

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, 14<sup>th</sup> January 2004 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Cribbin (Chair), Councillor Harrod (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Chavda, Freeson, Kansagra, McGovern, Sayers, Singh and Steel.

Councillors Jones and J Long also attended the meeting.

**1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests**

<b>Ref &amp; Site Address</b>	<b>Councillor</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
03/2845 School Main Building, Chalkhill JMI School, Barnhill Road, Wembley, HA9 9YP	Harrod	Personal – on Board of Governors of Chalkhill JMI School
03/3083 RE-DEVELOPMENT, Stonebridge Estate, London, NW10	Harrod	Personal – member of Stonebridge HAT Board

**2. Requests for Site Visit at start of Meeting**

Councillor Chavda made a request for a site visit for 17, Marquis Close, Wembley, HA0 4HF, reference 03/2745. This was put to the vote and declared LOST.

**3. Minutes of the Last Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2003**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the last meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2003 be agreed as a true and accurate record subject to an amendment that **Cllr Freeson** sought a report on wider traffic issues in the Pound Lane area to a future meeting considering policy issues.

**4. Planning Applications**

RESOLVED:-

that the Committee's decisions/observations on the following applications for planning permission under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), as set out in the decision column below, be adopted. The conditions for approval, the reasons for imposing them and the grounds for refusal are contained in the Report from the Director of Planning and in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO (1)	APPLICATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT (2)	DECISION (3)
<b>DEFERRED ITEMS</b>			
0/01	03/2656	City Guest House, 165 Preston Hill, Harrow, HA3 9UY  Retention of an existing single storey outbuilding to the rear of the hotel	Approval, subject to conditions as set out in the supplementary report, an amendment to condition 2 and an informative

This application was deferred at the last meeting for a site visit to enable members to examine the impact on the building at 2 Kinch Grove. Introducing the report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** referred to the supplementary report, stated that although there was an impact on the building of 2 Kinch Grove, neither the scale or location would justify refusal. The external finish of the outbuilding was to be completed within 3 months of approval being granted and details from the applicant concerning landscape were yet to be submitted.

He drew attention to conditions 1 and 2 as set out in the supplementary report which were not included in the report as conditions of the approval. These conditions were imposed to ensure that the development would be of satisfactory appearance and enhanced the amenity of the locality. He also added a third condition on materials that matched 2 Kinch Grove.

**Mrs Stephanie Sahajpal**, in objecting to the application, stated that she felt the building to be too close to the boundary wall and in her view it would be unattractive. Although she had no objection to the applicants having a garden shed, the proposed new building with an excessively large window was very different to the previous one, raising concern that the building could be used for purposes other than storage.

During members' discussion of this application, the size of the building was queried. **Cllr Kansagra** enquired as to whether the Unitary Development Plan (UPD) had a specific policy on size. **Cllr Sayers** asked officers' views on the distance of the building to the boundary wall and whether it was any closer or higher than what was usually permitted. **Cllr Freeson** enquired as to whether officers could have recommended the building to be situated elsewhere in the property. **Cllr Steel** requested that Condition 2 as set out in the supplementary report be amended so that the building could only be used for storage purposes with no opportunity for the applicant to apply for a change in use. **Cllr Harrod** added his support to this amendment.

In responding to members' queries, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that there were no specific restrictions on size unless buildings were in a conservation area, which this application was not. He confirmed that the building was indicated as no higher, and its proximity to the boundary wall no closer than what was routinely permitted. In his view, the location of the outbuilding was not sufficient to warrant refusal.

