

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2004 at 7.00 pm**

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

Councillor Coughlin 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>
04/0848 – Redevelopment of Stonebridge Estate	Harrod	Personal. Member of the Stonebridge HAT Board

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

None at the start of the meeting

**3. Minutes of the Previous Meeting -**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 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.

<b>ITEM NO</b>	<b>APPLICATION NO</b>	<b>APPLICATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>DECISION</b>
	(1)	(2)	(3)
<b>DEFERRED</b>			
0/01	03/1003	ASDA SUPERSTORE, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EX	Approval, subject to conditions
		Variation of condition 9 (hours of delivery) of planning permission No 98/0413 dated 03/07/98, for the construction of a retail	

superstore with provision of service yard and customer car parking to read as follows: "The store shall not be serviced on Sundays and Bank Holidays by more than six service vehicles on any one day without the consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority."

In his introduction, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** outlined the key issues involved with this application including the noise assessment tests undertaken independently and agreed with officers. He added that the Council's Transportation Unit and the Environmental Health Services had not raised objections to this application. There was no indication that delivery vehicles to the Asda site would increase following the grant of this permission. In referring to the content of the supplementary information circulated at the meeting, he said that the application had been recommended for approval with a condition requiring further monitoring and investigation in relation to noise levels, which would be undertaken within six months of the implementation of the consent and submitted within nine months. This would in effect be a re-assessment of the permission to allow the Council to review the extended delivery hours. In terms of security, he said that Asda had confirmed they would have round the clock security at night involving CCTV and staff patrols to ensure that the proposal did not present security problems. He reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

**Ms O Adebayo**, a resident at King's Court (a block of flats opposite Asda Stores), objected to the proposed extended delivery hours on grounds of increased traffic and noise nuisance.

**Mr Robert Dunwell** stated that the exit for shoppers from the Asda Store presented problems and he therefore urged members to be minded to defer this application until a Section 106 condition could be investigated between Transportation Unit officers and Planning officers that will require Asda to come up with a second exit for shoppers in order to ease congestion.

**Mr. Mathieson**, the applicant's agent stated that the proposed delivery hours would help ASDA to stagger deliveries and ease congestion in the area. As far as he knew, ASDA were pursuing discussions with residents on the issue of congestion. He added that the independent noise assessment test supported the extended delivery hours.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, **Cllr O'Sullivan**, the Ward Councillor stated that he had not been approached. Cllr O'Sullivan urged members to be minded to grant a 12-month temporary approval to enable the Council to monitor deliveries and to review the proposal after the period. He also asked that Asda should be compelled to employ full time security staff to patrol the site throughout the night.

Members then discussed this application during which **Cllr Kansagra** put forward an amendment for a 12-month temporary approval and a further condition requiring Asda to employ full time security staff at night.

In responding to these, the **Head of Area Planning** stated that the independent assessment on noise had been adequately covered in the body of the main report. He, however, recommended that the security arrangements could be covered as part of a management scheme required by a new condition.

Members then voted on the amendment in the name of **Cllr Kansagra** which was declared LOST by a majority.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra & H M Patel	<b>(2)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta & Singh	<b>(7)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>

Members then voted on the substantive recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report which was put to the vote and declared CARRIED by a majority.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta & Singh	<b>(7)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra and H M Patel	<b>(2)</b>

0/02	03/1053	ASDA SUPERSTORE, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EX	Approval, subject to conditions
------	---------	---	---------------------------------

Variation of condition 8 (opening hours) of planning permission reference 98/0413 dated 03/07/98 for construction of a retail superstore with provision of service yard and customer car parking to read as follows: "The premises shall not be open for retail trade except between the hours of 0800 Mondays to 2400 hours Saturdays, and between 1100 to 17.00 hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority."

*See above for preamble.*

Members then voted on the amendment in the name of **Cllr Kansagra** which was declared LOST by a majority.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra & H M Patel	<b>(2)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta & Singh	<b>(7)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>

Members then voted on the substantive recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report which was put to the vote and declared CARRIED by a majority.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta & Singh	<b>(7)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra and H M Patel	<b>(2)</b>

### NORTHERN AREA

1/01	04/0716	1-28 (inc) Evans Business Centre, Brook Road, NW2  Demolition of existing buildings and erection of buildings within Use Class D1 as secondary school and sixth form with ancillary facilities including indoor and outdoor sports facilities and car parking; the erection of residential units (Use Class C3), together with ancillary car parking; works of hard and soft landscaping and other works incidental to redevelopment of site	Refusal for reasons set out in the report and an additional reason 7
1/02	04/0684	1-28 (inc) Evans Business Centre, Brook Road, NW2  Demolition of existing buildings and erection of buildings within use Class D1 as secondary school and sixth form with	Withdrawn. The Committee would have refused it had it not been withdrawn by the applicant

ancillary facilities including indoor and outdoor sports facilities and car parking; the erection of 176 residential units (Use Class C3) together with ancillary car parking; works of hard and soft landscaping; and other works incidental to redevelopment of the site

