

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Wednesday, 28th June 2006 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillor Kansagra (Chair), Councillor Singh (Vice-Chair) and Councillors, Anwar, Baker (alternate for H M Patel), Dunwell, Hashmi, Hirani, J Long and R Moher.

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

Councillors Blackman, Chavda, Crane, Detre and H B Patel also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

32 Crawford Avenue, Wembley (reference 06/1061)

Councillor Anwar declared a prejudicial interest as the applicant, vacated the meeting room and did not take part in the discussion or voting.

4 The Green, Wembley (reference 06/0510)

The legal representative advised the Committee that although the applicant was an employee of the Council this had not influenced officers of the Planning Services in the determination or the recommendation of the application.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting – 8th June 2006

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 8th June 2006 be received and approved as an accurate record.

3. Requests for Site Visits

No requests for site visits were made at the start of the meeting.

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	APPLICATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
----------------	-----------------------	---

DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

0/01	06/0452	12 Hollycroft Avenue, Wembley, HA9 8LF Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension to dwellinghouse
------	---------	--

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and an informative

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) clarified the queries that arose at the site visit on the overall and the internal height of the lower section of the side extension next to No 10 Hollycroft Avenue. He stated that as the overall height of the single storey rear extension and the side extension would maintain the floor level, the resultant internal room height of 2.3 metres was considered to be adequate. He however amended condition No 5 as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting which required the landscaping of the areas indicated on the drawings with grass, shrubs and trees within six months of the commencement of the development.

Mr Charles Clark Maxwell objected to the proposed development on the grounds that it would further reduce light and outlook and also reduce his residential amenities. Furthermore, Mr Clark Maxwell stated that the proposed alterations which would result in a blank wall in excess of 3 metres high next to his property would be out of character with the dwelling.

In responding to the issues raised by the objector, the Assistant Manager (West Area) referred to the normal guidance on the height of extensions and the specifics of this application in terms of the change in levels, the gap between the boundary and the objectors building and the secondary nature of the flank wall glazing. He also added that the size of the objectors garden, while relatively small, was in accordance with the applicable supplementary planning guidance.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in condition 5 and an informative

0/02	06/0557	51 Norval Road, Wembley, HA0 3TD Erection of first floor side/rear extension and rear dormer window extension and installation of 1 side roof-light to dwellinghouse (as amended by revised plans received on 23/05/06)
------	---------	--

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and an informative.

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) stated that as the height and depth of the wall of the extension only exceeded the guidance set out in the supplementary planning guidance note 5 and the Sudbury Court Conservation Area Guide by a relatively small amount, it would not be expedient to pursue enforcement proceedings except for the roof overhang which was considered to have an additional impact. As those works did not comply with the approved plans, the Council's planning enforcement team had been asked to investigate enforcement action in relation to the potential harm of the overhanging roof feature.

In responding to additional objections received from the resident at No 53 Norval Road, the Assistant Manager stated that as the proposed first floor, side and rear extension would be set 1 metre away from the side boundary, it was not considered to cause any significant loss of light to No 53 Norval Road. He added that the occupiers of the adjoining properties were re-consulted on the revised proposal although it was not considered to have any significant impact on their amenities. He drew attention to an amended condition No 6 as set out in the supplementary information.

Mr Jack Gilbert raised objections to the proposal on the following grounds:-

- (a) lack of natural sunlight to the adjoining properties at Nos. 49 and 53 Norval Road, leading to obtrusion;
- (b) the proposed development would not conform to the Sudbury Court Conservation Area Design Guide as it would alter the character and appearance of the existing house and would also have a huge impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties;
- (c) the proposed development would contravene the Council's UDP Policies BE2, 9 and 21 which stated that domestic extensions should be of a scale, design and a relationship that respected the amenity, privacy, daylight and sunlight of adjoining properties as well complemented the character and general scale and appearance of the existing house and the local street scene;
- (d) it would set an undesirable precedent for others to follow which could change the rear aspect of this conservation area to the detriment of all residents.