Members then voted on the application subject to conditions as amended by **Cllr Steel** in condition 2 as follows; *"That the existing building at the rear is to be used ancillary to the hotel for storage purposes only"*. This was put to the vote and declared CARRIED by a majority with 2 abstentions.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern, Sayers & Singh (7)**

**AGAINST: None (0)**

**ABSTENSION: Cllrs Freeson & Steel (2)**

0/02	03/2628	27 Northwick Circle, Harrow, HA3 0EE  Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension to dwellinghouse and reconstruction of garage frontage, including its replacement with a habitable room	Approval, subject to conditions as set out in the supplementary report.
0/03	03/2629	27 Northwick Circle, Harrow, HA3 0EE  Conservation Area Consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension to dwellinghouse and reconstruction of garage frontage including its replacement with a habitable room	Approval, subject to conditions as set out in the supplementary report.
0/04	03/2361	The Eye Centre, 173B Cricklewood Broadway, NW2 3HT  Proposed extension to create 3 self-contained flats	Approval, subject to a Section 106 agreement, conditions as set out in the main and supplementary reports including an amendment to condition 8.

The **Northern Area Planning Manager**, in introducing the report, said that during the site visit it was noted that the Oaklands Passage's access to the Mews was blocked by gates that had not received planning permission. The matter had been referred to the Enforcement Team. He added that the residents at 1 Oakland Mews/173c Cricklewood Broadway had formally withdrawn their objection. In reiterating the recommendation for approval, he referred the Committee to a number of conditions with reasons set out in the supplementary report, which were omitted from the main report in error.

**Mr Stephen Peers**, representing the views of the residents of Oakland Mews, objected to the proposed development on grounds of invasion of their privacy, reduction in natural light and dominance of the immediate area. In his view the design was not in sympathy to the surrounding buildings.

In response to members' questions, **Mr Peers** stated that he believed the gates occupied freehold land and were installed to prevent 'undesirable' elements from gaining access. He believed the van blocking access to Oaklands Passage and the Mews during the site visit had been caused by the existing car parking problems in the area. In response to members concerns about access to the Mews for the Emergency Services, Mr Peers stated that the Fire Services had inspected the gates and approved their installation.

The applicant, **Mr Raja**, outlined the following points in support of his application:

- (a) the objector's property was 27 metres away from the site
- (b) the window frames would be of timber construction and hence would be in keeping with the area
- (c) the construction of the gates did not relate to him and agreed that they should not be there
- (d) his architect, a local resident in the Cricklewood area was knowledgeable as to the type of building designs in the area.

During discussion by members of the application, **Cllr Harrod** requested if condition 8 could be amended so that the windows would remain shut at all times. **Cllr Kansagra** expressed the view that the Committee would have no right to prevent the applicant from applying for an amendment allowing them to be able to open the windows in the future.

In responding to members' comments, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** explained that building regulations would not allow the applicant's windows to be closed at all times. Hence, it would be inappropriate to amend the wording of this condition. Before being put to the vote, members agreed that the window design would be of timber, as an amendment to condition 8.

Members voted unanimously to approve this application, subject to a Section 106 agreement, conditions as set out set in the main and supplementary reports and an amendment to condition 8.

## NORTHERN AREA

1/01	03/2499	3 Chalkhill Road, Wembley, HA9 9DS  Demolition of existing property and erection of 2 pairs of two-storey semi-detached houses	Approval, subject to conditions.
1/02	03/3351	1-10 inc, 10A & 11-13 Turpins Yard, Oaklands Road, NW2  Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 20 residential units (matters to be determined: means of access)	Approval, subject to a Section 106 agreement, other conditions and as amended in conditions 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9 and additional condition 13 in the supplementary report and additional conditions in relation to parking for office staff, traffic management, the environmental area and hours of demolition and informatives.

In introducing the report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** referred to concerns raised at the site meeting about security, extra traffic, use of parking permits and loss of buildings. In response, he said that the applicant had confirmed that there was no intention to remove the boundary walls, subject to design issues. The alleged abuse of parking permits had been raised with the Director of Transportation who had confirmed that permits were linked to a single resident by the registration number of the vehicle. To address concerns over loss of buildings, he recommended a further condition 13 requiring the applicant to obtain approval of reserved matters prior to demolition. He added that residents had been informed that the number of residential units had been reduced from 39 to 20 units. He recommended a re-negotiation of the contribution for open space and environmental improvements to a figure between £25,000 and £41,000 to reflect the reduction in units. He then clarified the affordable housing aspect of both sites adding that the tenure mix would be expected to comply with guidance of 90% socially rented and 10% shared ownership.

