1) Green Belt and Area of Special Character
The UDP's Policy E11, as amended in the context of the revised PPG2 (Green Belts), recognises that extensions to houses in the Green Belt can be acceptable: provided they minimise environmental impact on its character and are appropriate in terms of height, bulk, site coverage and proximity to a site's boundaries. Such extensions must not result in disproportionate additions, over and above the size of the original dwelling.

The permission granted in March 2002 allowed for improvements to the property as previously extended without substantially further increasing its size. The new extensions were not considered to be obtrusive or detrimental to openness. They were not considered to be disproportionate or inappropriate.

The current proposal differs from the approved scheme by the addition of a rear dormer. Whilst this suggests a large increase in floorspace over the previous proposal, in fact the floorspace already exists within the roof void but is not counted as usable floorspace. The only visible increase is to the volume of the building by virtue of the dormer window itself. In terms of the openness of the Green Belt this would have no impact and not give rise to any harm notwithstanding the overall increases in percentage terms over the original building.

2) Residential Amenity
The extensions proposed are not considered to detract from the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. Newlands, the adjoining property to the east, has a recessed building line and would not be affected. The rear dormer would accord with the Council's general design guidance and not give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

3) Consultation Responses
None
THE CASTLE P.H, 30 WEST STREET, HARROW ON THE HILL

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION IN THE FORM OF GLAZED COVERED WAY WITHIN YARD AREA

CUBE LTD FOR FULLER SMITH & TURNER PLC

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1676/01

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. Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building

INFORMATIVES:
1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E38), (SD1, D5, D16, D17, D18)

REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building.

continued/
3 The new position for the small drinks shelf to the Saloon Bar shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works on site.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building.

4 The hatch door in the glazed screen between Front Bar and Saloon Bar shall be reinstated prior to the commencement of works on site.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building.

5 All demolition work to create new or enlarged internal openings shall be carried out by hand tools or by tools held in the hand, other than power driven tools.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building.

6 All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric, whether internal or external, shall be finished to match the adjacent work with regard to the methods used, and to materials, colour, texture and profile.
REASON: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the Listed Building.

INFORMATIVES:
1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E34), (D12)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character of a Listed Building
2) Character of the Conservation Area
3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E6, E34, E38
SD1, D5, D12, D16, D17, D18

Grade II Listed Building
Conservation Area: Harrow on the Hill Village

b) Site Description
- public house located on the southern side of West Street at the junction with Crown Street
- the building is Listed Grade II and lies within the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area
- the application relates to an enclosed yard area, inaccessible to the public

continued/
Items 2/13 & 2/14 - WEST/415/02/FUL & WEST/414/02/LBC continued....

bb) Listed Building Description
- The Castle Public House is an exuberant red brick Edwardian building of 1901, which retains a number of exterior decorative features such as engraved window glass, false marble columns and leaded windows. The interior too has a number of interesting retained features, including a saloon bar with a glazed timber screen containing low doorway; cast-iron fire insert in south wall, central timber bar with glass racks and rear mirror plain public bar to west, with a cast-iron fire insert below a mirror, and a billiard room with Lincrusta replica linenfold panelling and timber fire surround.

c) Proposal Details
- permission is sought to construct a glazed link measuring 4.3m in width and 1.3m in depth
- the link would afford sheltered access from one part of the building to another

c) Listed Building Proposal Details
- internal alterations to service areas to create better provision of lavatories, including disabled lavatory
- creation of a glazed covered way within enclosed rear yard to provide access to disabled lavatory
- creation of new doorway access to ladies lavatory from Snug
- re-opening of hatch between front Bar and Snug and installation of sash window therein
- repair and upgrade of doors and windows to Bar areas

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEST/78/01/LBC</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent: Internal alterations to enlarge toilets and create utility area, formation of ramp to side entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/415/02/FUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Consultations
- CAAC: No objection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>Character of Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications</td>
<td>Sent 3 Replies 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/414/02/LBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>Alteration/Extension to a Listed Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifications</td>
<td>Sent 2 Replies 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 57 -
APPRAISAL

1) Character of a Listed Building
The Castle Public House has been listed as a good example of its relatively complete and unaltered bar features and decorations, including the substantial glazed mahogany screen and lincrusta wallpaper to the rear room. The proposed internal alterations are concentrated in the rear, undecorated service rooms of the building and would have a minimal impact on the areas of special character. The proposed glazed walkway, likewise, is in a service yard, and would have no impact on the special character of the building. It would be in timber and of an appropriate design to complement original work within the building.

The two new doorways to the ladies lavatory, from the Snug and the Saloon Bar would be appropriately detailed, with doors and fanlights to match existing original work in the property. The new sash window between Snug and front Bar is to be inserted in a reinstated hatch opening between the two, and will be appropriately detailed.

Minor repairs and upgrading to windows, doors, bar hatch and the hatch door in the mahogany screen are to be welcomed. Repair of the hatch door to the mahogany screen, has recently sustained minor accidental damage, and has been temporarily removed, should be secured by condition.

The new position for the small drinks shelf to be relocated to accommodate the enlarged doorway from the Saloon Bar should be reserved by condition.

