

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 at 7.00 pm**

PRESENT: Councillor Cribbin (Chair), Councillor Harrod (Vice-Chair) and Councillors Beswick (alternate for Singh), Chavda, Freeson, Kabir, Kansagra, McGovern, H M Patel and Steel.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Singh.

Councillors V Brown, Dromey and Sayers also attended the meeting.

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

<b><i>Ref &amp; Site Address</i></b>	<b><i>Councillor</i></b>	<b><i>Nature of Interest</i></b>
03/2774 76 – 78 Draycott Avenue	Steel	Personal. Lives in the local area

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

None at the start of the meeting.

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meetings – 10<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> March 2004**

**(a) 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004 be agreed as a true and accurate record.

**(b) 15<sup>th</sup> March 2004**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> March 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)
<b>DEFERRED ITEM</b>			
0/01	03/2884	Gladstone Park, Parkside, NW2  Erection of a changing-room pavilion in the south-east corner of the park behind the existing community centre and adjacent to Midlothian House, off Anson Road	Deferral. Following approaches to be considered: (1) Alternative site be investigated. (2) Planning, Corporate and Parks Dept to work out a co-ordinated scheme to provide an integrated approach that improves the site. (3) They consider whether an entirely new community centre could be constructed in place of the existing

In his introduction, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** referred to letters of objection from 3 occupiers in Midlothian House and officers' responses to the concerns raised. The following issues rose in the letters in respect of the location of the building, its design and impact on nearby residents, the risk of crime and the effect on the character of the area and the built environment chapter of the UDP had been fully addressed in the main report. In respect of the drinking fountain, he said that this would not be required as a kitchenette was proposed in the building which would provide drinking facilities in the new building. For this reason, officers did not foresee users of the facilities trespassing in the gardens of nearby houses as this would be illegal. He added that issues about the Gaelic football pitch and playground, the cables and pipelines were not matters relevant to this application. On the issue of the removal of trees, he said that a condition had been placed requiring details of existing trees to be removed and further landscaping around the area of the proposed building to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of the development. The objections about the removal of the tennis court were not founded as this did not form part of the proposal. The Planning Manager added that the toilets would not be open to the public, in response to **Cllr Janice Long's** written question about accessibility of the toilets to members of the public. He reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**Mr Eric Pollock**, in objecting to the application, stated that a major problem in the park was the lack of an adequate number of WCs for a total of six changing rooms. He also raised objections on environmental grounds, loss of amenity and poor siting for parking facilities. Mr Pollock urged members to be minded to identify an alternative location for the proposed development.

In response to a question by **Cllr McGovern** for clarification on loss of open space, **Mr Pollock** stated that this was in reference to a constant loss of green space over the last few decades particularly in the south of the park.

**Mr Robertson**, a resident at Midlothian House, speaking in objection to the application, challenged officers' views that the sight lines into the park from Midlothian House would only be partially blocked and that the existing boundary landscaping screen would further prevent a loss of outlook. He added that the views from Midlothian House would be blocked from a considerable number of angles, a factor which was critical from the viewpoint of the residents. He urged that an alternative site within the park should be identified for the building that would preserve the residential amenities of Midlothian House residents.

**Mr Peter Curran**, speaking in objection to the application, stated that the new plan which provided for an 18-metre wide building would be inappropriate within the site. He added that it would be better to relocate the community centre's facilities to a site that would prevent it from being constantly covered by graffiti.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, **Cllr Sayers**, the Ward member, stated that he had been approached by objectors and residents in the area. In echoing the sentiments expressed by Mr Pollock, Cllr Sayers stated that there was no need for this facility within the park at the site proposed. He added that the proposal had not designed out crime and hence it would be unacceptable to the residents of Midlothian House. He also added that it would be a disgrace not to open the toilets to members of the public. He re-stated that his principal objections were against the location of the changing rooms, impact on residential amenities and lack of facilities for use by members of the public.

In responding to some of the concerns raised, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that following a general assessment of the location, the **Director of Parks** had expressed a preference to concentrate facilities at the chosen location for reasons of economies of scale and general availability of services.

During debate, **Cllr Kansagra** expressed a preference for the new centre incorporating the changing room and the public toilets to be made available for use by members of the public. He urged members to be minded to defer the application pending further input from the **Director of Education, Arts and Libraries** and a further examination of the nearby electricity sub-station.