Objecting to the application, **Mr Henryk Terpilowski** stated that in his view most residents wished the land to continue to serve the community adding

there was no need for additional housing in the area. He suggested that the applicant could further reduce the number of residential units planned. He also stated that the open space provision was planned for Stonebridge, which was too far away for the local residents to benefit and asked that the Committee consider providing open space more immediate to the area.

Responding to queries from members, **Mr Terpilowski** stated that open space was needed in the area both for children and the community as a whole. He added that more greenery in the area would be welcome.

**Mr Ian Coward**, speaking on behalf of the applicant, explained that in his view allocating the land for community use was unrealistic. There was a strong need for housing in the area and the applicant had agreed to make financial contributions for the provision of open spaces. He asked Committee to note that the building was very old and that demolition was the best option in this instance. He added that the retention of the building for in commercial use would generate heavy traffic in the area. He explained that car parking provision would be subject to a Section 106 agreement.

In response to members' queries, **Mr Coward** said that parking space per unit was to be negotiated. He added that the applicant had consulted with planning officers and residents who had responded positively to the parking options proposed.

Following debate relating to item 1/03, members asked for officers to consider the following points:

- (a) to restrict the number of parking permits for office workers
- (b) to take legal advice regarding the provision of funding for improvements to traffic management and provision of open space and recreational facilities in the immediate local area and hours of operation concerning demolition of site.

Members then voted by a majority to approve the application, subject to a Section 106 agreement, other conditions as amended in conditions 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9 and additional condition 13 in the supplementary report and informatives.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Harrod, McGovern & Singh (5)**

**AGAINST: Cllrs Kansagra, Sayers & Steel (3)**

**ABSTENTION: None (0)**

**NB: Cllr Freeson was not present when this item was being discussed and therefore could not take part in the voting.**

1/03	03/3352	Theme Traders, The Stadium, Oaklands Road, NW2 6DJ	Approval, subject to a Section 106 agreement, conditions, amended conditions 2,4 and 8 and additional conditions 13 and 14 in the supplementary report and additional conditions in relation to parking for office staff, traffic management, the environmental area and hours of demolition and informatives.
		Outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings, erection of up to 21 residential units and up to 1200m <sup>2</sup> of office floor space (matters to be determined means of access)	

In introducing the report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** explained that residents had been advised of the increased number of units from 17 to 21. He recommended a re-negotiation of the contribution for open space and environmental improvements to a figure between £25,000 and £41,000. The percentage of units in total including both the Theme Traders and the Turpins Yard sites allocated for affordable housing was 52.5 per cent. He clarified the affordable housing aspect of both sites adding that the tenure mix would be expected to comply with guidance of 90% socially rented and 10% shared ownership. An additional condition 13 was recommended requiring the applicant to obtain approval of reserved matters prior to demolition. To address issues of traffic and general safety, a further condition 14 recommended that all redundant crossovers to the site over the footway be reinstated.

Objecting to the application, **Mr Gerard Reynolds** explained that in his view the area was already overdeveloped and the proposed residential units could only add to this situation. In expressing concern about the nearby electricity substation, he said that in the event of an accident many residents would be affected in an already overcrowded area. He requested a review of the plans.

**Cllr Sayers**, speaking on behalf of **Mr Clargo** (a local resident) who had been unable to attend the meeting, stated that **Mr Clargo** had organised a petition for the retention of the building and against its demolition. Other points raised on **Mr Clargo's** behalf included concerns about the noise impact of demolition and the possible loss in value of surrounding properties.