2) Character of the Conservation Area
The covered way would be within an enclosed yard area and would have no impact outside the site. It is concluded that the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

3) Consultation Responses
None
79 EVELYN DRIVE, PINNER

CONSERVATORY AT REAR

MR D J HUMPHRIES FOR MS D GRAY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Plan received 19-FEB-2002

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 east flank elevation of the conservatory hereby approved shall be fitted with solid fixed panels and shall thereafter be retained in that form. REASON: To safeguard the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents.
4. Completed Development – Conservation Area - Buildings

INFORMATIVES
1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E45), (SD1, D4, D5, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Impact on Conservation Area
2) Impact on Neighbours
3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D17
Conservation Area: Pinnerwood Park Estate

b) Site Description
- semi-detached dwelling on southern side of Evelyn Drive
- Evelyn Drive is a residential road within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details
- rear conservatory extending 2.77m in depth x 5m in width located to rear of lounge and breakfast area
- dwarf brick wall with timber doors and window frames and surround

continued/
d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/36978</td>
<td>Two storey side to rear extension</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>21-NOV-1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/704/94/FUL</td>
<td>Two storey side to rear and single storey rear extensions</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>22-DEC-1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for refusal:
"The proposed extensions, by reason of their siting, design and bulk, would unbalance the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings and would have a detrimental impact on local visual amenity which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area."
APPEAL DISMISSED 05-OCT-95

e) Consultations

CAAC: No objection; but CAAC queried how do the side walls work with glazing when against neighbours fence and existing kitchen

Advertisement
Character of Conservation Area
Expiry 21-MAR-2002

Notifications
Sent 2
Replies 0
Expiry 13-MAR-2002

APPRAISAL

1) Impact on Conservation Area

Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Boroughs Conservation Areas. The proposed conservatory is of a simple design employing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. As such the proposal would preserve the character of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) Impact on Neighbours

The proposal would only extend to 2.77m in depth adjacent to the boundary to the adjoining dwelling. This would more than comply with the Council's guidelines for such proposals and would neither appear overbearing nor result in loss of light. There are no flank windows on the elevation facing the adjoining dwelling and no overlooking nor loss of privacy would result.

3) Consultation Responses

None
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 630/02, 630/03

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

INFORMATIVES:
1. Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
3. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E45), (SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E38, E45,
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17
TPO
Listed Building: Not Listed
Conservation Area: Sudbury Hill
Car Parking: Standard

b) Site Description
- detached dwelling in residential cul-de-sac of 6 dwellings
- the house is of a relatively modern design being erected in 1970
- Sudbury Hill Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details
- erection of conservatory at the rear
- the proposed conservatory would be located centrally on the rear of the property extending 3 - 4.3m in depth

continued/
d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/4199</td>
<td>Erection of 15 detached houses and garage with access road (Outline)</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>28-AUG-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/4199/1</td>
<td>Erection of 12 detached houses and garages with access road</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>10-DEC-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/4199/2</td>
<td>Erection of 2 detached houses and garage (revised details for Plots Nos. 6 and 12)</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>02-SEP-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/10024</td>
<td>Erection of single storey side extension to dwellinghouse</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>21-MAY-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Consultations

- CAAC: Awaited

**Advertisement**

- Character of Conservation Area  
  Expiry: 13-JUN-2002

**Notifications**

- Sent: 4  
- Replies: 0  
  Expiry: 04-JUN-2002

**APPRAISAL**

1) **Character and appearance of the Conservation Area**

   Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. This part of the Sudbury Hill Conservation Area is characterised by modern dwellings erected in the 1970's. While the use of UPVC frames and glazing bars would normally be resisted elsewhere in this Conservation Area, their use is considered acceptable in this location. The proposed conservatory is relatively modest in scale and sufficient space would remain around it as a setting for the dwelling and for usable amenity space. In conclusion the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) **Consultation Responses**

   None
EXTENSION OF FRONT DRIVE

R KUKADIA

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1.5

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) Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building

INFORMATIVES

1) Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2) Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E5, E6, E30, E38, E39, E45), (S1, SD1, SD2, D5, D9, D16, D17, D18)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Impact on character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Impact on amenities of neighbouring occupiers
3) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E5, E6, E30, E38, E39, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, SD2, D5, D9, D16, D17, D18
Conservation Area: Pinnerwood Park Estate

b) Site Description
- semi-detached dwelling within Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area
- existing single driveway to garage and front porch crazy paved
- Article 4 direction controls provision and alteration of hardsurfacing

c) Proposal Details
- modest extension to driveway (1m² approx.) in crazy paving

d) Relevant History
None

continued/
Item 2/17 - WEST/448/02/FUL continued.....

e) Consultations

CAAC: Minimal extension: No objection. No change of materials envisaged, otherwise materials must be confirmed.

Advertisement
Development affecting the character and appearance of a Conservation Area
Expiry 06-JUN-02

Notifications
Sent 2
Replies 0
Expiry 24-MAY-02

APPRAISAL

1) Impact and character and appearance of the Conservation Area
The proposal would have minimal impact on the half of the front garden that is soft landscaped. Crazy paving is an acceptable form of hardsurfacing in this Conservation Area. There would be no perceptible loss of forecourt greenery in this part of Evelyn Drive and, accordingly, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

2) Impact on amenities of neighbouring occupiers
The proposal would have no material impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.