The Assistant Manager (West Team) stated that the issues raised by the objector had been assessed in the report and that the proposal complied with the Council's Unitary Development Plan and the Design Guide for the Sudbury Court Conservation Area.

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions as amended in condition 6 and an informative

NORTHERN AREA

1/01 06/1046 Theme Traders, The Stadium, Oaklands Road, NW2 6DJ

Renewal of planning permission 03/3351 for outline planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of up to 20 residential units (matters to be determined: means of access) with variation of condition 2 to allow a further 3 years for the submission of reserved matters

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions, an informative and a Section 106 agreement

As this application and the subsequent application reference No 06/1048 were linked, Members agreed to take the representations on both applications together but to decide on each separately.

The Area Planning Manager (Northern Area) clarified that both applications were for the renewal of an existing outline planning permission and that the proposed parking layout which was queried during the Members' site visit would be a reserved matter. The proposal, being close to public transport and services in Cricklewood Broadway, would be largely for a car free residential scheme with 3 parking spaces for disabled residents. As the 3 disabled bays located to the rear of the site would result in the disproportionate loss of potential amenity space, the Council's Transportation Unit had agreed to a revision which would allow 3 dedicated disabled parking bays to be provided along the site's frontage. The 6 parking spaces for the commercial element would exceed the Council's parking standards for B1 office use as set out in the Unitary Development Plan. In light of the comments made by Members about the provision of 3 disabled parking bays along the frontage rather than within the site, he recommended an additional condition No 13 as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

Mr Ian Coward, the applicant's agent, stated that he was happy with the officers' recommendation and was available to answer any queries that Members may raise.

Councillor Dunwell expressed concern that amenity space provided for the development would fall short of the Council's standards and enquired as to why there was no open space provided for future occupants.

In responding to this, the Planning Manager stated that currently there was no parking on site and that the proposed development would provide 6 car parking spaces which would be a net gain. In addition, the amenity space would be increased and that the scheme was being recommended for approval, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement which would benefit Mapesbury and/or the Gladstone Park areas.

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions including additional condition 13, an informative and a Section 106 agreement

1/02 06/1048 1-10 (inc), 10A & 11-13 Turpins Yard, Oaklands Road, NW2

Renewal of planning permission 03/3352 variation of condition 3 to allow a further 3 years for the submission of reserved matters

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions, informatives and a Section 106 agreement.

DECISION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions, informatives and a Section 106 agreement.

1/03 06/0820 41 Gladstone Park Gardens, NW2 6LA

Erection of a detached two-storey self-contained house rear of 41 Gladstone Park Gardens

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and informatives

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions as amended in condition 5 and informatives

1/04 06/1117 Garages rear of 129-145, 145A and Land rear of 151-157 Melrose Avenue, NW2 4LY

Demolition of 60 garages and a 2-storey dwellinghouse and erection of 6 x 4 bed houses with 12 parking spaces

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement

The Area Planning Manager (North Area) referred to the issues raised by local residents and Members during the last site visit and submitted the following responses:-

- (i) The Council's Transportation Unit had consistently advised that the single width access of 3 metres would be acceptable to serve smaller developments and given the limited volume of traffic generated it was unlikely that a significant number of vehicles would stop or reverse in the single car width access. The Transportation Unit was also satisfied that adequate turning room was within the site for refuse and other service vehicles to enter the site.
- (ii) On the issue of the dustbin enclosure, he recommended that an additional condition be included which would require the applicants to submit revised details for the storage of dustbins at each of the proposed houses.
- (iii) In reference to the boundary treatment, he stated that given the height of the existing boundary, the Council may consider a higher than normal replacement boundary treatment to be appropriate, subject to its design and appearance.
- (iv) In responding to claims of loss of privacy, he stated that only a ground floor laundry window and first floor opaque bathroom window would face north towards Melrose Avenue with no resultant overlooking.