1/03	04/0198	470 Church Lane, NW9 8UA	Approval, subject to conditions
------	---------	--------------------------	---------------------------------

Demolition of existing stores located on the existing eastern elevation, change of use of offices ancillary to engineers training school to offices (Use Class B1), change of use and subdivision of existing engineers training school (Use Class D1 with ancillary B1/B2 use) to use as 2 warehouse units (Use Class B8), removal and replacement of existing double-pitch roof over warehouse with a raised mono-pitch to align with the adjoining parapet and to increase the height, with associated external alterations

**Mr Alan Wipermann**, representing the objector at No 472 Church Lane, stated that the proposed change of use would be contrary to the London Plan that argued for the maintenance of educational uses. In his view, transport assessment had not been undertaken for the application. Mr Wipermann urged members to be minded to refuse the application as it would constitute an intensification of use of the site and obstruction to his client's access.

In responding to the issues raised, the **Head of Area Planning** drew attention to condition No 9 on access which he felt would address some of the issues outlined by Mr Wipermann.

**Mr Jay Patankar**, the applicant's agent, speaking in support of the application said that no traffic chaos would ensue in Church Lane as a result of the grant of planning permission for this application. He added that the building which had been empty for 15 years and encouraged unhygienic activities, had become dilapidated. He agreed with officers' report and urged members to be minded to endorse the recommendation.

Members voted by a majority decision with one abstention to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

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

<b>FOR:</b>		Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, Kansagra McGovern, H M Patel, Sengupta & Singh.	<b>(9)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>		None	<b>(0)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>		Cllr Steel	<b>(1)</b>
1/04	04/0930	25 Totternhoe Close, Harrow, HA3 0HS  Erection of two-storey side, single-storey rear extension to dwellinghouse (as amended by revised plans received 17/05/04)	Approval, subject to conditions

The applicant, **Mr Raj**, stated that he was satisfied with officers' recommendation for approval of this application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report. For this reason, he did not feel the need to address the Committee.

Members voted by a majority decision with one abstention (Cllr Steel) to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report.

1/05	04/0475	1-21 (inc) and Garages at rear, Oman Court, Oman Avenue, NW2  Erection of a four-storey side extension to eastern end of existing building to accommodate an additional 3 x 1-bedroom self-contained flats and demolition of existing garages to provide 23 car parking spaces and associated landscaping	Approval, subject to conditions and an additional condition on dropped kerb for waste disposal bins
------	---------	---	---

The **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that the provision for parking of 20 off-street parking spaces was considered adequate as it offered one parking space per unit. Visitor parking which was currently dependent upon the availability of on-street parking would continue. He added that the property which has a street frontage would provide some four on-street spaces which were also considered appropriate. In respect of the enquiry by **Cllr J Long** on the controlled parking zone and 'pay and display' bays, he said that the proposed extension of the CPZ was currently at its consultation stage and was proposed along St Michael's Road and Olive Road. Although some parking displacement was anticipated in the area of Oman Court, this was not sufficiently significant to recommend refusal of the application. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

**Mr Robert Dunwell**, speaking in objection to the application, stated that as the drawing was contradictory, it will not be possible for members to make a proper decision on the application. He added that as the refuse enclosures had been increased by 2 metres, this would add to the problems for the elderly and disabled persons. Mr Dunwell urged members to be minded to refuse the application.

**Mr Dominic Connolly** also objected to the application on the grounds that it would spoil the attractiveness of the block. He urged members to be minded to defer the application for a site visit in order to assess the full impact of the application on No 27.

**Mr Gavin Gallagher**, the applicant's agent, outlined the differences between this and the previous application adding that there was no material change between the two. He also added that the parking spaces contained in the report were found to be acceptable, and complied with planning policies. In his view, the proposal would meet the demand for affordable housing and the Council's Unitary Development policies. Mr Gallagher urged members to be minded to approve the application. In response to members' questions, he said that the bin enclosures had been changed following consultation with officers to facilitate manoeuvrability.

In responding to the issues raised, the **Northern Area Planning Manager** stated that the enclosures were required to facilitate manoeuvrability. On the issues of euro bins, he recommended that a crossover be provided to enable the euro bins to be collected.

