

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Thursday, 11th November 2004 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Cribbin (Chair) and Councillors Freeson, Kansagra, McGovern, R S Patel (alternate for Harrod) and Singh.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Harrod and H M Patel.

Councillor Fox also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

Councillor R S Patel declared a personal interest in the 10 Ennerdale Drive, NW9 0DT application, stating that he had arranged a meeting between the applicant and the Planning Service. On the advice from the Borough Solicitor, it was agreed that this did not amount to a prejudicial interest so he took part in the discussion and voting on this application.

2. Requests for Site Visits

None.

3. Minutes of Previous Meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 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 decisions 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	Application and Proposed Development
		NORTHERN AREA
1/01	04/2537	43 Basing Hill, Wembley, HA9 9QS
		Proposed alterations comprising reduction and reposition of rear dormer, removal of outbuilding, removal of parapet to party wall, replacement of roof tiles, provision of landscaping to the front garden, reduction of front boundary wall and removal of lighting to front of dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant consent subject to conditions and informatives

The Assistant Northern Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the supplementary report circulated at the meeting regarding responses to issues raised by the applicant concerning the roof and the rear dormer. He also advised the Committee of an amendment to condition 5 as set out in the supplementary report.

Mr Simon Alexander, speaking on behalf of the residents of 41 Basing Hill, stated that they did not object to the application in principle but reiterated that the alterations should be carried out within 6 months, as had been set out in condition 1 of the report. He requested that the consultees receive information regarding the detailed plan of this application when it became available.

Mr Robert Dunwell, speaking on behalf of the applicant, thanked the Planning Service for the advice given to the applicant and asked that the application be approved as presented to the Committee.

During debate, Councillor Kansagra stated that it would have been desirable if this applicant had sought planning permission from the outset. Councillor McGovern sought clarification over the height of the boundary wall. Councillor Freeson suggested that an inspection be undertaken to determine the stability of the boundary wall.

In reply to some of the issues raised, the Assistant Northern Area Planning Manager advised that the wall appeared to be reasonably stable and he confirmed that the proposals were for the entire wall to be contained within the applicant's site. The Assistant Northern Area Planning Manager added that the revisions to the site included that the boundary wall be no higher than 3 metres.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions, informatives and an amendment to condition 5 as set out in the supplementary report

1/02 04/2007

81 Brook Road, NW2 7DR|

Erection of two-storey side and rear and single storey rear extensions to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse consent

The Assistant Northern Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to the supplementary report circulated at the meeting which detailed how the proposal contradicted guidance note SPG5.

Mr S Attanayake, the applicant's agent, circulated photographs of both the application site and 75 Brook Road. He drew Members' attention to the photographs of 75 Brook Road showing a 2 storey house that had received planning permission, and of the application site, stating that a flat roof to the

side extension would minimise the impact on 79 Brook Road. He stated that both 79 and 83 Brook Road supported the application. He felt that the application both enhanced the street scene and assimilated with the rest of the street and therefore merited approval.

DECISION: Planning permission refused

1/03 04/2765 332-336, 332A-C inc Neasden Lane, NW10
Erection of first floor, second floor and third floor rear extension to building, creating 12 additional residential flats (outline application – details of siting only)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse consent

DECISION: Application withdrawn. The Committee indicated that it would have been minded to refuse the application had it not been withdrawn by the applicant.

1/04 04/2860 10 Ennerdale Drive, NW9 0DT
Alterations to and retention of brick-built outbuilding in rear gardens of dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant consent subject to conditions

DECISION: Planning permission approved subject to conditions

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01 04/2578 Lampshade Design, 30-31 Sapcote Trading Centre, High Road, NW10 2DH
Infill roof extension to commercial premises

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant consent subject to conditions

DECISION: Planning permission approved subject to conditions and additional informative as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting.

2/02 04/2353 37, Flats at 1-10, 37, 39 & 41 High Street, NW10
Erection of 3-storey building comprising 4 x 2-bedroom flats, 6 x 1-bedroom flats and 2 studio flats with associated balconies, rear amenity and refuse storage above the ground floor of the building to the rear of 37- 41 High Street NW10 (car-free development)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory section 106 or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental services to agree exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor

The Head of Area Planning advised Members that a significantly improved application had been submitted since the withdrawal of an earlier one. He felt that the proposals would make a positive contribution toward the overall urban design and appearance of Harlesden Town Centre.