In recommending the application for approval, subject to conditions, he drew attention to amended conditions as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting:

No 13 (for further details of the layout of the site entrance);

No 14 (requirement to submit a scheme to remove the parking bays opposite the site entrance for approval);

No 15 (for full details of the boundary treatment to the whole of the site);

No 16 details of the means by which existing trees in the gardens of properties adjoining the site were to be protected from damage;

No 17 for revised details for the storage of dustbins within the site.

The Planning Manager also added an informative advising the applicant to ensure that workers, neighbouring residents and the local environment were fully protected from asbestos which may be present during demolition.

Mr B Thorpe expressed concerns on the following grounds:-

- (a) that the development would be out of character with the properties in the area;
- (b) as a result of the loss of garage and parking facilities for residents, there would be an excessive amount of on street parking to the detriment to the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway;
- (c) the turning circle within the site would be lower than the required standard.

In responding to Members' questions, Mr Thorpe said that he had no precise estimates of the number of the local residents using the lock-up garages. He also expressed a wish for more sympathetic roofing which would not be overbearing to the street scene.

Mr Tim Hands expressed concerns about the surrounding walls and loss of parking spaces which would result from the proposed development. He also expressed further concern about security.

Mrs Yvonne Cohen stated that during the site visit, Members declined to view the proposed development site from Kenneth Crescent and the impact of the proposed development on those residents' gardens. She therefore urged Members to be minded to defer the application for a site visit so that they would be able to view the application site from Kenneth Crescent.

Mr Andrew Archer, the applicant, stated that he was satisfied with the conditions imposed on the boundary fences and treatment. He added that the proposed development would not generate an increase in the volume of traffic and that each house would have two designated parking spaces. In his view, the new development would provide a greater measure of security for neighbouring residents. He also added that as the existing garages were not large enough, residents were using them mostly for storage purposes.

The Head of Area Planning reiterated the comments of the Director of the Transportation Unit and confirmed that with only one on-street car parking space removed, refuse trucks would be able to manage the turn into the site, even if this was from one direction only. He added that the Transportation Unit had advised that the loss of one on-street parking space was satisfactory in the local context and that they had also expressed the view that they would not normally consult local residents on a change of this scale. A condition could also be imposed to ensure that the owners of the new dwellings would not be eligible to apply for extra parking spaces in the area.

During the debate, Councillor Anwar sought clarification on the height of the boundary wall and the responsibility for its maintenance. Councillor Hashmi expressed concerns about parking and enquired how the Council would control the amount of car ownership within the site. Councillor Dunwell stated that a specific limit be put as a condition on the height of the wall up to say 3.3 metres and moved a deferral.

In responding to the above, the Head of Area Planning clarified although there was sympathy for those residents who wished the height of the existing wall to be maintained, there may be practical, design and amenity reasons why this may not be appropriate. However, he agreed that there was scope for the future boundary to be higher than the normal requirement of 1.8 – 2.4 metres and suggested that up to 3 metres could be appropriate subject to its location and design. He added that maintenance of the wall would be likely to be the responsibility of the freeholder and would be subject to the joint management agreement. The Planning Manager (North Area) stated that when the details of the wall were submitted for consideration, officers would seek residents' views on the height, design and materials. The legal representative advised that in any case there would be consultation by the Highways Unit as part of the Traffic Order amendments.

Members voted on the motion by Councillor Dunwell for deferral of the application which was declared LOST. Members then voted by a majority to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main and supplementary reports and additional conditions on fencing and the ineligibility of the residents for residents' parking permits when the CPZ was introduced.