3) Consultation Responses
None
91 PINNER HILL ROAD, PINNER

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: Elevations received 07-MAR-2002, details received 27-MAY-2002 (2 sheets)

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 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E45), (SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E38, E45
 Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17
 Conservation Area: Pinnerwood Park Estate

b) Site Description
• semi-detached dwelling located at the junction of Pinner Hill Road and Latimer Gardens
• Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area

c) Proposal Details
• replace existing plastic windows with wooden framed windows on the front side and rear elevations

continued/
Item 2/18 - WEST/150/02/FUL continued.....

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/3969/1</td>
<td>Single storey rear extension</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>14-OCT-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/25696</td>
<td>Single storey rear extension</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>18-JUN-84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Consultations

CAAC: Feel that timber windows should be used as this would enhance the Conservation Areas character

Advertisement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of Conservation Area</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-APR-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01-APR-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPRAISAL

1) Character and appearance of Conservation Area

Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. The existing windows, which are of plastic, are of poor quality and detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and this part of the Conservation Area. The proposal to replace these with timber framed windows is therefore welcomed as these would enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling and therefore that of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) Consultation Responses

Concern regarding inappropriate materials - the applicant has now revised his proposals to use wooden frames instead of UPVC
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 02/1125 and Site Plan

GRANT permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the receipt of no further material objections by 27-JUN-2002 and 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  Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building

INFORMATIVES
1  Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2  Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
3  Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E38, E45), (SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1)  Character of the Conservation Area
2)  Impact on Neighbours
3)  Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a)  Summary
   UDP Key Policies: E38, E45
   Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17
   Conservation Area: Pinnerwood Park Estate

b)  Site Description
   • semi-detached dwelling in a residential road characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached dwellings
   • Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area

continued/
Item 2/19 - WEST/465/02/FUL continued.....

c) **Proposal Details**
- rear conservatory extending to a maximum of 3.05m in depth, 1.8m in depth adjacent to the boundary of no. 11
- brick base with hardwood window frames and glazing bars

d) **Relevant History**
WEST/109/00/FUL  Removal of door in flank elevation and infilling with brickwork and relocation of fence to side of property.

GRANTED  17-MAR-2000

e) **Consultations**
CAAC  Conservatory should be hardwood.  Question impact on neighbour.  Perhaps over fussy in design.

**Advertisement**  Character of Conservation Area  Expiry  27-JUN-2002

**Notifications**  Sent  2  Replies  0  Expiry  30-MAY-2002

APPRAISAL

1) **Character and Appearance of Conservation Area**
Policy E38 of the UDP stresses the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. The proposed conservatory would only extend across part of the rear elevation of the dwelling and is of a traditional design and of material which would be sympathetic to the appearance of the property. The proposal would therefore preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) **Impact on Neighbours**
The Council's supplementary guidance indicates that the Council will normally grant planning permission for single storey extensions on semi-detached dwellings of up to 3m in depth adjacent to the boundary to an adjoining dwelling. The proposal would only extend 1.8m in depth adjacent to the boundary of no.11 and would therefore more than comply with the guidance. No undue loss of light would occur. There are only high level flank windows on the elevation facing no.11 and no overlooking nor loss of privacy would result.

3) **Consultation Responses**
Conservatory should be hardwood:  a condition to require approval of all materials is proposed
Perhaps over fussy in design  the applicant has now submitted a revised scheme showing a simpler, less decorative design
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1, 3(b)

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

1) Time Limit - Full Permission
2) 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:
   (b) the ground surfacing
   The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be retained.
   REASON: To safeguard the appearance of the locality.
3) Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building

INFORMATIVES

1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
3 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E5, E6, E30, E38, E39), (S1, SD1, SD2, D16, D17, D18, D9)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Impact on character and appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Impact on amenities of neighbouring occupiers
3) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary
   UDP Key Policies: E5, E6, E30, E38, E39
   Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SD1, SD2, D16, D17, D18, D9
   Conservation Area: Pinnerwood Park Estate

b) Site Description
   • semi-detached property within Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area
   • existing single width driveway to garage and porch - 3.6m wide crossover in tarmac and slabs
   • Article 4 direction controls resurfacing and extensions to driveways

continued/
c) **Proposal Details**
- extension to existing driveway 8m² approx. and resurfacing in tarmac
- crossover width of 3.6m would be retained
- remainder of front garden to be soft landscaped as existing

d) **Relevant History**
None

e) **Consultations**
- **CAAC:** Object: Loss of soft landscaping and increase in hardsurfacing. Potential threat to a Cypress tree and to large local authority grass verge on street
- **Advertisement** Development affecting the character and appearance of a Conservation Area
  Expiry 11-APR-02
- **Notifications**
  Sent 2  Replies 0  Expiry 03-APR-02

**APPRAISAL**

1) **Impact on character and appearance of the Conservation Area**
The proposal, as amended, would not increase the width of the crossover and would only begin to increase the width of the driveway at a distance of 1.1m behind the front boundary. The extent of hardsurfacing would be consistent with others in this locality and the remaining front garden (approximately half of the total) would be soft landscaped.

It is not considered that there would be any unacceptable loss of forecourt greenery in the streetscene. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

2) **Impact on amenities of neighbouring occupiers**
The proposal would have no material impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.