DECISION: Planning permission approved subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental services to agree exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

2/03 04/2660

Land next to 760 Harrow Road, NW10 5LE

Erection of four-storey building, including 12 No flats, retail space to ground floor, associated parking

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

DECISION: Application withdrawn. The Committee indicated that it would have been minded to refuse the application had it not been withdrawn by the applicant.

2/04 04/2577

203 & 203A-C Willesden Lane, NW6

Demolition of existing three-storey dwellinghouse containing 4 flats, erection of five-storey block of flats containing 10 units (4 x 1-bedroom and 6 x 2-bedroom flats) with provision of 5 parking bays at basement level

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

The Southern Area Planning Manager drew the Committee's attention to an amendment to reason 1 to refuse as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting.

Ms Anna Pavlovic, the applicant's agent, stated that she felt there was insufficient time to respond to the objections raised, some of which she deemed irrelevant. She believed that there had been considerable consultation with the Planning Services and other relevant authorities in composing the application. She stated that since the publication of the report, proposals had been altered to reduce the gradient of the access ramp to the basement parking area. She also felt that the concerns raised by the Director of Transportation could also be addressed.

In reply to the issues raised, the Southern Area Planning Manager explained that objections to the application could only be passed on to the applicant once they had been received. He stated that not all pre-application advice

had been addressed in the proposals such as concerns regarding basement parking and he advised that the access ramp needed a major re-design. He added that a survey by Transportation Unit of the proposals had indicated that there would not be sufficient space for overspill parking in the surrounding roads.

The Head of Area Planning advised that the applicant's architect had received a written response from the Director of Planning regarding her concerns over the recommendations.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an amendment to reason 1 to refuse as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting.

WESTERN AREA

3/01 04/2669 20 Audrey Gardens, Wembley, HA0 3TG

Erection of single storey rear extension and detached store in rear garden area of dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Agree planning permission subject to conditions

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions

3/02 04/2673 Gormley Group, Gormley House, Waxlow Road, NW10 7NU

Use of part of second floor of industrial premises as a vocational and enterprise educational training centre (D1)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Agree planning permission subject to conditions

The Western Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to further concerns raised, amendments to reasons 1 and 2 and an additional reason for granting approval as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting. He added that the applicant had given assurance that a fire risk assessment had been undertaken.

Mr Gary Holmyard, in objecting to the application, stated that he was not aware that any risk assessment had been undertaken by the applicant. He objected to the application for the following reasons:-

- (a) Health and safety issues such as vehicles entering and exiting the industrial estate where the site was located;
- (b) The potential security risk posed by the fire escape route passing through other tenants in the building;
- (c) Suspicion that a recent burglary was connected to the students who visited the site;
- (d) That the site, as a school, was inappropriate due to it being within 200 yards of mobile phone masts; and

- (e) That the number of students visiting the site was 50, not 25 as specified in the report.

He concluded by requesting that the Committee undertake a site visit.

In reply to Members' questions, Mr Holmyard stated that he was not objecting to a former vacant property becoming occupied, but felt that the use of the premises by young people would be inappropriate considering the dangers posed by the flow of vehicles to and from the industrial estate.

Mr Malone echoed Mr Holmyard's concerns regarding young people visiting an industrial estate, feeling it was an inappropriate place to locate a school.

Councillor Singh, in response to Mr Malone's comments, stressed that the applicant was proposing a vocational centre and not a school in the traditional sense.

Mr Sandy Young, the applicant, began by stating that the application had the broad support of a number of organisations. He asserted that the purpose of the Centre was to offer an opportunity to those children who were not academically gifted but who were capable of gaining basic work skills. He stressed the unique and important role played by the Vocational and Education Training Centre, stating that it was to be the subject of research by Durham University. Responding to Mr Holmyard's comment concerning student numbers, Mr Young confirmed that although a total of 50 students would be visiting the site, no more than 25 would be on site at any one time. He concluded by stating that the students deserved a chance to enhance their prospects and to gain BTEC qualifications and that a refusal would deny them this opportunity.