**Cllr Freeson** also stated that although he did not object to the principle of the development, he would like the other yard site to be investigated. He argued for a deferral of the application in order that officers from Planning Services, Corporate Services and the Parks Department could work out a co-ordinated scheme that would provide an integrated approach that improves the site.

Members voted by a unanimous decision to defer the application for the above reasons.

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

**FOR:** Cllrs Cribbin, Beswick, Chavda, Freeson, Harrod, Kabir, (10)  
Kansagra, McGovern, H M Patel & Steel

### NORTHERN AREA

1/01	03/3729	7 Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EA	Approval, subject to conditions as amended by the Committee in respect of conditions 6 and 9 and the deletion of condition 8
		Change of use into one 4-bedroom self-contained flat at ground floor level and two 1-bedroom self-contained flats at first floor level, demolition of 2 chimney stacks and erection of single storey side extension in front of existing two-storey side extension to east elevation of dwellinghouse	

In introducing the report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager**, referred to members' query about the narrowness of the width of The Drive and whether there was scope to provide three parking spaces in the front garden area with the provision of some soft landscaping. In response, he said that this was possible although the amount of soft landscaping on the frontage would need to be reduced in order to accommodate the third parking space. With this in view, he reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to an amendment in condition 6 to provide parking to the front garden only, a deletion of condition No 8, an amendment in condition No 9 requiring the applicant to submit further details of the layout to the rear garden area.

**Mrs Sussman** stated that she was happy with the amended condition that parking will be provided to the front of the property only. With this in mind, she withdrew her objection to the application.

Members voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to the amendments in conditions 6 and 9 and the deletion of condition 8.

1/02	04/0237	28 Mapesbury Road, NW2 4JD	Approval, subject to conditions
		Creation of basement extension, hard surfacing and landscaping and installation	

		of pillars and steel gates to front of dwellinghouse	
1/03	03/3223	12A-E Teignmouth Road NW2  Removal of 3 roof lights and installation of 3 roof lights and rear dormer window extension to rear elevation of flat in roof space	Approval, subject to conditions
1/04	03/3768	76 Tewkesbury Gardens, NW9 0QX  Erection of 2-storey side and part first-floor rear extension and part single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse	Approval, subject to conditions
1/05	04/0249	BACS, 3 De Havilland Road, Edgware, HA8 5PA  Revised application for demolition of existing commercial building and erection of 177 self-contained dwellings, comprising 28 four-bedroom town houses, 19 three-bedroom town houses, 11 one-bedroom flats, 111 two-bedroom flats and 8 three-bedroom flats and 141 car parking spaces, 1,500m <sup>2</sup> of public open space, and associated landscaping and servicing	Approval, subject to conditions as amended by the Committee in respect of condition 14 and a Section 106 agreement. There should be a new condition saying that the footpath should only be provided if this is required by the Council at a later stage.

In introducing this report, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed members that revised plans had been received showing the removal of four balconies and replacement by Juliet balconies and incorporating highway amendments as sought by Planning Officers. He added that officers had also received a land survey that sought to strengthen the applicant's view that the relationship of what was being proposed to Halford Close would be acceptable. Within the time available to assess the survey, officers considered that this issue could be covered by an amendment to condition No 14 which would require additional details following the revised highway plans. .

He then referred to letters of representations from the local MP, in particular the provision of a public footpath between the site and Halford Close and the lack of secondary school places and doctors' accommodation. He also referred to letters of objection and comments received from seven neighbouring occupiers as set out in the supplementary report removal contractor and for the asbestos to be disposed of in a licensed waste site. In response, he said that most of the objections raised had been addressed in the main report except for the removal of asbestos and the loss of value to houses in the area (the latter was not a relevant planning matter). With regard to asbestos removal, he said that although the Planning Service had no control over its removal, this would be controlled through other legislation which the applicant would need to comply with. With this in view, he suggested an additional informative requiring the applicant to ensure that any asbestos removal should be completed by an approved asbestos

On the issue of affordable housing, he said that 85 units were proposed – 7 one-bedroom, 51 two-bedroom, 19 three-bedroom and 8 four-bedroom units. He added that Housing Services had sought additional four 2-bed units, which the applicant had considered would not be viable in terms of the management of the units. The applicant had however offered two additional 2-bed units, which Housing Services have confirmed would be an acceptable alternative. He then referred to the educational implications of the development.