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions as amended in conditions 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and a Section 106 agreement

1/05 06/0971 2 Townsend Lane, NW9 7JH

Erection of two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions as amended in condition 3

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01 06/1028 Willesden Court House, St Mary's Road, NW10

Erection of a part 7-storey, part 6-storey building comprising 56 flats, with commercial use on the ground floor (as accompanied by Transport Assessment Scoping Study March 2006; Ecological Assessment March 2006; Townscape & Visual Assessment 5 April 2006; Design Report)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

The Area Planning Manager (South Area) referred Members to the contents of the supplementary information circulated at the meeting that set out additional objections:

- (i) the height of the 6/7 storey building would be over-bearing and dominant;
- (ii) the height would be at odds with the current development of Stonebridge Park where two-storey properties were replacing the original high rise blocks;
- (iii) the accommodation provided by the new building should be 100% affordable housing to benefit the communities;

The Planning Manager noted that the above matters had been discussed and addressed in the officers' report. He however added a further reason (9) for recommending refusal of the application as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

Mr Chambers in endorsing the officer's recommendation for refusal highlighted the parking problems in the Craven Park area and urged the Council to negotiate with the owners of the site with a view to buying it back for use as a public car park.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an additional reason 9.

2/02 06/0823 387-389 Chapter Road, NW2 5NG

Erection of a 3-storey building comprising 12 self-contained flats (6 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed) including cycle racks, storage bin and recycling stores, soft and hard landscaping (as accompanied by Urban Design statement dated 20/02/06

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

Members were informed that the applicant had confirmed in writing the withdrawal of the application from consideration. Members confirmed that on the basis of the information available they would have refused planning permission had the application not been withdrawn.

DECISION: The Committee would have been minded to refuse the application had it not been withdrawn.

2/03 06/0712 8 Station Terrace, NW10 5RT

Change of use from use Class A1 (retail) to mixed use A1 and A3 (retail and café)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions.

2/04 06/0597 Oddbins, 100 Willesden Lane, NW6 7TW

Installation of new acoustic louvres to plant room, new ATM unit, new single leaf access door to service area, new stainless-steel, ram-raid bollards and new automatic entrance door

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission

DECISION: Planning permission granted

WESTERN AREA

3/01 06/1061 32 Crawford Avenue, Wembley, HA0 2HT

Erection of part single storey and two-storey side and rear extension and front porch and canopy, with balustrade, extension to dwellinghouse and provision of balustrading around single storey rear extension

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

The Assistant Planning Manager (West Area) stated that the proposed development was being recommended for refusal for the reasons set out in the main report. These included inappropriate roof design with a variety of eaves levels, overall size and scale of extensions that would result in an inadequate ground floor setback and an excessive width which would give rise to a significant and harmful addition to the original house. He added that the proposal would thus be considered to be out of keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling and would contravene the Council's UDP policies and the supplementary planning guidance note 5 (altering and extending your home).

Mr Shahzad Anwar the applicant, stated that the last revisions that he had submitted to the Planning Committee were in accordance with the supplementary planning guidance note 5. He added that a mere reduction of 0.3 metres in the width of the extension would not have any significant effect on the street scene. Mr Anwar also queried the reasoning for the development to be set back at the existing ground floor side extension by 1.5 metres from the front wall. He added that any more lowering of the eaves level would result in varying window heights which would not be visually appropriate for a corner site. In conclusion, Mr Anwar stated that the submitted plans were in accordance with the SPG 5 Design Guide and would not have any massing or harmful impact on the street scene.

In responding to the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning stated that the key issues were the location of the property as a corner property, the relationship of the extension to the original house and the size of the overall proposed development. He explained that while SPG5 limited the width of extensions to a maximum of the internal width of the living room, it was usually the case that extensions over 3.5 metres in width appeared out of proportion and scale with the original house. This was the key issue of principal about the scale of the extension.

NB: Councillor M Anwar declared a prejudicial interest vacated the meeting room and did not take part in the discussion or voting on this application.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

3/02 06/1075 Sham Lodge, 2C Sudbury Hill Close, Wembley, HA0 2QR

Erection of single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and informatives.