3) **Consultation Responses**
The proposal has been amended since CAAC considered the application: the amount of hardsurfacing has been decreased and there is now no increase in the width of the crossover that would reduce the grass verge or bring hardsurfacing any nearer to the street Cypress tree.
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: PC4689, Site Plan

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

1 Time Limit - Full Permission
2 Materials to Match
3 The window(s) in the north east 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 Completed Dev't - Conservation Area - Building

INFORMATIVES:
1 Standard Informative 23 - Considerate Contractor Code of Practice
2 Standard Informative 32 - The Party Wall etc. Act 1996
3 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E38, E45), (SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17, D18)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS
1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
2) Amenity of Neighbours
3) Consultation Response

INFORMATION

a) Summary
UDP Key Policies: E6, E38, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D16, D17, D18
Conservation Area: Roxborough Park and The Grove

b) Site Description
• detached two storey house located on Lansdowne Road facing Grove Hill
• the house is set on its own between the rear garden boundaries of houses on Whitehall Road and Lowlands Road
• the property is located within the Roxborough Park and The Grove Conservation Area

continued/
c) Proposal Details
• construction of a conservatory to the rear of the house
• the conservatory would measure 3.82m in depth and 3.7m in width

d) Relevant History
None

e) Consultations
CAAC: No objection

Advertisement

Character of Conservation Area  Expiry

23-MAY-2002

Notifications

Sent  Replies  Expiry

6  0  14-MAY-2002

APPRAISAL

1) Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area
The proposed conservatory would be of a simple lean-to design which would match an existing single storey rear element. The proposal would be set between this and a wall which flanks the patio. It is considered that the form and scale of the proposal are acceptable and that the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

2) Amenity of Neighbours
The north-west flank wall of the proposal would be sited approximately 1.6m from the rear garden boundary of houses on Lowlands Road. This would involve a length of 1.6m beyond the existing patio wall. Subject to a condition requiring obscure glazing it is considered that there would be no undue impact in this regard.

3) Consultation Response
None
GREYLANDS, 47 WELLINGTON ROAD, HATCH END, 

CHANGE OF USE: RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME TO GUEST HOUSE (CLASS C2 TO C1) 

THE DRAWING ROOM FOR LIBERTY DEVELOPMENTS LTD C/O 

RECOMMENDATION 

Plan Nos: SK1, unnumbered site location plan received 07-FEB-2002 

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

1. The proposal represents an inappropriate use on a non-secondary residential road, by reason of more transient occupation of the premises leading to increased and more intermittent patterns of activity, to the detriment of the quiet residential character of this part of Wellington Road and contrary to Policy H16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan. 

2. The proposal would be likely to lead to increased parking and vehicular activity on the highway within the vicinity of the site, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential property, contrary to Policy H16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994). 

INFORMATIVES 


MAIN CONSIDERATIONS 

1) Impact on residential character 
2) Loss of residential care home 
3) Parking and amenity 
4) Consultation responses 

INFORMATION 

a) Summary 

UDP Key Policies: E6, E46, E51, H10, H16, T13, R25, R26 
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SR2, EP25, D4, T13, R16, R17 
TPO 
Car Parking 

Standard: 10 
Justified: 10 
Provided: 5 

continued/
Item 3/01 - WEST/149/02/FUL continued.....

b) Site Description
• two storey extended building on north eastern side of Wellington Road adjacent to Wellington Avenue
• forecourt hardsurfaced - five parking spaces provided
• no on-street parking restrictions

c) Proposal Details
• change of use from residential care home to guest home
• 15 bedrooms to provide 30 bed spaces

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/36319</td>
<td>Change of use from private dwelling house to residential home for the elderly with parking and access</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>21-NOV-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/40685</td>
<td>Outline: Single storey rear and first floor side extension to residential home for the elderly to provide three additional rooms, garage at side and parking</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>06-AUG-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/41588</td>
<td>Details pursuant to outline permission LBH/4065 dated 6/8/90 for single storey rear, first floor side extension to residential home for the elderly to provide 3 additional rooms, garage at side and parking</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>13-DEC-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/165/95/FUL</td>
<td>Single storey side extension to provide 2 additional single bedrooms to care home and revised parking layout and access</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>18-JUL-95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Applicant’s Statement
Need for small guest houses with access to public transport and London distributor roads. Council policies support need for guest house/hotel accommodation. Would be suited to business and domestic visitors. Premises not licensed and no function room exists/provided. Large scale conference/banqueting not appropriate for building or intended clientele. Adopted standard would limit rooms to 8, new plan would allow 15 rooms proposed without increase in parking. Unlikely that care home facility will continue: alternatives therefore needed. Proposal is preferable to alternatives that could be implemented without planning permission.

f) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40 + 2 petitions of 124 signatures</td>
<td>30-MAY-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued/
Response: Detrimental to character of quiet residential area, increased activity, increased vehicle movements, increased turning due to cul-de-sac location, loss of residential care home contrary to demand, permitted change to hostel, loss of property value, increase population, Council’s parking standard require at least 10 spaces but can’t be provided on site, poor public transport, increased noise, would attract undesirable transient population, precedent for other properties, intensification of commercial use, impediment to emergency vehicles, loss of security and safety, no need, risk of flooding, not informed through official channels, inspection report for existing home good, existing visitor levels low, would become house of multiple occupation, traffic hazard at junction, low activity levels from care home use, increase in late and early morning activity, contrary to Policy R25.

Hatch End Association: Detrimental to quality of this residential area, increased traffic and on-street parking, contrary to policies, greater demand for elderly care home, noise and disturbance to neighbours.