**Mr Coward**, speaking on behalf of the applicant, explained that as in the Turpins Yard application, housing was imperative in the area. He stressed that the proposal would be a quality development and that there was no evidence to suggest that there would be additional risks from the electricity substation as a result of additional residents in the area.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, **Cllr Long** stated that she had been approached by some objectors regarding both this application and the Turpins Yard application. She expressed concerns about:

- (a) the congestion likely to be caused during the construction of both sites
- (b) the Section 106 agreement and its lack of proximity of open space provision in the immediate local area
- (c) facilities for children particularly as the Stadium development was designated for affordable housing
- (d) the Section 106 agreement for the Turpins Yard site seemed inadequate.

She requested that these be considered:

- (a) demolition and construction hours of Monday to Friday (as opposed to Monday to Saturday)
- (b) the number of car permits to office workers in the area be restricted.

Furthermore, she asked officers to explain the reason for the Stadium's demolition whilst it was still a viable concern.

Members discussed the application, with **Cllr Sayers** stating that car parking was already a problem that could be exacerbated by the proposals and he suggested replacing the Stadium with a car park should it be demolished. He expressed concern that the simultaneous demolition of both sites presented the danger of both areas remaining empty for long periods of time. He asked that Committee consider funding being made available to spend on traffic calming in the area and echoed **Cllr J Long's** comments concerning hours of demolition and creating recreational space in the immediate area. He thought it unfair that the proposed development would not provide sufficient parking spaces for residential units classified as social housing.

**Cllr Kansagra** expressed regret that the application meant losing an employment site. He added that if the Stadium site was to become a residential area it should be for affordable housing and agreed with **Cllr J Long's** and **Cllr Sayers'** comments regarding provision of recreational and open space.

In response to comments made by members, the **Head of Area Planning** explained that the Stadium Site was linked with affordable housing and the Turpins Yard site with private housing. The report had indicated that the advantages of providing much needed housing outweighed the employment opportunities the sites had previously offered. The number of units proposed was far smaller than other sites and the density complied with Council

policies. On the hours of demolition and construction, he explained that there could be practical problems in preventing work from taking place on Saturday but that consultation could take place with the Environmental Health Unit. With regards to parking provision, he explained it was standard policy to reduce the number of parking spaces for affordable housing developments. He noted members' comments concerning open space in the immediate local area and agreed an application to restrict parking permits to office users would be appropriate under these circumstances.

**Cllr Kansagra** made a request that applications 1 /02 and 1 /03 be deferred. This was put to the vote and declared LOST.

Members then discussed the points raised during the debate and asked that officers address the following points:

- (a) to restrict the number of parking permits for office workers
- (b) to take legal advice regarding the provision of funding for improvements to traffic management and provision of open space and recreational facilities in the immediate local area and hours of operation concerning demolition of site.

Members then voted by a majority to approve the application, subject to a Section 106 agreement, conditions as amended in conditions 2, 4 and 8 and additional conditions 13 and 14 in the supplementary report and informatives.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Harrod, McGovern & Singh (5)**

**AGAINST: Cllrs Kansagra, Sayers & Singh (3)**

**ABSTENTION: None (0)**

**NB: Cllr Freeson was not present when this item was being discussed and therefore could not take part in the voting.**

1/04	03/3367	1-31 Jenner House, Buddings Circle, Wembley, HA9	Approval, subject to conditions and amendment to condition 5 as set out in the supplementary report and a Section 106 agreement.
		Demolition of existing two-storey block of 31 dwellings and erection of 2 two-storey blocks of 15 dwellinghouses, comprising 5 two-bedroom, 8 three-bedroom, 2 five-bedroom houses, 12 associated car parking spaces, new access and landscaping	

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** asked the Committee to note that as the land was currently Council-owned, the Section 106 agreement would not come into effect until the ownership of the land was transferred to the applicant. In reiterating the recommendation for approval, he drew members' attention to an amendment in condition 5 as set out in the supplementary information.

**Mrs Watling**, in objecting to the application, expressed concern that crime and violence could increase if the application was approved. She considered the area already overcrowded in terms of housing. In her view, the existing building was a fine example of its type that did not deserve to be demolished. Responding to members' questions, she explained that the reason she thought crime and violence could increase if the development went ahead was because it would create extra traffic that could attract more criminal elements to the area.