He stated that the two closest High Schools (Kingsbury High School and Claremont High School) had limited capacity projected for the next educational year, however the Schools Organisation Plan provided for a change in admissions policy for Kingsbury High School so that local primary schools would become feeder schools from 2004. In addition, it was proposed to increase its admissions from 300 to 315. He also added that there was scope to increase capacity and Section 106 funds could be used to alleviate the impact on local school places. Although there were vacancies at Wembley High School in the current Year 7, as it was 3 miles away from the De Havilland Road site, the Council would be required to pay for bus passes. He added that Kingsbury Green Primary School was in the process of expanding by one form of entry. In addition, there were vacancies in the First and Middle Schools at Stag Lane Primary, the nearest primary school situated in the Borough of Harrow.

In concluding the education aspects of the application, he said that the need for further schools' capacity in Brent had been under review and in particular was now the subject of close liaison between Education, Housing and the Planning Services. This work would be continually reviewed in terms of changing pressures and may result in specific educational proposals being programmed. In terms of the proposed development, he stated that a combination of proposed admission changes, proposals to increase capacity, existing limited capacity and scope to cater for demand through further capacity increases would appear to meet the implications of the proposed development.

He added that the applicants had accepted the principle of providing an education contribution for potential new children to the Borough, however they had offered £684,000 as against officers' requirement for £1.2m. He said that a revised total educational contribution taking into account Policy CF6 of £1,094,160 would be sought from the applicants. In this regard, he asked members to delegate authority to the **Director of Environmental Services** to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the **Borough Solicitor**.

He referred to the main issue raised by residents at the site visit about the footpath link between the existing and the proposed development, adding that the footpath link would be an integral part of the design and the whole estate was conceived so that Cobham Close and Halford Close were in direct alignment. Taking this into account and the advice from the Metropolitan Police, further amendments to condition No 14 were proposed to include the design, lighting and layout of the footpath link to Halford Close. Subject to these, he reiterated the recommendation for approval subject to the amendment to condition No 14, an additional informative on demolition and delegation to officers to re-negotiate the educational contribution.

**Mrs Linda Lynch** stated that although she was not opposed to the principle of a residential development on the site, she felt that an additional 800 persons on the site would create various problems including parking, access to medical services and admissions to local schools which were already over-subscribed and with long waiting lists. She also raised objections to the application on grounds of lack of leisure and sporting facilities and loss of privacy. Mrs Lynch further raised concerns about asbestos during the demolition of the existing BACS building and the footpath, which she said would lead to increased anti-social behaviour in the area.

In response to members' questions, **Mrs Lynch** stated that she was also concerned about the lack of sports centres and leisure facilities for the youth and that a further increase in the number of people in the area would exacerbate the situation. She also added that the problems that the footpath would cause far outweighed the one minute walking time that would be saved by its inclusion in the proposed scheme.

**Mr Roger Schwartz**, Chair of Halford Close and De Havilland Road Residents' Association, speaking in objection to the application, stated that the footpath proposed within the development would be unsafe and lead to an increase in crime within the area. The advantages that would be derived from the footpath would be far outweighed by the disadvantages.

In response to members' questions, **Mr Schwartz** stated that improved lighting and CCTV cameras were only cosmetic and would not address the safety concerns raised by the residents. He also added that people who lived in areas with walkways and footpaths had a constant feeling of insecurity, making their lives a nightmare.

**Mr Afshar**, also spoke in objection to the application, stating that living adjacent to the proposed walkway he perceived a clear fear of crime and an increase in anti-social behaviour in the area. He also raised concerns about possible devaluation of property values and environmental concerns especially the removal of asbestos during demolition.

**Ms Tina Khakee**, the applicant's agent, speaking in support of the application, stated that the plans had been amended to overcome all previous concerns expressed by residents. She added that the proposal provided sufficient amenity space per dwelling and open space and that concerns about layout, density and amenity issues had all been resolved. She also added that the amended plans submitted had addressed concerns about highways issues.

In response to members' questions, **Ms Khakee** said that the footpath had been included at the request of officers who had expressed no concerns about security. She undertook to speak to the community police in respect of further amendments to the proposal in order to address any further existing residents' concerns. She also stated that the building contractor, Laing Homes, would conform to all regulations in removing the asbestos in the present building. Furthermore, Ms Khakee stated that the footpath of 5 metres was of sufficient width as recommended by the Highways Unit. In her view, the proposal provided an appropriate scheme on the site in terms of parking, amenity space, density and overlooking.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, **Cllr Dromey**, the Ward member, stated that he had been approached by the objectors to the application. Cllr Dromey's concerns were mainly on the footpath/alleyway and educational implications of the application. He said that the inclusion of the footpath would destroy a small community where children can currently play freely without any fear. The inclusion of a footpath will allow anyone to travel through to the estate increasing anti-social behaviour. He reiterated that to allow the inclusion of the footpath would take away the community amenity contrary to provisions within the Council's Unitary Development Plan, which did not permit footpaths.