APPRAISAL

1) Impact on residential character
The proposal falls foul of adopted UDP Policy H16, which requires *inter alia* that hotels/guest houses be located on a secondary road within or near local/district centres. Revised Deposit Draft UDP Policy R17, in seeking to encourage hotel and guest accommodation, directs such uses to secondary roads close to town centres but undertakes to give consideration to suitable sites and areas well served by public transport and recognises that conversions should respect the character and amenity of the locality.

The Revised Deposit Draft UDP identifies Hatch End as an area of low public transport accessibility. Although the application property is already converted from a single family dwellinghouse and is located within walking distance of Hatch End Local Centre, it is nevertheless sited within an established, quiet residential area and not on a secondary road. It is considered that the proposed use would be substantially greater in intensity than that of the existing care home, and would by its nature and size introduce a more transient (less residential) level of activity, which would be significant. Such a situation would be detrimental to the residential character of the locality, contrary to Policy H16 and revised Draft R17.

2) Loss of residential care home
There is no policy presumption against the loss of residential care home spaces. The Residential Care Home Standard Commission has advised that there are 27 registered care homes in Harrow providing 553 bedspaces, compared with 19 homes in Ealing providing 460 spaces.

3) Parking and amenity
The existing premises generate a standard minimum requirement, based on 15 registered bedspaces, of 5 parking spaces, as adopted, and no set standard (but a restraint based approach to be demonstrated) in respect of the Revised Deposit Draft UDP. The proposal would generate a standard minimum requirement for staff and visitors of 10 spaces, as adopted, and no set standard (but a maximum of 3 spaces for residential customers) in respect of the Revised Deposit Draft UDP.
The Council's Highway Engineer is happy that the standard shortfall of 5 spaces would not prejudice highway safety and that, having regard to central Government advice, a refusal emanating from a failure to adherence strictly to parking standards could not be sustained.

It is likely that the existing care home use generates some level of vehicular and general activity over and above that which might otherwise occur from a single family dwellinghouse, particularly by visitors during evenings and weekends. As noted above, however, it is considered that the proposed guest house use would significantly alter and increase levels of activity within the vicinity of the site. Similarly with parking, whilst no in-principle objection to a shortfall in the adopted parking standard could be sustained, it is recognised that on-street parking activity is likely to be concentrated and with increased vehicle movements at certain times as a result of the proposal, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the character of this residential locality.

Noise from amplified sound could, were the proposal acceptable, be controlled by condition.

4) Consultation responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted change to hostel</th>
<th>- hostels sui generis - no permitted change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of property value</td>
<td>- not a material consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precedent for other properties</td>
<td>- each application to be considered on its own merits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impediment to emergency vehicles</td>
<td>- unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of security and safety</td>
<td>- unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no need</td>
<td>- Council's UDP acknowledges need for hotels and guest houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of flooding</td>
<td>- unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not informed through official channels</td>
<td>- consultations carried out in accordance with Council guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection report for existing home good</td>
<td>- not a material consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would become house of multiple occupation</td>
<td>- subject to planning control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic hazard at junction</td>
<td>- no material deterioration likely to arise from proposal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: SK1, unnumbered site location plan received 01-MAY-02

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

1. The proposal represents an inappropriate use on a non-secondary residential road, by reason of more transient occupation of the premises leading to increased and more intermittent patterns of activity, to the detriment of the quiet residential character of this part of Wellington Road and contrary to Policy H16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).

2. The proposal would be likely to lead to increased parking and vehicular activity on the highway within the vicinity of the site, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential property, contrary to Policy H16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (1994).

INFORMATIVES


MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Impact on residential character
2) Loss of residential care home
3) Parking and amenity
4) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E46, E51, H10, H16, T13, R25, R26
Deposit UDP Key Policies: S1, SR2, EP25, D4, T13, R16, R17
TPO
Car Parking
Standard: 10
Justified: 10
Provided: 5

continued/
b) Site Description
- two storey extended building on north east side of Wellington Road, Hatch End; adjacent to Wellington Avenue
- forecourt hardsurfaced - five parking spaces provided
- no on-street parking restrictions

c) Proposal Details
- change of use from residential care home to guest home
- 15 bedrooms to provide 30 bed spaces

d) Relevant History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LBH/36319</td>
<td>Change of use from private dwelling house to residential home for the elderly with parking and access</td>
<td>GRANTED 21-NOV-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/40685</td>
<td>Outline: Single storey rear and first floor side extension to residential home for the elderly to provide three additional rooms, garage at side and parking</td>
<td>GRANTED 06-AUG-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/41588</td>
<td>Details pursuant to outline permission LBH/4065 dated 6/8/90 for single storey rear, first floor side extension to residential home for the elderly to provide 3 additional rooms, garage at side and parking</td>
<td>APPROVED 13-DEC-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST/165/95/FUL</td>
<td>Single storey side extension to provide 2 additional single bedrooms to care home and revised parking layout and access</td>
<td>GRANTED 18-JUL-95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Applicant’s Statement
Need for small guest houses with access to public transport and London distributor roads. Council policies support need for guest house/hotel accommodation. Would be suited to business and domestic visitors. Premises not licensed and no function room exists/provided. Large scale conference/banqueting not appropriate for building or intended clientele. Adopted standard would limit rooms to 8, new plan would allow 15 rooms proposed without increase in parking. Unlikely that care home facility will continue: alternatives therefore needed. Proposal is preferable to alternatives that could be implemented without planning permission.

f) Notifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>23 + petition of 112 signatures</td>
<td>30-MAY-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response: Traffic, congestion, noise + disturbance, inadequate parking, out of character in established residential area, precedent, no demand, loss of residential care home, elderly less active, few visitors to existing home, professional visits during daytime, short term transient population, should revert to dwelling, inappropriate to cul-de-sac location, security and safety, add to pressure from restaurants, contrary to Council policy, adverse social effects, precedent for other hotels, inadequate notification.

continued/
APPRAISAL

1) Impact on residential character
The proposal falls foul of adopted UDP Policy H16, which requires *inter alia* that hotels/guest houses be located on a secondary road within or near local/district centres. Revised Deposit Draft UDP Policy R17, in seeking to encourage hotel and guest accommodation, prefers such uses on secondary roads close to town centres but undertakes to give consideration to suitable sites and areas well served by public transport and recognises that conversions should respect the character and amenity of the locality.

The Revised Deposit Draft UDP identifies Hatch End as an area of low public transport accessibility. Although the application property is already converted from a single family dwellinghouse and is located within walking distance of Hatch End Local Centre, it is nevertheless sited within an established, quiet residential area and not on a secondary road. It is considered that the proposed use would be substantially greater in intensity than that of the existing care home, and would by its nature and size introduce a more transient (less residential) level of activity, which would be significant. Such a situation would be detrimental to the residential character of the locality, contrary to Policy H16 and revised Draft R17.

2) Loss of residential care home
There is no policy presumption against the loss of residential care home spaces. The Residential Care Home Standard Commission has advised that there are 27 registered care homes in Harrow providing 553 bedspaces, compared with 19 homes in Ealing providing 460 spaces.

3) Parking and amenity
The existing premises generate a standard minimum requirement, based on 15 registered bedspaces, of 5 parking spaces, as adopted, and no set standard (but a restraint based approach to be demonstrated) in respect of the Revised Deposit Draft UDP. The proposal would generate a standard minimum requirement for staff and visitors of 10 spaces, as adopted, and no set standard (but a maximum of 3 spaces for residential customers) in respect of the Revised Deposit Draft UDP.

The Council's Highway Engineer is happy that the standard shortfall of 5 spaces would not prejudice highway safety and that, having regard to central Government advice, a refusal emanating from a failure to adherence strictly to parking standards could not be sustained.

continued/
Item 3/02 - WEST/406/02/FUL continued.....

It is likely that the existing care home use generates some level of vehicular and general activity over and above that which might otherwise occur from a single family dwellinghouse, particularly by visitors during evenings and weekends. As noted above, however, it is considered that the proposed guest house use would significantly alter and increase levels of activity within the vicinity of the site. Similarly with parking, whilst no in-principle objection to a shortfall in the adopted parking standard could be sustained, it is recognised that on-street parking activity is likely to be concentrated and with increased vehicle movements at certain times as a result of the proposal, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the character of this residential locality. The proposal is therefore unacceptable on parking grounds.

Noise from amplified sound could, were the proposal acceptable, be controlled by condition.

4) Consultation responses
Precedent: each application to be considered on its own merits
Loss of security and safety: unlikely
No demand: Council's UDP acknowledges need for hotels and guest houses
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RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: A1.11, 12, A2.01, A3.01

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

1. The proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site, by reason of excessive density, site coverage, scale and inadequate space about the building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Roxborough Park Conservation Area, and the setting of the adjacent locally listed buildings.

2. Excessive bulk and depth of building is proposed adjacent to 53 Roxborough Park, resulting in a loss of outlook and light to that property.

3. Noise and disturbance from the ramp to the basement car park would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of 53 Roxborough Park.

4. The scheme does not provide cycle parking facilities in accordance with the Council's standards.

INFORMATIVES

1. INFORMATIVE:
   Notwithstanding the note on your submitted plan(s), this decision has been made on the basis of measurements scaled from the plan(s), unless a dimensioned measurement overrides it.

2. Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E35, E38, E45, T13, H8), (SD1, D4, D5, D13, D17, T13, H5)

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Appearance of area/scale of development
2) Neighbouring amenity
3) Character of Conservation Area/setting of Locally Listed Building
4) Parking/highway issues
5) Consultation Responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E35, E38, E45, T13, H8
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, D13, D17, T13, H5
Car Parking

Standard: 12 (11)
Justified: 9 (9)
Provided: 9 (9)

continued/
Item 3/03 - EAST/533/02/FUL continued.....

Site Area: 1050m²
Habitable Rooms: 23
No. of Residential 8
Density: 219 h.r.p.h

b) Site Description
• vacant site on southern side of Lowlands Road, eastern corner of junction with Roxborough Park
• last used as temporary contractors' compound following previous use by funeral undertakers
• 2-storey house at 53 Roxborough Park adjacent to southern boundary
• locally listed single storey commercial premises at 26-40 Lowlands Road abut eastern boundary
• Roxborough Park and The Grove Conservation Area contiguous with eastern boundary
• Metropolitan railway line on opposite side of Lowlands Road
• site location within Controlled Parking Zone with residents permits for on-street parking
• Harrow Strategic Centre boundary runs along centre of Lowlands Road

c) Proposal Details
• 3-storey building to accommodate 8 flats
• mainly brick elevations at ground/first floors, glazed second floor, flat roof over building
• balconies on corners of building facing Lowlands Road
• ground floor private patio in rear corner of building adjacent to 53 Roxborough Park
• pedestrian entrance from Lowlands Road
• basement car park with 9 spaces, accessed via ramp next to 53 Roxborough Park
• ground floor slightly elevated to allow for ramp
• rear garden depth between 10 and 13m
• rear garden amenity space 175m²
• net density 318 h.r.p.h.