During members' debate, **Cllr Kansagra** commented that the applicants' proposal for residential housing to provide permanent (in place of temporary) accommodation building was more likely to reduce crime in the area.

Members voted unanimously to approve this application, subject to conditions as amended in condition 5 as set out in the supplementary report and a Section 106 agreement, to be entered into concurrently with the transfer of the Council's interest in the land.

1/05	03/2565	71 Barn Rise, Wembley, HA9 9NH	Approval, subject to conditions as set out in the supplementary report and informatives.
		Erection of three-storey side extension at lower ground, ground and first floor level, single-storey rear extension at lower ground floor level and rear dormer window extension to dwellinghouse	

Introducing the report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** referred to Condition 8 concerning the applicant's requirement to provide details of landscaping proposals for the rear garden, extensions and boundaries and an amendment regarding the demolition of the rear brick staircase.

During debate, **Cllr Harrod** expressed his concern that this was another example of a site that had gone ahead with works without planning permission and subsequently applying for approval after work had been completed. **Cllr Steel** echoed his comments and suggested that there be discussion at future Committee meetings to prevent this situation from occurring so often.

Replying to members' comments, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that in this particular example, the applicant was having to demolish something they

had built and he suggested that such situations could be publicised to show the importance of obtaining prior planning permission.

**The Chair** agreed that this was an area that needed to be addressed.

Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application, subject to conditions as set out in the supplementary report and informatives.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern, Sayers & Singh (7)**

**AGAINST: Cllr Steel (1)**

**ABSTENSION: None (0)**

1/06	03/2854	School Main Building, Chalkhill JMI School, Barnhill Road, Wembley, HA9 9YP  Erection of a multi-use sports hall for both school and the community complete with ancillary facilities	Approval, subject to conditions and additional conditions as amended in conditions 1,2 and 3 in supplementary report.
------	---------	---	---

**NB: Cllr Harrod declared a personal interest and did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

#### **SOUTHERN AREA**

2/01	03/2851	School Main Building, St Mary's RC Primary School, Canterbury Road, NW6 5ST	Approval, subject to conditions.
------	---------	---	----------------------------------

Formation of a Multi use Games Area (MUGA) with the erection of two floodlights upon the existing school playground

2/02	03/2942	Granville Centre, Granville Road, NW6  Refurbishment including elevational changes to Granville Centre and the erection of a two-storey rear extension	Approval, subject to conditions, additional conditions and an informative as set out in the supplementary report.
------	---------	--	---

The **Acting Southern Area Planning Manager** asked Committee to note the new Condition 9 as set out in the supplementary report, requiring the applicant to submit details of materials for the western and eastern elevations to the Local Planning Authority and a new informative raised concerning sustainability issues including recycling, waste minimisation and a post construction review.

During members' debate, **Cllr Freeson** said he supported the application but asked that there be some attempt to negotiate the renovation of the exterior of the building, although he appreciated the difficulties involved. **The Chair** agreed with this view and asked officers to investigate.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to conditions, additional conditions and an informative as set out in the supplementary report.

**NB: Cllr Steel was not available during consideration of this application and therefore did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

2/03	03/2874	9 Leopold Road, NW10 9LN	Approval, subject to conditions.
		Change of use of laundrette to self-contained flat, alterations to first floor front elevation and removal of external rear staircase to first floor	
2/04	03/2964	Aerial Services, 300 High Road, NW10 2EN	Refusal
		Demolition of existing building and erection of 1 part three-storey, part four-storey building comprising 8 two-bedroom and 3 one-bedroom flats, one retail unit and ancillary cycle park and refuse stores	
2/05	03/3110	Willesden Sports Centre Stadium, Donnington Road, NW10 3QX	Approval, subject to conditions a Section 106 agreement, conditions and additional conditions as amended in conditions 4, 5 and 7 in supplementary report.
		Demolition of existing athletics stadium and existing sports and leisure facility to south of retained outdoor track; erection of new integrated leisure building including 2 pools, sports hall, indoor running tube with integrated spectator stand, new landscaping of part of surrounding park including reconfiguration of car parking, potential realignment of existing pedestrian	

routes through park, new children's play area, new fencing and new meadow upon derelict lido site