**Cllr Dromey** further added that the recent approvals given to proposed developments in Grove Park (150 units), Theoco (50 units), BACS (177), Kingsbury Veterans (20), Safeways' Site (400) and Oriental City (600) would pose enormous problems for the local schools, GP facilities, social amenities and nursery provision within the area.

During debate, **Cllr Freeson** stated that there was a need for the parking issues to be looked at again and that consideration should be given to the application to proceed without the footpath being added at this stage but to be reviewed at a later date and that all family dwellings should be in houses rather than flats. **Cllr Beswick** emphasized the need for the Committee to listen to concerns expressed by the residents about the walkway. **Cllr Kabir** echoed Cllr Beswick's sentiments about the footpath and added that the local primary school of Roe Green Infants' School was heavily over-subscribed. **Cllr Kansagra** stated that the inclusion of the footpath would lead to muggings and assaults within the area. He also expressed concerns about the density of the development and the pressures that this would bring to bear on the provision of GP facilities and school places. Cllr Kansagra moved a deferral of the application to enable the applicant to submit another application for a smaller scheme without a footpath.



**Cllr Harrod** asked for a need to strike a balance between the advantages and disadvantages of having a footpath included within the scheme. He urged the inclusion of the Council's Community Safety Unit in designing the footpath that would include sufficient lighting. He pointed to a health clinic on the site of Roberts Court and the re-examination by the **Director of Education, Arts and Libraries** of the educational needs and possible increase in school places for the local residents.

In summing up the debate, **the Chair** stated that the principal objections to the application were the footpath, school places and adequate facilities for residents. She added that the Section 106 funding would be available to address most of the issues raised here.

In responding to the issues raised by members, the **Head of Area Planning** said that there was a planning brief that went through consultation outlining the benefits of a footpath within the development. He added that if members wished to delay the inclusion of the footpath, this could be done by the imposition of conditions. He also added that the density provisions were within policy and that the application would not constitute an over-development of the site. The mix of tenure had been accepted by the Registered Social Landlord and the Housing Services. The parking provisions within the development would be available for all the residents and managed by the Registered Social Landlord (RSL) in compliance with policy and guidance. He also added that the applicant was working closely with the Housing and Education Departments to resolve issues raised about community support for the local residents.

Members then voted on the amendment in the name of **Cllr Kansagra** for a deferral of the application to enable the applicant to submit a smaller scheme without a footpath. This was put to the vote and declared **LOST** by a majority.

In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No 66(d), voting on the amendment in the name of Cllr. Kansagra was recorded as follows:-

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Kansagra, H M Patel & Steel	<b>(4)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Beswick, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kabir & McGovern	<b>(6)</b>

Members then voted on a further amendment in the name of **Cllr Freeson** for approval of the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and as amended in condition No 14 and a further condition that the footpath should only be provided if it is required at a later stage by the Council.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Beswick, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kabir & McGovern	<b>(6)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Kansagra, H M Patel & Steel	<b>(4)</b>

1/06	04/0263	96 Regal Way, Harrow, HA3 0RY	Approval, subject to conditions and a further condition requiring smooth rendering of the flank wall(unless otherwise agreed by the Council)
		Erection of two-storey side and single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse	

In his introduction, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that the issue raised by the resident from No 98 Regal Way about loss of light had been addressed in the main body of the report. In addition, he stated that the conservatory at No 98 Regal Way was considered to further restrict the availability of light to that dwellinghouse. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

**Mr Brian Reagan**, from No 98 Regal Way, reiterated his concerns about the loss of light if the application was approved.

In response to a suggestion by **Cllr Kansagra** for a condition to be added to the grant of planning permission that would enable the wall to be painted white, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that there was the problem of getting access to the wall.

**Mr Tailor**, the applicant, stated that he was submitting this application in order to provide additional space for his family. He referred to a similar extension by the objector as a relevant precedent and added that his scheme complied with the provisions of the Council's supplementary planning guidance on home extensions.