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions and informatives

3/03 05/2387 Acton Car Rental next to 11, 3C Ranelagh Road, Wembley, HAO 4TW

Change of use of existing office to place of worship (Use Class D1), retention of front gate and boundary fencing to site

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant temporary planning permission for two years, subject to conditions

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) clarified that the exact arrangements for the festivals had been outlined by the applicant and that each event would not last more than one hour, after which some of the congregation may leave or return to the Temple building. As with the Temple activities, the maximum capacity would be 30 people. In addition, he stated that the applicant had submitted a management plan that clarified and outlined all events and services at the site. In the officers' view, it was not considered that the number of festivals, given the proposed arrangements, would result in any significant concern. He referred to Members' queries about amplified sound during the site visit and stated that a condition was being recommended to address this concern.

The Assistant Planning Manager stated that the anticipated opening date of 2nd July 2006 was considered unrealistic due to a number of outstanding works to be completed at the site to make the building operational and to enable the applicant to comply with the conditions of the permission if it were approved. These included the erection of a boundary wall and gates, the installation of a new vehicular crossover and the laying out of parking spaces and the site generally including the installation of cycle parking bays. He then referred to further objections received from the representatives of the Siva Temple at Pavitt Hall

Mr Jayadaven, representing the Siva Temple at Pavitt Hall, stated that he had received the Committee's report quite late which did not enable him to digest and respond appropriately. He added that case law had been cited which had not been referred to in the report. He alleged that officers had not made a proper assessment of the activities of the Temple which were known to be detrimental, and that the Charity Commission were investigating the activities of the Temple. He also alleged that the applicant had submitted biased evidence and urged Members to defer the application pending due investigation of those claims.

Mr Nagendran Seevaratnam, on behalf of the temple, circulated a paper that requested Members to allow the organisation to complete the highway and crossover work that had been started to the standards required by the Highways and Transportation Division. He also asked for a three-month period to enable the organisation to complete the Ranelagh Road site boundary wall and landscaping which he anticipated would be completed between September and November 2006.

In referring to the concerns expressed by the Planning Service about the use of the prayer hall, the applicant submitted that the centre's activities would be conducted without detrimental effect on the amenities of neighbours, road users and the environment. It would also be confined to the existing buildings which had been fully refurbished with quality materials and all windows and doors double glazed. He particularly urged Members to be minded to allow the organisation to perform the religious ceremony at the centre on 2nd July, the most auspicious day in its calendar.

In response to Members' questions, the applicant stated that the site would hold 30 persons as the Trust did not have many devotees or membership within the Borough.

The legal representative advised Members that the material consideration here was the change of use and that matters referred to by the objector were for the security agencies including the Metropolitan Police to address.

In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Practice, Councillor Chavda stated that he had been approached by the applicant. Councillor Chavda urged Members to be minded to approve the temporary planning permission and in particular to allow the organisation to perform the religious ceremony on 2nd July 2006, the most auspicious day in the Trust's calendar from 9.30 am to 1.30 pm.

In responding to Members' questions, the Head of Area Planning stated that the applicant had submitted a management plan for the operation of the prayer hall which officers considered to be adequate. He added that a 2 year temporary approval subject to conditions was recommended, reflecting officers' concerns and to allow officers to monitor, assess and review the change of use.

Members were minded to approve the application, subject to the conditions as set out in the main and the supplementary report and a further condition allowing the Trust to use the site on 2nd July 2006 from 9.30 am to 1.30 pm.

DECISION: Temporary planning permission granted for two years, subject to conditions including additional conditions 10 and 11, the deletion of condition 5 and amendment to condition 8

3/04 06/0510 4 The Green, Wembley, HA0 3QZ

Erection of part single storey and two-storey side and rear extension, rear dormer window extension, replacement of front entrance doors, installation of two rear roof-lights and erection of detached garage at side of dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) stated that the applicant had submitted a revised set of drawings and elevations which indicated a reduction in the width of the extension to 3.6m, and an alteration in the design of the windows in the front elevation to a smaller size. As the original determination of the application was mainly based on the width of the extension which had now been addressed, the Supplementary information set out why the original recommendation for refusal had been changed.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

3/05 05/1784 Osram, 61-69 Lumen Road, Wembley, HA9 7PX

Use of site as a waste-transfer station for the reception, storage and transfer of waste, open storage of skips and other containers, vehicle parking (skip lorries and parking for staff and visitors) and erection of part single storey and two-storey portable buildings for use as offices, WC and storage, and erection of walls, fences and gates

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) stated that five further letters of objection had been received that reiterated the concerns already stated in the main report.