d) Relevant History
EAST/244/00/FUL 2/3 storey building to provide 8 flats (resident permit restricted) with parking at front

GRANTED 08-JUN-00

e) Applicant’s Statement
• seeks to establish close relationship to character of Conservation Area in terms of form and material expression
• provide necessary and attractive frontage to Lowlands Road in harmony with adjacent single storey buildings
• site coverage follows curved form of Lowlands Road creating conclusion to building line
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Item 3/03 - EAST/533/02/FUL continued.....

- clear break between single storey buildings and proposal
- building depth and bulk in no way hinders outlook from adjacent property
- balconies do not overlook neighbouring gardens
- provide housing that relates sympathetically to Conservation Area while forming strong visual presence to this prominent site
- does not turn blank façade to Lowlands Road but seeks to address both street and corner successfully

f) Consultations
EA: No comments
CAAC: Question overbearing relationship with adjoining house. Would like a drawing showing street elevation including locally listed shops. However, design generally considered an improvement on that previously granted.

Advertisement
Character/appearance of Conservation Area Expiry

Notifications
Sent Replies Expiry
14 1 31-MAY-02

Response: Concern regarding impact of building works on neighbouring property; increased traffic flow should not make road or corner more dangerous.

APPRAISAL

1) Appearance of area/scale of development
It is considered overall that this scheme proposes an excessive scale of development and site coverage with building. The proposed density of 219 hrph exceeds the maximum upper limit of 200 hrph in the Replacement UDP. Although an increase in this recommended limit can be allowed for on sites near Harrow Town Centre, it is considered that the higher density proposed in this scheme demonstrates overdevelopment of the site due to adverse impacts on neighbouring buildings and the character of the Conservation Area.

It is therefore considered that the appearance of the area would be harmed by the scale of development. In terms of the principle of design, the proposed building is considered to be less mundane and would be an improvement on the design of the previous approval, subject to amendments to size and siting.

2) Neighbouring amenity
The proposed building would project 8.4m beyond the adjacent 2-storied rear wall of no.53 Roxborough Park. Although elements of the building would be cut away to reduce its impact, the 45° code would still be breached, and this would give rise to a loss of outlook and light to the neighbouring property.

continued/
Noise and disturbance would be generated by vehicles using the ramp to the car park, to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

3) **Character of Conservation Area/setting of Locally Listed Building**
Insufficient separation distance would be provided between the proposed building and the adjacent single storey locally listed buildings which also mark the Conservation Area boundary. The greater bulk of the proposed building would thereby be overbearing, detrimental to the setting of the locally listed buildings and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Roxborough Park Conservation Area.

4) **Parking/highway issues**
It is considered that sufficient parking spaces are proposed, given the close proximity of good public transport facilities. An acceptable ramp gradient is proposed. However, no cycle parking provision is shown.

5) **Consultation Responses**

Impact of building works on neighbouring property: this is covered by other legislation
Traffic flow: it is considered that highway safety would not be prejudiced by the proposals
CONTINUED USE OF PROPERTY FOR MIXED USE AS RESIDENTIAL DWELLING AND FOR THE GROOMING OF DOGS

ROBIN BRETHERRICK ASSOCIATES FOR MS DEBBIE JAMES-KIRBY

RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: RAB/02/101, /102

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

1 The dog grooming business, by reason of the activity, noise, traffic and disturbance it generates, is detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring residents.

INFORMATIVE:
1 Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E45, E46, E51, T13), (SD1, D4, D5, T13)

2) The Borough Secretary and Solicitor to the Council be authorised to:

(a) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to S.172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 requiring the steps set out in (3) below in the time period of (4) below;

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

   (i) supply the information through the issue of Notice(s) under S.330 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990;

   and/or

   (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Parking
2) Impact on Neighbouring Residents
3) Consultation responses

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E45, E46, E51, T13
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5, T13
Car Parking

Standard: )
Justified: ) See report
Provided: )

continued/
b) **Site Description**
- No. 91 is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential road characterised by a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings
- to the west the site is bounded by St. Georges Church
- an outbuilding adjacent to the western boundary is being used as a dog grooming business without the benefit of planning permission

c) **Proposal Details**
- continued use of outbuilding adjacent to the western boundary of the site for the purposes of a dog grooming business

d) **Relevant History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAR/23049/A</td>
<td>Erect pair of houses with garages (outline)</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>14-APR-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR/23049</td>
<td>Erect pair of maisonettes 2 garages (outline)</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>14-APR-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/252</td>
<td>Erect pair of semi-detached houses with garages</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>06-JUL-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/252/1</td>
<td>Erect pair of semi-detached houses with garages (revised)</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>25-JAN-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH/252/2</td>
<td>Erect pair of semi-detached houses and garages</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>23-MAR-66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) **Applicant’s Statement**
- a letter was sent to the applicant in 1990 indicating the use as a dog grooming business did not constitute a material change of use
- the business transferred to a shop unit in November 1990 and continued until September 1990
- the business operates Tuesdays to Saturdays at the applicants mothers house
- one other person is employed full time and her husband works part time
- maximum of 10 customers/day
- on average there are 6-8 drop-offs and collections/day
- the outbuilding is located adjacent to the church and is shielded by the main house from the next dwelling and garage
- there is on-street parking available in the road
- if refused permission then this would result in loss of jobs and loss of a local service and the applicant would lose her home
- conditions suggested by the applicant to restrict hours of operation, numbers employed, provision of signage and a personal permission

continued/
Item 3/04 - WEST/122/02/CON continued.....

