

**Supplementary Information
Planning Committee on 24 February,
2010**

Item No. **4**
Case No. 09/2229

Location Jubilee Heights, Shoot Up Hill & Cedar Lodge, Exeter Road, London, NW2 3UL
Description Erection of 1 x 10-storey north-flank extension and 1 x 7-storey south-flank extension to existing building and 1 x 4-storey building over existing car park and vehicular accesses, all totalling 21 x 2-bedroom self-contained flats, provision of 10 cycle spaces, raised garden deck and associated works to existing car-parking and landscaped amenity spaces (as accompanied by Design & Access Statement, Daylight & Sunlight report, SAP Calculations & Compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 report, Background Noise Survey)

Agenda Page Number: 19

Withdrawal:

This application was withdrawn by the applicant's agent on 19 February 2010.

Further submission (petition):

Subsequent to the drafting of the report, a petition was received from 15 parties objecting to the scheme. The petition reiterated previous objections and requested the Committee to uphold the recommendations of Planning Officers.

Recommendation:

The application has been withdrawn. The Planning Committee are asked whether, on the information available, they would have supported the recommendation to refuse.

DocSuppF

**Supplementary Information
Planning Committee on 24 February,
2010**

Item No. **5**
Case No. 09/2562

Location 11 Mentmore Close, Harrow, HA3 0EA
Description Erection of a single- and two-storey rear extension and a first-floor side extension to the dwellinghouse (as per revised plans received on 10/02/2010)

Agenda Page Number: 37

Additional comments and objections

Further comments have been received from No. 9 Mentmore Close. They have requested for the application to be deferred from tonight's Planning Committee meeting, as they have not had an opportunity to review the amendments made to the scheme during the course of the application. In response to this request, your officers are of the view that as the amendments have reduced the depth of the rear extension, patio and width of the first-floor rear extension, any impact upon the neighbouring properties has been reduced, and thus there was not a need to reconsult. As such, it is not considered necessary to defer the

application.

Councillor Colwill has also raised additional objections on the following grounds:

Inappropriate relationship to other buildings

As referred to in the remarks section the extension is not considered to adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Alter the character of the house

The amount and style of extension that is proposed is not unusual throughout the Conservation Area. The extension is of a scale that is subservient to the main dwellinghouse.

Alter the roof lines

The proposal will not alter the roof line of the main house. The roof of the first-floor side and rear extension will be lower than the main roof and will match the pitch angle of the main roof.

Clarification of intended use

Councillor Steele has queried the purpose of the extensions and the intended use of the house. There is no indication from the application form or plans that the intended use of the property is other than a single family dwellinghouse.

Inaccuracies within the main Committee Report

Your officers would like to highlight a typing error within the penultimate paragraph of Page 40. The first-floor rear extension will only project out by 2.4m from the window at No. 9 Mentmore Close, rather than "7 2.4m".

Inaccuracies within the revised plans

The revised plan shows a covered area behind the garage on the ground-floor plan but not on the elevations. The covered area is also not included in the description of the development. Your officers recommend that a condition is included to exclude this covered area from the scheme. The wording of the condition is provided below:

Additional Condition 9

Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted drawing MENC11/2 Rev B, this application does not grant permission for the covered area to the rear of the garage as detailed on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan.

Reason: In the absence of sufficient information to assess the implications of such a feature and in the interests of the amenities of the neighbouring occupants.

Comments from Borough Solicitor

The Borough Solicitor has recommended that the wording of condition 6 is amended to read as follows:

Revised Condition 6

Notwithstanding the submitted plans otherwise approved, further details of the windows to the front elevation of the side extension shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any works commencing on site **and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.** Such details shall include:

(a) Elevation of proposed window at a scale of 1:10

(b) Cross-section at a scale of 1:5 through the transom showing the relationship of opening and fixed lights, with full-sized details of externally mounted glazing bars

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development which does not prejudice the amenity of the Northwick Circle Conservation Area.

Recommendation: Remains Approval