In reply to various queries from Members, Mr Young maintained that a sound security system was in place on the premises, fire alarms were in place and a fire risk assessment had been undertaken. He stressed that there had been no security concerns since the Centre had opened and that a company on the industrial estate had been very supportive, offering the Centre's students work placements. He felt that the Centre would benefit from being located on the industrial estate as it would offer students a professional environment in which to gain basic skills.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Fox stated that although he was not a Ward Member for the application site, he was a governor at John Kelly Boys' School, the applicant who ran the Centre. He stated that although he understood the concerns raised by the objectors, the opportunity presented by this application, which met Government objectives to enhance opportunities for the less academically gifted students, merited approval. He stressed that the students who wished to attend the Centre had to prove their willingness to learn and that the site's industrial estate location offered the relevant work skills within immediate proximity.

During debate, Councillor Freeson stated that the application offered chances for young people, especially as this type of education and training was lacking generally and he commended the objectives of the Centre.

In reply to Members' queries, the Head of Area Planning stated that the hours of use for the Centre were not conditional as it was not appropriate in this case, although he anticipated that use would be mainly confined to daytime hours.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and reason 1 in the report to be a condition as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting

3/03 04/2060 School Main Building, Oakington Manor School, Oakington Manor Drive, Wembley, HA9 6NF

Erection of single storey, pitched-roof classroom block comprising 3 reception classrooms with central play activity area, ancillary children's toilet facilities and new nursery unit, covered-walkway link to main school and timber play decks with extensions into wooded area in eastern side of school facing Monks Park

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Agree planning permission subject to conditions

The Western Area Planning Manager drew Members' attention to amendments to conditions 4 and 7 as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and amendments to conditions 4 and 7 as set out in the supplementary report circulated at the meeting.

3/04 02/2319 44 Preston Road, Wembley, HA9 8JY

Retention and completion of boundary walls to property

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Agree planning permission subject to conditions

Ms Trisha Connolly objected to the application on the grounds that the height of the boundary wall was domineering and intrusive and that in some parts it exceeded the 2 metre maximum height as recommended as a condition in the report.

Mr S Mehar, the applicant, stated that he had chosen to replace the original boundary wall consisting of a wooden fence with that of a brick wall in order to provide more privacy and to enhance his property. He also felt that the wall was necessary to prevent rubbish encroaching from the street.

During debate, Councillor Freeson offered the opinion that there were other alternatives to building boundary walls to ensure privacy.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions

3/05 04/2763

25 Castleton Avenue, Wembley, HA9 7QH

Erection of part single storey, part two-storey side and rear extension

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Agree planning permission subject to conditions

Mr Henry Wyman objected to the application on the grounds that:-

- (a) The applicant did not reside on site;
- (b) The application had attracted 6 objections from neighbours;
- (c) Suspicion that more bedrooms would be added;
- (d) That there would be more than 1 person co-habiting in each bedroom; and
- (e) More congestion and rubbish would be generated by additional vehicles and tenants.

In reply to the comments made by Mr Wyman, the Western Area Planning Manager advised Members that the behaviour of potential tenants was not a planning matter and he confirmed that the site was to consist of 2 units.

The Head of Area Planning advised Members that the restriction on this site was for up to 6 co-habitants living as a household. He added that the arrangements had to include an element of shared living and that enforcement action could be undertaken if this was not taking place.

The Chair advised Mr Wyman that a breach of these regulations could be reported to the relevant authorities.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions

7. **Any Other Urgent Business**

Councillor Freeson stated that he had submitted a written request for various items to be considered by the Planning Committee as soon as practically possible as he considered these a matter of urgency.

In reply, the Head of Area Planning acknowledged that it would be beneficial for a clearer programme to be drawn up for future policy item reports to Planning Committee. He stressed the need to prioritise the work programme and stated that there were limits to what could be achieved with the available resources. He advised that he would discuss the issues raised with the Director of Planning and the Chair and would provide Councillor Freeson with a written response. He added that a work programme would be suggested for the next

Planning Committee at which policy items would be considered (26th January 2005).

8. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next ordinary meeting of the Committee would take place on Tuesday, 30th November 2004 at 7.00 pm and that the site visit for the meeting would take place on Saturday, 27th November 2004 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm.

M CRIBBIN
Chair

Mins2004/05/Council/planning/pln11nj