Mr Kenneth Wilkins raised objections to the proposed use of the site as a waste transfer station on the following grounds:-

- (i) increase in air pollution affecting the health of all the local residents;
- (ii) increase in traffic congestion caused by skip lorries;
- (iii) the applicant had consistently been dumping rubbish in the area without planning permission;
- (iv) the operation would have a detrimental impact on the new housing estate in the East Lane area;
- (v) the proposal would not enhance the area and was likely to cause a blight on the area, similar to the operation of the Neasden Goods Yard in Neasden.

Mr Goodgain the agent stated that the Environment Agency had already granted a waste management licence to the company and requested that the application be deferred for a site visit to enable Members to assess the planning impact of the use of the site as a waste transfer station.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Blackman stated that he had been approached by the local residents. He clarified that several letters of objection had been received from residents in Carlton Avenue East and that air pollution as a result of the operation was travelling as far as Edison Drive. In endorsing officers' recommendation for refusal, Councillor Blackman urged Members to be minded to commence enforcement action to stop the operation.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

3/06 06/0893 35 Littleton Road, Harrow, HA1 3SY

Erection of single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and an informative

DECISION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions and an informative

3/07 06/0667 Northwick Park Golf Club, 280 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TZ

Retention of internally illuminated, free-standing sign at either side of site entrance

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

Members agreed to consider the representations for all four applications together but to decide on them separately.

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) stated that the reason for recommending refusal of the retention of an internally illuminated free-standing sign at either side of the entrance was not based on textual inaccuracy but rather on the size, location and illumination of the sign. It was for this reason that the applicant's request for a meeting with officers to change the text was not considered to be adequate to resolve the unsatisfactory nature of the proposed development. He referred to additional representation received from Northwick Park Hospital expressing concerns on the lighting and its impact on the ward block at night. He clarified that the provision of a large concrete over-area, the installation of permanent bowling machines and their covers amongst others did not constitute permitted development. In respect of the retention of the hard surface and the lighting to the north of the Club, he stated that the applicant's request to have the overflow car park capacity reduced from 137 to 60 had not been provided with any clear justification to support it.

Mr Jack Gilbert on behalf of the residents' working group raised the following objections to planning applications for the Northwick Park Golf Course;

- a) the internally illuminated signs which were inappropriate within Metropolitan Open Land and displayed activities within the site that were unauthorised
- b) the high volume of traffic constantly in Watford Road posed a danger to anyone trying to gain safe entrance and exit to the site

- c) the caged batting baseball court which was visible from Watford Road was unsightly and contravened the Council's UDP policies on open public space
- d) the proposals for the overflow car park would destroy a large part of the metropolitan open land
- e) the picket fence and wooden shed by the site entrance to the golf course was unsightly with inadequate landscaping and poor irrigation
- f) the lighting at the site detrimentally affect residential amenities.

Ms Gaynor Lloyd an objector stated that the land was Metropolitan Open Land which was subject to the Council's Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan. She added that the adventure golf course needed to be landscaped and that the lighting was a major problem for the residents. She also referred to the metal baseball cage, the traffic congestion and other unauthorised commercial uses on the site.

In response to Members' questions, Ms Lloyd stated that she felt the impact of the overflow car park would be seen from the road and the footpath from the farm. She also re-stated her concerns on landscaping, the batting cage, illumination and lack of tree screening.

Mr Piggins, the applicant, stated that the land was previously a derelict site and that in partnership with the local authority, a scheme that complied with the Council's policies and standards was put in place, resulting in a golf course of international renown and widespread support. He added that the applications were submitted long before the enforcement notices were even considered.

