

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday, 19th February 2004 at 7.00 pm

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

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Freeson.

Councillors Fiegel and Van Colle also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

<i>Ref & Site Address</i>	<i>Councillor</i>	<i>Nature of Interest</i>
03/2828 and 03/2868 Redevelopment of Stonebridge Estate NW10	Harrod	Member of Stonebridge HAT Board
03/3610 Avonhurst House Coverdale Road NW2	Harrod	Member of Willow Housing Ltd. Board

2. Requests for Site Visit at Start of Meeting

None at the start of this meeting.

3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings – 14th and 28th January 2004

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the meeting held on 14th January 2004 and 28th January 2004 be agreed as a true and accurate record.

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)
---------	--------------------	--	--------------

NORTHERN AREA

1/01	03/3304	136 Dudden Hill Lane, NW10 1DA Conversion into two self-contained flats and erection of a single storey rear extension	Approval, subject to conditions
------	---------	---	---------------------------------

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that the proposed flat conversion would offer two suitably designed new units and would not prejudice highways safety. The single storey rear extension would be in keeping with the character of the area and would meet supplementary planning guidance note 5 in respect of the scale and position of extensions in residential areas. He added that given the parking controls in the area and the restrictions of the property to the existing one (off-street) parking space, it was not felt that the development would not significantly contribute to hazardous highway conditions. With this in view, he reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

Mrs Abate, in objecting to the proposed development, stated that the conversion of the property into two flats and additional rear extension would be an inappropriate development for the site which was already suffering from noise nuisance and environmental problems in respect of rubbish left in the garden and sewage blockages. She urged the Committee to be minded to refuse the application for the above reasons.

Mrs Wikner, speaking in similar vein, stated that the proposed development would be unsuitable for multiple-occupation in an area which was already suffering from environmental problems. In addition, the proposed development would lead to loss of light to her kitchen and she wondered whether the owner intended to use the flat roof for future re-development for another flat.

Members noted the representations by the objectors and the officers' introduction but decided by a unanimous decision to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 65(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:-

FOR:	Cllrs Cribbin, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern, Sayers, Singh & Steel	(7)
AGAINST:	Nil	(0)
ABSTENTIONS:	Nil	(0)

NB: Cllr Sattar-Butt was not present at the start of the discussion of this application and therefore could not take part in the voting.

1/02	03/2333	41 Kenton Road, Harrow, HA3 0AD	Approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement
		Outline planning application for demolition of existing house and erection of 3-storey building to provide 7 flats and associated parking (matters to be determined, siting and means of access)	

Mrs Ann West objected to the proposed outline planning application on the following grounds:-

- (a) it would constitute an over-development and lead to overcrowding;
- (b) it would lead to an increase in the incidence of subsidence;
- (c) there would be an increase in traffic in an area which was close to a roundabout and would therefore constitute a highway hazard;
- (d) the proposed development would lead to loss of light and loss of privacy to her garden.

Mrs West sought assurances from officers and suggested the following:-

- (a) that there should be a full structural survey to ascertain that there would not be subsidence as a result of the proposed development;
- (b) a full assessment impact study of the volume of the development;
- (c) that the owner of No 41 would not build on the land adjoining (No 43 Kenton Road) and that a brick wall should be erected at the boundary.

In responding to the issues raised by the objector, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that this was an outline application only and that further aspects of the development would be looked into at the detail application was submitted.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

1/03	03/3289	31 Gladstone Park Gardens, NW2 6LA	Approval, subject to conditions, the deletion of condition 5 and the roof of rear dormer window being amended to have a flat roof
		Rear dormer window, front and side roof-light to first floor flat	

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that amended plans for the rear dormer had been received since the publication of the report. The overall proposal now showed a flat roof design which would reduce the overall bulk to the original roof. As a result of this, condition No 5 was no longer required. He reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and the deletion of condition No 5.

1/04	03/3589	Ecole Phillippe Gaulier, St Michael's Church Hall, St Michael's Road, NW2 6XG	Approval, subject to conditions and amendments in conditions 3 and 5
		Change of use to nursery school	

In his introduction, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that the local residents were being consulted on the proposals for a controlled parking zone (CPZ). Given the proposed on-street parking, the Director of Transportation considered that parking would generally be made available for parents dropping off and picking up their children from the nursery. He added that the applicant had revised the ages of children that would be admitted to the nursery and in respect of that he had amended condition No 3 to restrict the ages of the children using the nursery from three months to seven years and for no other purpose. In respect of the hours of operation (condition 5), he stated that the nursery activities within the building shall be permitted between 0800 hours and 1800 hours Monday to Friday for 48 weeks in a year with the premises being opened for staff an hour before the opening time and cleared 30 minutes after the closing time. This was to ensure that the use did not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties. He reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the amendments in conditions 3 and 5 and other amendments as set out in the report.