In response to **Cllr Kansagra's** suggestion, **Mr Tailor** said that he had no objections to the wall being painted white if access could be gained.

Members voted by a unanimous decision to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and a further condition requiring smooth rendering of the flank wall(unless otherwise agreed by the Council) .

**NB:** **Cllr Steel was not present throughout the discussion of this application and therefore did not take part in the voting. Cllr Chavda had at this time left the meeting.**

1/07	03/2774	76 & 78 Draycott Avenue, Harrow, HA3	Approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.
		Demolition of 2 dwellinghouses and erection of a three-storey block, comprising 10 self-contained flats, a bin enclosure and 10 car parking spaces	Transportation Unit be asked to look into the parking issues in Draycott Avenue

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** informed members that the Council's Transportation Section had confirmed that following a consultation, the local residents had rejected the introduction of a controlled parking zone in the area. In referring to **Cllr Colwill's** concerns about the character and how the scheme can be said to be in keeping with the area, he said that in officers' view the character of the area was not defined by the density of development as much as the setting, scale and design of the building. He further added that the relationship of the proposed scheme with the existing character in terms of its aspects was fully discussed in the main report. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

**Mr Choudary**, a resident at No 80 Draycott Avenue, objected to the proposed development on the grounds that it would exacerbate the parking situation within the area which had been made worse by the presence of the local schools, the Sainsbury store and the local chiropody surgery. This would also add to the already busy traffic situation and raise concerns about vehicular and pedestrian safety. Mr Choudary also expressed concerns about the possible devaluation of property values if the application was approved and noise nuisance during building construction.

In response to members' questions, **Mr Choudary** said that much of the traffic and parking problems came from the local university students. He reiterated that residents had rejected the idea of a controlled parking zone for the area. In response to questions from **Cllr Steel**, Mr Choudary stated that the proposal would lead to loss of light and overshadowing in view of its excessive height. He reiterated that the flow of traffic currently was very bad and that this application would exacerbate the situation.

**Mr Mahoney** of No 3 Ridgeway, objected to the proposed development, on the grounds that it did not provide sufficient amenity space, would lead to loss of views and overlooking. In his view the proposed development was inappropriate for the site and would be out of keeping with the area, currently comprised of detached properties. Mr Mahoney also added that the development was not community hearted but rather for a profit motive.

**Mr Peter Ellis**, the applicant's agent, stated that the increase in the height of the building was very marginal and would have no effect on Mr Choudary's garden. In order to address the concerns about overlooking, the rear of the property had been restricted to two-storey high.

In response to members' questions, Mr Ellis said that the materials that would be used for the development would match existing properties in the area, thereby ensuring that the development was in keeping with the character of the area.

**Cllr Steel** stated that the congestion and the traffic jams in the area and the illegal parking even on double yellow lines were common in the area. In his view, the scheme would not be in keeping with the remainder of the properties in the area and that it would change the character of the area.

**Cllr Freeson** stated that as the demography of the Borough was continually changing it was likely to result in a more intensive use of urban space. Although he was sympathetic to the concerns raised by the objector, he did not see this application as constituting a great aesthetic intrusion in the plans. He moved an amendment for approval of the application, subject to conditions as set out in the report. He also requested that the Committee request Transportation Unit to examine the parking issues within Draycott Avenue. This was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED** by a majority.

Members then voted on the substantive recommendation for approval of the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and subject to a Section 106 agreement, and also a referral to the Transportation Unit to look into the parking issues in Draycott Avenue. This was put to the vote and declared **CARRIED** by a majority.

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

**FOR:** Cllrs Beswick, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kabir & McGovern **(6)**

**AGAINST:** Cllrs Kansagra, H M Patel & Steel **(3)**

### **SOUTHERN AREA**

2/01	04/0196	79 Leghorn Road, NW10 4PE  Demolition of existing building and erection of 3-storey building comprising 13 flats with associated amenity space, car parking and bin enclosure	Withdrawn. The application would have been refused had it not been withdrawn
2/02	03/3761	School Main Building, Malorees Junior School, Christchurch Avenue, NW6 7PB  Erection of first floor extension to existing main Junior School building	Approval, subject to conditions

### **WESTERN AREA**

3/01	03/3716	28 & 30 Carlyon Road, Wembley, HA0  Demolition of an existing single storey rear extension at No 28 Carlyon Road and erection of part single and two-storey side and rear extension and front porch extension to dwellinghouse at 28 Carlyon Road and erection of first floor part rear extension to dwellinghouse at 30 Carlyon	Approval, subject to conditions
------	---------	--	---------------------------------

Road (as amended by plans received on  
10/02/04)

**Mr Gordon Richards**, objected to the proposed development, on the following grounds:-

- (a) loss of light;
- (b) loss of privacy;
- (c) adverse impact on residents;
- (d) inadequate parking provision;
- (e) need for wider consultation with residents;
- (f) a complete change in the social make-up of the area

Mr Richards delivered a petition in support of the objections raised to the application.