Members voted by a majority to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the report and an additional condition on the dropped kerb for the waste disposal bin.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Cribbin, Chavda, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, Sengupta & Singh.	<b>(9)</b>	
<b>AGAINST:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra, H M Patel & Steel	<b>(3)</b>	
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>	
1/06	04/0982	30 Dryburgh Gardens, NW9 9TS	Approval, subject to conditions
		Conversion of garage into habitable room	
1/07	04/0742	5 <sup>th</sup> Dimension Design, 389-393 Edgware Road, NW9 6NJ	Approval, subject to conditions
		Change of use from Class A1 (retail) to Class A2 (financial and professional services) for use as a betting office	

## SOUTHERN AREA

2/01	04/0959	Warehouse rear of 2 Wrentham Avenue and 107-109 (inc) Chamberlayne Road, NW10	Refusal
		Change of use of 107-109 Chamberlayne Road involving demolition of existing warehouse building and two-storey rear extension and erection of part two-storey and part four-storey building to provide a 66-bedroom old people's care home with ancillary accommodation	
2/02	03/3447	377 & 377A Kilburn High Road, NW6	Approval, subject to conditions, a condition on design of balconies and a Section 106 agreement
		Demolition of an existing two-storey office building and erection of part 3-, part 4- and part 6-storey building with basement comprising A1 use at ground floor and basement level, 26 x 1 bed, 6 x 2 bed and 3 x studio flats for key worker units with basement cycle parking facility, store and plant room, administration office and laundry room, provision of amenity space, motor cycle parking facilities, refuse collection area and loading area	

In his introduction, the **Southern Area Planning Manager** outlined the similarities between this and the previous application adding that the main difference between the two was in terms of occupancy, as this proposal was for self-contained units for key worker occupation only. He then referred to additional representations from the owner of No 3 Cavendish Close which related to the impact of the scheme on the kitchen window in the side elevation of the block, in terms of loss of light and outlook from this window. In his view, it would be difficult for officers to recommend a refusal based on the objection raised by the objector at No 3 Cavendish Close. He therefore reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

**Mr Robert O'Hara**, the applicant's agent, was satisfied with the officers' report and the recommendation and did not wish to address the Committee.

The **Head of Area Planning** recommended a further condition on the design of balconies.

Members voted by a majority with one abstention to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main report and an additional condition on the design of the balconies.



## WESTERN AREA

3/01	03/3681	<p>Brentfield Road Service Station, Brentfield Road, NW10 8JP</p> <p>Outline application for erection of four-storey building to include basement with 18 car parking spaces and plant/store room, redevelopment of existing petrol station with shop and new facilities at ground floor level and 18 self-contained flats (12 two-bedroom and 6 one-bedroom) on first, second and third floors (matters to be determined: siting, external appearance and means of access)</p>	<p>Withdrawn. The Committee would have refused it had it not been withdrawn</p>
3/02	04/0767	<p>Crest Hotel, 28-32 Craven Park, NW10 8TE</p> <p>Alterations in conjunction with the conversion of existing three-storey hotel into 5 x three-bedroom and 8 x two-bedroom self-contained flats, provision for 12 car parking spaces, cycle parking and amenity area</p>	<p>Approval, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 4, 5, 6 and an additional condition 8 on car parking and access</p>
3/03	04/0729	<p>30 &amp; 32 Pitfield Way, NW10</p> <p>Demolition of existing two dwellinghouses and erection of 1 three-storey building containing 3 one-bedroom flats; 1 four-storey building containing 2 three-bedroom flats and 12 one-bedroom flats; 1 part single storey and 2-storey building containing bike store, bin store, 1 studio unit and provision of landscape area</p>	<p>Withdrawn. The Committee would have refused it had it not been withdrawn by the applicant</p>
3/04	04/0836	<p>31 Marquis Close, Wembley, HA0 4HF</p> <p>Erection of new two-storey, 3-bedroom dwellinghouse within curtilage of existing dwellinghouse</p>	<p>Approval, subject to conditions</p>
3/05	04/0852	<p>62 Hillfield Avenue, Wembley HA0 4JW</p> <p>Erection of 2-storey side extension and installation of 1 No window to first floor front elevation of dwellinghouse</p>	<p>Approval, subject to conditions</p>