During the debate, **Cllr Sayers** expressed a view that the site would not be suitable for use as a children's nursery in view of the traffic chaos that would ensue. For this reason, he moved a refusal of the application.

In responding to members' questions, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that the number of children that would be admitted to the nursery would be set by OFSTED and that the number of weeks for use of the nursery would be 48 weeks. He added that the proposed use would be an improvement as the building was currently unused and with no other use proposed.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 65(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:-

FOR:	Cllrs Cribbin, Harrod, McGovern, Sattar-Butt, Singh & Steel	(6)
AGAINST:	Cllrs Kansagra & Sayers	(2)
ABSTENTIONS:	Nil	(0)

1/05	03/3347	2 Nutfield Road, NW2 7EB	Application withdrawn
		Conversion of two-storey dwellinghouse into doctor's surgery (D1), erection of two- storey rear extension, side external staircase and rear dormer window roof	

extension, installation of ground floor rear window, relocation of front entrance door and formation of 3 front vehicular parking spaces

1/06	03/3489	24 Woodland Close, NW9 8XP	Approval, subject to conditions
		Single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse	

Mr Treptow, the owner of the adjoining property at No 26, stated that the houses in the area had very small gardens and that the proposed development would lead to loss of character of the area. He urged members to be minded to visit the site in order to assess the implications of the proposed development. He added that as Nos 22 and 24 belonged to the same owner, consultation on the application had not been properly undertaken. Mr Treptow reiterated his request for a site visit.

In responding to the issues raised by the objector, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that ownership of properties was not a planning matter. In his view, the proposal accorded with the standard policy for extensions and he therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

Members voted by a majority decision with one abstention to approve the application.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 65(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:-

FOR:	Cllrs Cribbin, Harrod, Kansagra, McGovern, Sattar-Butt, Sayers & Singh	(7)
AGAINST:	Nil	(0)
ABSTENTIONS:	Cllr Steel	(1)

1/07	03/2560	Tennis Courts, next to Synagogue, Preston Road, Harrow, HA3	Deferral and authority delegated to Director of Planning to issue the decision
		Details pursuant to condition 2 (site levels), 3 (materials), 4 (boundary treatment only) and 6 (landscaping) of full planning permission reference 02/1167 dated 17/01/03 for erection of a two-storey synagogue building including associated car parking, landscaping and removal/lopping of trees	

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that officers had received revisions to the landscape works which showed a clear intention to provide a quality landscape. He, however, added that officers would wish to fine tune the proposals and provide residents with eight additional days in which to consider the details. With this in view, he amended the recommendation to deferral and that subject to no additional objections from local residents specifically to the landscaping proposals during the next eight days, authority be delegated to the Director of Planning to issue the decision.

1/08	03/3002	20 Sedgcombe Avenue Harrow, HA3 0HL	Approval, subject to conditions
		Demolition of existing side garage, removal of side dormer window extension and erection of part single storey, part two- storey side extension and part single storey, part two-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse	

Mr Henry, in objecting to the proposed development, stated that it would still have a detrimental impact on the daylight to his property.

Members took note of this but decided to approve the application by a unanimous decision, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

1/09	03/3536	Asda Superstore, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EX	Approval, subject to conditions, additional conditions 3 and 4 and a Section 106 agreement to include a link bridge to the Health Centre
		Erection of mezzanine floor for retail shop	

In updating members, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that Asda were not willing to provide an undertaking to facilitate the bridge link between the store and the health centre car park for the following reasons; the timescales involved in the planning application process and secondly, a pedestrian link from Chalkhill Road to the car park already existed. He added that although this planning gain would have been highly beneficial to users of the health centre, it would be difficult to justify refusal of the planning application on this basis alone and he considered that on balance the proposal would be acceptable. He referred to a £2,000 contribution from Asda towards public art which he found to be acceptable. He also added that the initial contribution sought of £75,000 towards non car access, had now been revised to a sum of £35,000. Although this was lower, the Transportation Unit recommended acceptance.