Members took note of the representations and the petition but voted unanimously to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

3/02	03/1811	74 Pebworth Road, Harrow, HA1 3UE	Approval, subject to conditions
		Erection of single storey conservatory extension to rear of dwellinghouse and conversion of garage into habitable room	
3/03	02/0699	192 & 192A Ealing Road, Wembley	Approval, subject to conditions
		Removal of canopies and single storey rear extension and erection of a part single and two storey side and rear extension to extend the ground floor shop and form an additional two bedroom self-contained first floor flat	

The **Western Area Team Manager** stated that he had raised the suggestion by members with the applicant to reduce the depth of the rear extension. The applicant's agents did not wish to amend the proposals for the following reason: That vehicles delivering to the site would be too large to utilise the restricted area that would be available if the suggestion were to be followed. He added that the loading and unloading presently was taking place from Bowrons Avenue and for this reason, the scheme would not result in the loss of any servicing or parking facilities. He also added that to provide loading and unloading at the rear of the site would result in these activities taking place nearer to the houses in Bowrons Avenue. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, **Cllr Valerie Brown**, the Ward member, stated that she had been approached by residents and the shopkeepers about the application. She informed members that there was a constant problem with little fork lifts in the area and which were obstructing the use of the road. In addition palettes were being left on the pavement to the detriment of pedestrians. She therefore urged members to be minded to impose appropriate conditions that would prevent the above.

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

3/04	03/2493	IKEA Department Store, 2 Drury Way, NW10 0JP	Refusal
------	---------	---	---------

Erection of ground floor extension to retail store, external fire-escape and canopy link extension, alterations to external appearance of building including partial re-cladding, erection of perforated screens around part of multi-storey park and alterations to car parking, vehicular and pedestrian access within site

In his introduction, the **Western Area Planning Manager** informed members that revised proposed site plans had been submitted and drew attention to the following applications that were omitted from the history of the site No 94/0136, 95/1907 97/2440 and 03/0450. He reiterated the recommendation for refusal for this and the subsequent application.

**Mr Gary Deacon**, the Store Manager, stated that he was aware that the only concerns to this application had been raised by Transport for London (TfL). He added that IKEA wished to work closely with the Council and that the car parking layout would ease and improve traffic flow onto the North Circular Road (A406). He also added that the proposal would have a positive impact on the flow of traffic in the area in general. Mr Deacon further added that this proposal would ease access to the store and address the concerns expressed by Brent residents and other customers about difficulties they were experiencing in visiting the store.

In responding to the issues raised by the applicant, the **Head of Area Planning** said that he would be happy to come back to members on the car park within the scheme. He added that the key issue here was a request by TfL for further clarification on the impact of increased trade on the traffic flow to North Circular Road to be provided by IKEA. This has not been addressed as yet and hence officers were recommending refusal.

During discussion, **Cllr Kansagra** suggested a deferral of the application pending confirmation of agreement between the applicant and TfL.

Members however voted by a unanimous decision to refuse the application.

3/05    03/2363    IKEA Department Store, 2 Drury Way,    Refusal  
NW10 0JP

Erection of ground floor extensions and alterations to customer entrance and toilets and customer returns area, extension to first floor restaurant and formation of first floor staff facilities within existing building, erection of canopies and alterations to car parking, vehicular and pedestrian access within the site

## **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:-

- (i) Planning appeals received – 1<sup>st</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004
- (ii) Enforcement appeals received – 1<sup>st</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004
- (iii) Planning appeal decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004
- (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> February 2004
- (v) Planning selected appeal decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> January 2004

## **8. Any Other Urgent Business**

None raised at this meeting

## **9. Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Committee will take place on Wednesday, 28<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at 7.00 pm. The site visit for the meeting will take place on Saturday, 24<sup>th</sup> April 2004 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 10.22 pm.

M CRIBBIN  
Chair

Mins2003'04/Council/planning/pln31mrj