In introducing the report, the **Southern Area Planning Manager** referred to additional letters of objection from members of Dolphins Swimming Club in respect of the size of the pool and continued provision of swimming facilities during construction of the swimming pool. Although most of the issues raised by the letters had been covered in the main report, he added the following;

- a) the issue of continued provision during construction was not within the control of the Committee, rather a matter to be resolved with the Council's sports development unit
- b) the assistant Director of Sports and Leisure had stressed that the proposal would provide facilities to a modern standard.

In respect of the fence around the site that needed to be replaced, he recommended an additional condition requiring the applicant to submit details for approval and completion to be carried out prior to occupation. He also recommended a further condition requiring details of the management plan for the use of the site, in the interests of the amenities of adjoining occupiers. In reiterating the recommendation for approval, he drew members' attention to additional minor changes to the wording of conditions 4, 5 and 7 which will be incorporated in the final decision notice.

In objecting to the application, **Mr Tony Burton** of Brent Dolphin Swimming Club stated that the original plans had been for an 8-lane swimming pool and he was surprised that they had since been reduced to a 6-lane pool. He was concerned about the period in between the removal of the old swimming pool and the completion of the new one, which would temporarily leave the club without a pool and suggested that it could force the club to close.

In response to members' questions, **Mr Burton** explained that the club did not have any financial support and contributions came entirely from club members. Club membership was also falling but he felt the club was important in the area and that it acted as a feeder club for larger swimming organisations. He informed the Committee that the club was looking for a new swimming pool in between the closure of the old and building of the new pool. The club was negotiating with Hampstead School and Westminster College over use of their pool but he admitted downsizing was inevitable.

Also objecting to the application, **Mr Andy Brommage**, again representing Brent Dolphin Swimming Club, asked Committee to assist in ensuring the survival of the club. He stressed the club needed support for alternative schemes and that it was important it existed to benefit future generations.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, **Cllr Jones**, a Ward Councillor of the area, stated that she had been contact with members of Brent Dolphin Swimming Club. She explained that in the original plans for

Willesden Sports Centre, more funding had been expected. Environmental Services had to go through all the usual procedures and bidding processes and that funding arrangements had subsequently required revision. There had been delays to the proposals and the area desperately required a new sports centre. She assured members that there was every intention to find a solution to the problems that faced Brent Dolphin Swimming Club and other clubs with similar problems. Financial assistance would be provided for transport and hire costs and negotiations with clubs would continue.

During members' debate, **Cllr Freeson** made 2 recommendations. The first was to re-consider the possibility of Brent Dolphin Swimming Club continuing to use the present pool until the new one was completed. The second was that every effort be made to enable the new swimming pool to be of 8 lanes. **Cllr Kansagra** suggested that a separate application for an 8 lane swimming pool could be made at a later date and that the club was deserving of funding. **Cllr Chavda** commented that the club was of particular benefit to promoting health and fitness amongst youngsters. He was surprised that the new swimming pool had been recommended for a 6 lane (from 8 lane) pool. He moved that the application be deferred in order to give the club time to find suitable new premises. This was put to the vote and declared LOST.

**Cllr Harrod** explained that he had much sympathy for the club's situation, but that the overall application was the most important issue. He added that at least the club had an opportunity to inform Committee of the problems it faced and that the resulting discussion had presented ways in which it could be helped.

Responding to members comments, the **Head of Area Planning** informed Committee that any delay to this application could have serious funding implications. **The Chair** added that a decision was needed at this meeting.

Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application, subject to a Section 106 agreement to be entered into concurrently with the grant of a lease in respect of the land by the Council, conditions and additional conditions as amended in conditions 4, 5 and 7 in supplementary report.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern & Singh (6)**

**AGAINST: Cllr Chavda (1)**

**ABSTENSION: None (0)**

**NB: Cllrs Sayers and Steel were not available during consideration of this application and therefore did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

## WESTERN AREA

3/01	03/2183	2B Second Avenue, Wembley HA9 8QF	Approval, subject to conditions.
		Conversion of dwellinghouse to 2 x two-bedroom flats, installation of 3 side windows and provision of one parking space in the front garden area (as amended by plans received on 16/12/03)	

Introducing the report, the **Deputy Western Area Planning Manager** asked Committee to note that the properties in Second Avenue were large enough in principal to be converted into flats. He added that it appeared that the application property had carried out alterations that had not received prior planning permission. He added that revised plans had now been received.

In objecting to the application, **Ms Mei Liu** stated that she was concerned that the flat conversion would bring more residents to the area which would have traffic and car parking implications. She suggested a restriction on parking spaces for new properties. She circulated a photograph to Committee and asked members to note the current congestion. She added that the applicant's proposals raised safety issues.

During members' debate, **Cllrs Kansagra** and **Steel** both noted that this applicant had previously carried out alterations without prior planning permission. **Cllr Steel** added that he would be voting against the application.

Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application, subject to conditions.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

<b>FOR:</b>	<b>Cllrs Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern &amp; Singh</b>	<b>(5)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	<b>Cllrs Chavda, Kansagra &amp; Steel</b>	<b>(3)</b>
<b>ABSTENSION:</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>(0)</b>

3/02	03/2745	17 Marquis Close, Wembley, HA0 4HF	Approval, subject to conditions
		Change of use from dwellinghouse to a residential care home for the elderly	

In reiterating the recommendations on the report, the **Deputy Western Area Planning Manager** explained that given the limited number of occupants living together as a single household, the scale of the proposed use was considered to be compatible within the locality and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the local residents.

**Cllr Chavda** commented that he did not think the location was appropriate for the type of use proposed. He added that the road was very narrow and parking space was limited.

Members voted by a majority decision to approve the application, subject to conditions.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 66(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:

**FOR: Cllrs Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern, Sayers, Singh and Steel (8)**

**AGAINST: Cllr Chavda (1)**

**ABSTENSION: None (0)**

3/03	03/3113	Refugees into Jobs, 3 Lincoln Parade, Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8UA	Approval, subject to conditions and an informative.
		Erection of temporary portable building in the rear parking area for use as offices in conjunction with main building	
3/04	03/3083	Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate, NW10	Approval, subject to conditions.
		Phase 3C (Sites 24b 28c, 31b) Details of the erection of a terrace of 4 two-storey, two-/three-bedroom dwellinghouses with 6 on-street car parking spaces on site 28c, the erection of a terrace of 20 dwellinghouses (3 two-storey, 2-/3-bedroom, 5 three-storey 3-/4-bedroom, and 12 three-storey 4-/5-bedroom) a terrace of 17 three-storey dwellinghouses (15 three-/four-bedroom and 2 five-bedroom) with 34 on-street car parking spaces on site 31b and a terrace of 4 three-storey 3-/4-bedroom dwellinghouses and terrace of 5 three-storey 4-/5-bedroom dwellinghouses with 9	

on-street car parking spaces on site 24b in pursuance of conditions 1 and 18 of planning permission 97/0131 dated 04/09/97 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the entire site with the provision of residential units in two-, three- and four-storey blocks, new open space, and shops with community facilities, as amended by planning permission 02/3210 dated 06/03/03

**NB: Cllr Harrod declared a personal interest and did not take part in the discussion or voting.**

**8. Any Other Urgent Business**

None

**9. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 28<sup>th</sup> January 2004 at 7.00 pm. The next meeting to consider planning applications will take place on Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> February 2004. The site visit will take place on Saturday, 14<sup>th</sup> February 2004 at 9.30 am.

The meeting ended at 9.55 pm

M CRIBBIN  
Chair

*Mins2003'04/Council/planning/pln14jaj*