In respect of the travel plan, he stated that Asda would not agree to the provision of interest free season ticket loans because for administrative reasons. They, however, stated that they could negotiate individual staff discounts for buses and trains with the operators and as such it was suggested that a Section 106 agreement should be modified to provide evidence that they can obtain either discounted public transport rates or provide interest free season ticket loans. The Planning Manager therefore recommended additional condition No 3 to secure the travel plan and condition No 4 to secure servicing plan respectively. Subject to these, he reiterated the recommendation for approval.

Ms Gloria Travers, a local resident, stated that there was a need for a pedestrian bridge between Asda car park and the health centre which would be of great benefit not only to the residents but also would serve to reduce the flow of extra traffic build up along Forty Lane. In addition, the link bridge would a gesture of goodwill especially for the new health centre and a beneficial facility for the neighbours. She also stated there was every need for Asda to live up to their commitment of community involvement. In her view, Asda had shown little or no involvement in the community affairs and she therefore urged members to be minded to include the link bridge between the car park and the health centre as part of the Section 106 agreement.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, **Cllr Van Colle** stated that he had been approached by the applicant and that he was a member of the Chalkhill Development Board. He stated that although the presence of Asda had generated extra employment and benefit to the community, he was of the view that the inclusion of the link bridge between the car park and the new health centre would be of great benefit to the residents. Cllr Van Colle urged members to be minded to include the link bridge as part of the Section 106 agreement.

Members then discussed this application during which a majority felt that there was a need for the link bridge to be included as part of the Section 106 agreement as this would be beneficial to the residents and users of Asda Superstore.

Cllr Kansagra endorsed the views expressed by Cllr Van Colle and moved a deferral of the application pending an agreement on the inclusion of the link bridge as part of the Section 106 agreement.

The **Head of Area Planning** in responding to the issues raised stated that the Council was in negotiation with Asda over the link bridge and in his view, while there was a clear link in planning terms, it would be difficult to sustain on appeal a refusal by the local planning authority of this application on grounds of the link bridge alone. The **Borough Solicitor** reiterated this viewpoint however she also advised that if the Planning Committee considered it a planning requirement, they could add the bridge link to the section 106 terms irrespective of Asda's stated position.

Members voted on the amended recommendation to approve the application, subject to the inclusion of the link bridge as part of the Section 106 agreement which was declared CARRIED unanimously.

1/10	03/3436	Theoco Renault, 5 Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware, HA8 5LD	Approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement
		Demolition of existing building and erection of a new car showroom with ancillary facilities to the ground floor, basement car parking and 53 flats above	

In his introduction, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** advised members that the rear service road should be adopted as highway although this will require agreement from the current owners. The works on that road should be carried out to the Director of Transportation's satisfaction pursuant to detailed clauses contained within the draft Section 106 agreement. The overhanging of garage doors will be one of such issues to be resolved to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation. He also added that the rear access to the site was required in order to reduce the traffic circulation in and around the frontage of the application site in accordance with the UDP Policy TRN20. The level of traffic to be expected from this development will be unacceptable if it was allowed to flow directly into the A5 Edgware Road. In his view, this redevelopment would provide an opportunity to both remedy existing traffic problems and also work towards the UDP site specific proposal TP1, which seeks improvement to provide a more attractive environment. He also drew attention to the responses received from the London Borough of Barnet but reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

Mr T Hawes stated that the rear access would lead to more traffic and that as the proposal was intended for key worker housing, most of the workers would be working shifts and this in itself would lead to a generation of noise nuisance throughout the day and night. He urged that the access to the application site be restricted to Edgware Road.

Members then discussed this application during which they noted that the use of traffic calming measures and the adoption of the rear access road to the satisfaction of the Director of Transportation would ameliorate the concerns expressed by the objector. Members voted by unanimously to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01	03/3480	Rear of 9 Nicoll Road, Car Park rear of 14 High Street, NW10	Application Withdrawn
		Outline application for demolition of the existing car repair garage and warehouse construction of four-storey care home	
2/02	02/2473	Brondesbury Road Gating, Brondesbury Road, NW6	Approval, subject to conditions

Installation of security gates and panels to control access to residents' homes at the following locations: Addison Court between 6-10 (evens) and 22 & 28-30 (evens) and 98-100 (evens) Brondesbury Road; Bron Court; Eldon Court and 42 Brondesbury Villas