3/06	04/0488	1 Beresford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 1YX	Refusal
		<p>Alterations and change of use from light industrial use (Class B1) to gymnasium (Use Class D2), ancillary offices, storage rooms and restaurant at basement level, formation of 56 car parking spaces, reception areas and plant room at ground floor level and 2 assembly halls (for conferences, functions and religious activities etc), prayer room and ancillary offices at first floor level, installation of 4 multi-panelled roof lights, erection of replacement re-sited external staircase, removal of external staircase, reduced canopy and alterations to form access to and from ground floor car parking in the North West elevation and formation of double height glazed entrance to first floor on South (Beresford Road) elevation and part removal of windows and provision of grilles and screening to first floor of building and provision of 19 car parking spaces on Heather Park Drive frontage and 15 car parking spaces on Beresford Road frontage</p>	
3/07	04/0848	Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate, NW10	Approval, subject to conditions as amended in condition 4 on balcony design
		<p>Erection of part 4 and 7 storey building comprising of 5 shop units at ground floor fronting Hillside, one office unit at ground and first floor levels on the corner of Hillside and Shakespeare Road and creation of 35 two-bedroom self-contained flats and 14 one-bedroom self contained flats, provision of 28 car parking spaces and servicing of the shops and offices to the rear and provision of 6 car parking spaces on the Shakespeare Crescent frontage (Site 22)</p>	

3/08	04/0865	Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate, NW10	Approval, subject to conditions
		Details of the erection of part single storey, part 3-storey and part 4-storey buildings containing 26 one-bedroom and 3 two-bedroom flats and common room and provision of cycle parking and 6 on-street car parking spaces on Site 25 in pursuance of conditions 1, 2, 7 and 18 of planning permission reference 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 permission 02/3210 dated 06/03/04	

### SPECIAL ITEMS

4/01	04/0301 to 0327 (inc)	Streetbroadcast Ltd (27 applications)  Bridge Road, Blackbird Hill, Carlisle Road, Church Lane, Church Road, Dudden Hill Lane, Forty Lane, Harrow Road, Willesden High Road, Wembley High Road Kingsbury Road, Neasden Lane, Preston Road, St John's Road, Watford Road and Wembley Park Drive	Refused for reasons set out in the report and the additional reason of impact on the Barnhill Conservation Area, in the case of Grand Parade, Forty lane
		Installation of replacement 70 lamps with an integral advertisement panel creating a two sided 'Streetlite display' (1110mm wide and 1765mm high x 480 deep) for display of 4 sheet size advertisement, the underside being 3m above ground level at various locations detailed in Annex 1	

In his introduction, the Northern Area Planning Manager drew members' attention to a number of minor corrections as set out in the supplementary information. He added that the location of application reference 04/0307 on land at 8 & 13 Grand Parade was within the Barnhill Conservation Area and thus contravened policy BE21. In reiterating the recommendation for refusal, he added a further reason of its impact on the Conservation Area.

Mr Arthur Lee speaking in support of the applications stated that the body and conclusions of the report were inaccurate in terms of lamppost placement, history of the application, income, consultation, method of assessment for public safety and amenity criteria. In the light of these, he felt that Members would not be able to make proper decision of the applications.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, Councillor Coughlin stated that he had not been approached by the applicant. He said that the lamppost signs would not cause light pollution, were unbreakable and were to be sited in a commercial area. He urged members to be minded to defer the applications for more information which was site specific.

During debate, Councillor Kansagra moved an amendment for deferral for a S106 agreement to offset the harm likely to be caused and incorporating Brent colours

In responding to some of the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning said that the method of assessment was robust and conducted to a clear procedure. He explained why he felt Mr Lee's criticisms were unfounded. He explained that the majority of locations raised amenity or safety issues and other constraints, including existing advertising, limited the scope for a co-ordinated approach. In his view, on balance, it would be out of keeping to give approval to the remaining disparate sites. He added that financial contribution had been removed from the application and that he was not aware of any proposals to include corporate colours in the adverts. The Borough Solicitor advised Members that funding and revenue implications were not planning issues in the consideration of the applications.

Members then voted on the substantive recommendation for refusal for the reasons set out in the main and the supplementary information which was declared CARRIED by a majority.

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

<b>FOR:</b>	Cllrs Chavda, Cribbin, Freeson, Harrod, McGovern, & Singh	<b>(6)</b>
<b>AGAINST:</b>	None	<b>(0)</b>
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Cllrs Kansagra, H M Patel, Sengupta and Steel	<b>(4)</b>

## 8. 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> – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004
- (ii) Enforcement appeals received – 1<sup>st</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004
- (iii) Planning appeal decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004
- (iv) Planning selected appeal decisions – 1<sup>st</sup> – 30<sup>th</sup> April 2004

**9. Any Other Urgent Business**

None raised at this meeting

**8. Date of Next Meeting**

The next ordinary meeting of the Committee is scheduled to take place on Wednesday, 30<sup>th</sup> June 2004 at 7.00 pm. The site visit for the meeting will take place on Saturday, 26<sup>th</sup> June 2004 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House. There will be a special meeting of the Committee on Thursday, 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2004 at 7.00 pm

The meeting ended at 9.45 pm.

M CRIBBIN  
Chair

M CRIBBIN  
Chair

Mins2004/05/Council/planning/pln2jnj