f) Consultations
CEHO: Awaited

Notifications
Sent  Replies  Expiry
19      5  28-FEB-2002

Response: Inadequate parking, noise and disturbance, dog fouling

APPRAISAL

1) Parking
The Council does not have a parking standard for such a use. Off street parking for up to 2 vehicles is available at the site. Visits to the site have also revealed numerous on street spaces available with close proximity to the premises. In these circumstances it is not considered that a reason for refusal on highway safety grounds could be sustained.

2) Impact on Neighbours
Consultations with neighbours has indicated several areas of concern about the business. These include noise and disturbance from customers arriving in cars, increased dog fouling in the street and noise and disturbance from the dogs barking. While the applicants have suggested various conditions to restrict disturbance to the neighbours it is not considered that these would overcome the problems outlined above. In these circumstances it is considered that planning permission should be refused and enforcement action taken to bring about a cessation of the use.

3) Consultation Responses
Inadequate parking - see above
Dog fouling - see above
Noise and disturbance - see above

ENFORCEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

1.0 Breach of Planning Control
Without planning permission the change of use for mixed use as a residential dwelling and for the grooming of dogs

2.0 Reason for Enforcement
2.1 The dog grooming business, by reason of the activity, noise, traffic and disturbance it generates, is detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring residents.

3.0 Requirements of the Notice
3.1 Cease the use of the site as a dog grooming business

4.0 Time for Compliance
2 months
RECOMMENDATION

Plan Nos: 1884/P/13, 14, 15

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

   1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of excessive bulk and rearward projection, would be unduly obtrusive, result in loss of privacy, light and overshadowing, and would be detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining property.

INFORMATIVE:
Standard Informative 41 - UDP & Deposit Draft UDP Policies & Proposals (E6, E45), (SD1, D4, D5)

2. The Borough Secretary and Solicitor to the Council be authorised to:-

   (a) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to S.172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 requiring the steps set out in (3) below in the time period of (4) below

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

      (i) supply the information required by the Borough Secretary and Solicitor to the Council through the issue of Notices under S.330 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990;

      and/or

      (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

1) Neighbouring Amenity
2) Consultation Responses
3) Other Considerations

INFORMATION

a) Summary

UDP Key Policies: E6, E45
Deposit UDP Key Policies: SD1, D4, D5

continued/
b) **Site Description**
- eastern side of Crofts Avenue on northern corner of junction with Bonnersfield Lane
- end-terraced house with recently built 2-storey side extension and single storey rear extension, with glazed conservatory
- outbuilding at far end of garden

c) **Proposal Details**
- retention of unauthorised glazed conservatory
- 2.750m along boundary with No. 4 Crofts Road, obscure glazing on boundary
- 2.750m width x 2.5m high
- 1.1m high brick plinth with glazing above on all 3 sides

d) **Relevant History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST/776/98/FUL</td>
<td>Single and 2-storey side, single storey rear extensions</td>
<td>GRANTED</td>
<td>18-NOV-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) **Notifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>Replies</th>
<th>Expiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>09-MAY-2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPRAISAL**

1) **Neighbouring Amenity**
Planning permission EAST/776/98/FUL allowed a single storey rear extension with an external depth of 2.4m, in accordance with the relevant guideline in relation to a terraced house. This has been built. The additional conservatory has increased the depth of extension along the boundary with No.4 to 5.150m, substantially in excess of the 2.4m guideline, and this has resulted in an unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring occupiers.

In addition, the obscure glazing along the boundary gives rise to a perceived loss of privacy, to the further detriment of neighbouring amenity. Enforcement action to seek removal of the conservatory is therefore recommended.

2) **Consultation Responses**
None

3) **Other Considerations**
During the processing of application EAST/776/98/FUL, a parapet was deleted above the flank wall of the 2-storey side extension because of the detrimental impact it would have had on the appearance of the area, given its prominent corner location. The approved elevational drawing shows a hipped end roof with no parapet. The extension as built, however, possesses a parapet which is obtrusive, out of character and detrimental to the appearance of the area. Enforcement action to seek its removal is recommended.

continued/
ENFORCEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

1) The Breach of Planning Control

1.1 Without planning permission the construction of a single storey rear extension.

1.2 Without planning permission the construction of a parapet above the flank wall of the 2-storied side extension.

2) Reasons for Enforcement

2.1 The single storey rear extension, by reason of its size, siting and design, conflicts with the Council's guidelines for such development and gives rise to an unacceptable loss of amenity to the neighbouring occupiers.

2.2 The parapet wall, by reason of its design and siting, is obtrusive, unattractive and out of character with the area, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

3) Requirements of the Notice

3.1 Removal of the single storey rear extension and parapet wall and reinstatement of the building in accordance with planning permission ref: EAST/776/98/FUL.