2/03	03/3032	College of North West London, Willesden, Denzil Road, NW10 2XD	Approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement
		Outline application to seek permission for the principle of redevelopment of Austin, Brunel and Curie buildings, and temporary nursery and student union buildings and car parking areas for improved and rationalised educational facilities and accesses (as clarified by letter received on 2, 3, 4 & 6/02/04 and plans received on 06/02/04)	
2/04	03/3610	Avonhurst House, Coverdale Road, NW2	Approval, subject to conditions including coordinated colour scheme
		Refurbishment of existing 3-storey residential block, comprising internal alterations to sheltered housing for the elderly to ground and first floors, replacement of doors and windows to ground and first floor and to communal areas on second floor and the creation of an enclosed rear garden to the sheltered housing (as revised by plans submitted 29/01/04 and 30/01/04)	

In expressing his objection to the application, **Mr Delaney** stated that there was a need for the redecoration and replacement of the double glazed windows to the entire floors and not just ground and first floors as proposed. He added that there should be a condition imposed for a co-ordinated colour scheme. Mr Delaney also urged members to defer the application pending proper consultation with the residents and neighbours of Peascroft, Avonhurst and Willow Houses.

Mr Michael Molloy, the applicant's agent, stated that he had taken the concerns expressed by the residents into account in submitting the application. He added that proper consultation had been carried out with all residents in the neighbourhood via Brent Council Planning Service. Mr Molloy also stated that he would consider adding a co-ordinated colour scheme as requested by the objector.

The **Head of Area Planning** in responding to the issues stated that he would be happy to add a further condition requiring the applicant to carry out a co-ordinated colour scheme in the refurbishment programme.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and an additional condition on a co-ordinated colour scheme.

2/05	03/2886	70 & 70A Chaplin Road, NW2 Erection of single storey building in rear garden of dwellinghouse	Approval, subject to conditions
2/06	03/3225	14 Sidmouth Road, NW2 5JX Erection of single storey side and rear extensions and replacement of the front canopy and column to dwellinghouse	Approval, subject to conditions
2/07	03/3121	Warehouse rear of 2 Wrentham Avenue and 107-109 inc Chamberlayne Road, NW10 Change of use of 107-109 Chamberlayne Road, two-storey rear extension and demolition of existing warehouse building and erection of part two-storey and part four-storey building to provide 72 bedroom old people's care home with ancillary accommodation	Application withdrawn
2/08	03/3030	Car Park rear of 155-163 Kilburn High Road, NW6 Outline application for the erection of a lower ground and part five-storey building (Use Class D1) with main entrance off Priory Park Road (3,670m ² floor space – gross external) for teaching and ancillary facilities and the provision of disabled parking (as clarified by letters received on 2 & 6/02/04 and plans received on 06/02/04)	Approval subject to conditions, additional conditions 8, 9 and 10 and a Section 106 agreement

The **Southern Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that following legal advice, the recommendation in the report had been changed from 'approval, subject to a Section 106 agreement' to 'approval, subject to conditions and additional conditions as set out in the supplementary report'. He added that in order to minimize the environmental impact from traffic generated to and from the site, additional condition No 8 was being recommended in respect of a green travel plan. He added that in the interest of highway and pedestrian safety, an additional condition No 9 had been added. This would require details of works to widen the carriageway of the terrace to 5.5 metres to be submitted and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. He also added that in order to ensure that a community facility was maintained within the development, a further condition No 10 was being recommended to require that no part of the development shall be occupied unless details of an area within the ground floor of the building for the inclusion of the community facility had been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Subject to these and other conditions as set out in the main report, he reiterated the recommendation for approval.

Ms Dawn Reid, in objecting to the proposed development, said that it would exacerbate the parking and traffic problems in Priory Park Road. She added that there had been improper consultation and inadequate notice given of the development to the residents by the developers. In her view the College should have organised a residents' public meeting as part of the consultation and inclusion of the community.

Mr Al Forsyth of KABRAG stated that although he valued the contribution by the College in the neighbourhood, the site along with 4 other sites which had been designated as a major opportunity site, should be planned for redevelopment as a single entity. He added that he would like to be included on the Kilburn High Road Review Group. Mr Forsyth however urged members to defer the application pending further consultation and review of all five major opportunity sites within the area.

Kathryn Jennett, the applicant's agent, stated that an initial meeting had been held with residents about the application and that proper consultation had been undertaken. She added that the application was an outline proposal that accorded with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) note 17. She assured the residents that the fire gate will not be removed. In urging members to approve the application subject to the conditions as set out in the reports, Ms Jennett stated that the College had no control over the other major opportunity sites except the car parking area only.

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

WESTERN AREA

3/01	03/3456	2 Allonby Gardens, Wembley, HA9 8QX	Approval, subject to conditions
		Erection of two-storey side and single storey rear extension and rear facing	

dormer window to dwellinghouse and detached garage at rear of garden

The **Western Area Planning Manager** informed the Committee that Thames Water Authority had indicated that as the development lies within three metres of the sewer crossing the site, their consent would be required for the works. He added that a suitable informative in those terms would be added to any permission granted for this development. He then referred to a signed petition by 30 residents in Allonby Gardens and Windermere Avenue that raised the following main points:-

- (a) over-development of the site;
- (b) restriction on the maintenance of the stream over which it is sited;
- (c) obstruction to the view of traffic;
- (d) objections to the garage in any position in the garden; and
- (e) that the applicant had contravened planning and conservation area legislation.

In responding to these issues, he stated that as the report clearly set out, the proposed development would not constitute an over-development of the site. The maintenance of the stream would be resolved between the applicant and the Building Control and Thames Water, subject to an informative. In respect of the obstruction to the view of traffic from the access, he said that the Director of Transportation had not raised objections to the siting of the access. He also added that the design, siting and bulk of the garage would not be out of keeping with the character of the development in the locality so as to warrant a refusal. On the claim that the applicant would contravene conservation area legislation, he said that the application would be decided on its merit and that any contravention would be the subject of enforcement proceedings if it were considered expedient to do so. He reiterated the recommendation for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

Mr B Patel, objected to the proposed development, on the following grounds:-

- (a) as the application would be prejudicial to highways safety, it was important to receive the comments from the Director of Highways before members decided on the application;
- (b) concerns over access to the site needed to be resolved before the grant of permission;
- (c) as the route was a regular bus service route, visibility and view would be obstructed due to the significant increase in traffic;
- (d) the proposed development would create security problems.

Mr Patel therefore urged members to be minded to refuse the application for the above reasons.

In responding to some of the issues raised, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that issues of road and traffic safety had already been dealt with by the Director of Transportation. The Planning Manager clarified that previous withdrawals by the applicant for the development of the site were for schemes which were not identical to the proposed development and that the withdrawals were made before determination by officers.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 65(d), voting on this application was recorded as follows:-

FOR: Cllrs Cribbin, Harrod, McGovern, Sattar-Butt, Singh & Steel (6)

AGAINST: Nil (0)

ABSTENTIONS: Cllr Kansagra & Sayers (2)

3/02 03/3533 59 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8JZ Approval, subject to conditions

Erection of ground floor rear and first floor side extension to dwellinghouse, conversion of an existing side garage into habitable room and external alterations involving replacement of garage door with 2 windows and alterations to the roof design of the existing single storey side extension not covered by proposed first floor side extension (as amended by plans received on 20/01/04 and 29/01/04)

3/03 03/3147 Wembley Park Station, Bridge Road, Wembley, HA9 9AA Approval, subject to conditions, a new condition 9 and amended condition 4

Extensions and alterations to station including enlargement of ticket hall and concourse, extended over bridge, staff accommodation building, extension of front stairs, access ramp, passenger lifts, lighting, landscaping and new street furniture

In his introduction, the **Western Area Planning Manager** referred to comments received from the Director of Transportation in support of the proposed refurbishment which he added would accord with Policy TRN8 of Brent UDP 2004. In his view, the service arrangements to the proposed extension were considered to be acceptable, however, at least a further eight secure cycle spaces for the new staff accommodation building should be provided. He also referred to comments by the Manager of Wembley Plaza Hotel raising concerns over the extended closure of the station between October 2004 and March 2005 as this would have a profound impact on the business of the hotel. The Planning Manager added that whilst the objections of the hotel were acknowledged, any closures proposed would be during the weekend so as to minimize disruption to passenger services.

He reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the deletion of the words 'to the satisfaction of the local planning authority in condition No 4', an amendment in condition No 6 and a new condition No 9 requiring the applicant to provide eight additional secure cycle spaces for staff, as set out in the supplementary report.

During debate, **Cllr Harrod** expressed concerns about the inadequacy of the funding by TfL and the proposed escalators. **Cllr Steel** expressed a preference for escalators as, in his view, lifts were prone to vandalism.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to the conditions as amended and an additional condition No 9 on secure cycle spaces.

3/04 03/2828 Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate, NW10 Approval, subject to conditions

Details of the erection of a terrace of 8 two-storey, two-/three bedroom dwellinghouses and 4 two-storey, two-/three-bedroom dwellinghouses and provision of 13 car parking spaces on Site 1b, the erection of 48 terraced dwellinghouses (15 two-storey, two-/three –bedroom, 17 three-storey, three-/four bedroom, 14 three-storey, four-/five bedroom, 1 three-storey, five-bedroom and 1 three-storey, five-//six-/seven-bedroom) and 36 flats (24 one-bedroom and 12 two-bedroom) with 63 car parking spaces on Site 2, the erection of a terrace of 14 dwellinghouses (12 two-storey, two-/three-bedroom and 2 three-storey, five-bedroom) and a three-storey terrace of 8 dwellinghouses (4 four-/five-bedroom and 4 three-/four-bedroom) and provision of 18 car parking spaces on site 3b, the erection of a two-storey terrace of 3 two-/three-bedroom dwellinghouses with an on-street parking space and a disabled three-bedroom house with on site parking space on site 5b and a three-storey terrace of 4 four/five-bedroom dwellinghouses and 9 flats (6 one-bedroom and 3 two-bedroom) on site 10a with 10 on street parking spaces in pursuance of conditions 1, 2, 7 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 2-, 3- and 4-storey, blocks, new open space, shops and community facilities (as amended by planning permission 02/3210 dated 06/03/04)

3/05	03/2868	Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate NW10	Approval, subject to conditions
		<p>Refurbishment of existing 24 flats in Bernard Shaw House (3 two-bedroom and 21 one-bedroom), erection of third floor to Bernard Shaw House to provide 7 flats (1 two-bedroom and 6 one-bedroom) and erection of four-storey link extension between north end of Bernard Shaw House and terrace of new dwellinghouses on site 26 to provide 8 one-bedroom flats, extension of road 15 to Knatchbull Road and provision of 2 car parking spaces in pursuance of conditions 1 and 9 attached to outline planning permission reference 97/0131 dated 04/09/97 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Stonebridge Estate to provide a new road network, approximately 1,604 residential units in 2-, 3- and 4-storey blocks, new open space, shops and community facilities, as varied by planning permission 02/3210 dated 06/03/03</p>	
3/06	03/3450	Monks Park Clinic, Monks Park, Wembley, HA9 6JE	Approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement
		<p>Demolition of clinic and toilets and erection of part 2-storey and 3-storey primary health care centre and single storey kiosk/café with associated 8 car parking spaces, cycle parking and landscaping</p>	

7. Planning Appeals

Members were requested to note the information reports in the information bulletin circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

that the following be noted:-

- (a) **November 2003**
 - (i) Planning appeals received – 1st – 30th November 2003
 - (ii) Enforcement appeals received – 1st – 30th November 2003

- (iii) Planning appeal decisions – 1st – 30th November 2003
 - (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions – 1st – 30th November 2003
 - (v) Planning selected appeal decisions – 1st – 30th November 2003
 - (vi) Enforcement selected appeal decisions – 1st – 30th November 2003
- (b) **December 2003**
- (i) Planning appeals received – 1st – 31st December 2003
 - (ii) Enforcement appeals received – 1st – 31st December 2003
 - (iii) Planning appeal decisions – 1st – 31st December 2003
 - (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions – 1st – 31st December 2003
- (c) **January 2004**
- (i) Planning appeals received – 1st – 31st January 2004
 - (ii) Enforcement appeals received – 1st – 31st January 2004
 - (iii) Planning appeal decisions – 1st – 31st January 2004
 - (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions – 1st – 31st January 2004
 - (v) Planning selected appeal decisions – 1st – 31st January 2004
 - (vi) Enforcement selected appeal decisions – 1st – 31st January 2004

8. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

10. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place on **Wednesday, 10th March 2004 at 7.00 pm**. The site visit for the meeting will take place on Saturday, 6th March 2004 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 9.30 pm.

M CRIBBIN
Chair

Mins2003'04/Council/planning/pln19fj