In response to Members' questions, Mr Piggins stated that in order to address the concerns on lighting, he would be happy to have them switched off at 6.00 pm. He also undertook to landscape the area and provide screening and shrouding. He added that the batting cage was being intensively used by many people including local schools. He also stated that the proposal was fully supported initially by the Local Authority and that he was informed that the batting cage did not require prior planning permission.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Detre, a Ward Member, stated that he had been approached by the applicant but not objectors. He stated that the signage made people aware of the facility and that the applicant had spent £8m to ensure that the golf club was a world class facility within the Borough. In his view, the golf club was a decently well managed facility within the Borough. He also added that parking was needed on site or else there would be an overspill into the adjoining roads including Norval Road and the local hospital. In his view, the batting cage was not obtrusive and urged Members to support the facility in order to ensure the success of the operation.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Blackman stated that he had not been approached. He stated that the site was previously a dumping ground which had been restored and enhanced by the applicant. It appeared that there was genuine confusion as to what aspects of the operation required prior planning permission. He also added that the current operation fitted in nicely with the strategic aims of the Borough and urged Members to approve the application, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Crane stated that he had been approached by the applicant. He urged Members not to refuse permission for the batting cage and submitted that there was no adverse impact from the site's lighting. He drew Members' attention to the applicant's willingness to address the lighting issue and to listen to the views of the local residents. Councillor Crane urged Members to be minded to approve the application.

In responding to some of the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning stated that the applications were not considered appropriate developments within Metropolitan Open Land. He added that the size and structure of the batting cage and the adventure golf course were of concern to officers, that there had now been evidence presented to assist with assessing the parking requirements and that the sign currently included activities which appeared to be unauthorised. He referred to the late suggested amendments and that these were not considered to address the concerns.

Members then had an extensive debate during which they felt that they had not had enough time to consider all the circumstances including the Mayor of London's report received only a day before the meeting. Members decided by a majority that all four applications be deferred to enable officers and the applicant to discuss the applications with the intention of investigating further changes and improvements to the proposals.

DECISION: Deferred.

3/08 06/0762 Northwick Park Golf Club, 280 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TZ

Retention of caged baseball batting court and kiosk and associated floodlighting and landscaping (as accompanied by Supporting Information and Design Statement document dated March 2006 and Planting Proposals document dated May 2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission

DECISION: Deferred.

3/09 06/0768 Northwick Park Golf Club, 280 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TZ

Retention of hard surface and lighting to the north of the club house to create an overflow car park (as accompanied by Supporting Information and Design Statement document dated March 2006 and Planting Proposals document dated May 2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

DECISION: Deferred.

3/10 06/0769 Northwick Park Golf Club, 280 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TZ

Retention of adventure golf facility, including external lighting and landscaping (as accompanied by Supporting Information and Design Statement document dated March 2006 and Planting Proposals document dated May 2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

DECISION: Deferred.

3/11 06/0078 Redevelopment, Stonebridge Estate, Stonebridge, NW10

Erection of part three-, five- and six-storey building to provide health centre, community centre, radio station, café, retail shop, 25 one-bedroom flats, 32 two-bedroom flats and 2 studio flats, formation of 47 basement car parking spaces (of which 17 are for the health centre), 17 surface car parking spaces and 4 lay-by car parking spaces, provision of vehicular access from The Avenue and landscaping on land fronting Hillside and The Avenue between Stonebridge Park Hotel and the BACES site (as accompanied by Planning Support Information document dated 14/06/06 and Supporting Statement dated January 2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

The Assistant Area Planning Manager (West Area) stated that the applicant had submitted statements in support of the application covering residential amenity, sustainable and community facilities. These were taken into account in the determination of the application and as a result of which a number of additional conditions as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting were being recommended.

Mr Paul Rogers, the applicant's agent, stated that the application represented the final community facility for the Stonebridge area which was critical to the delivery of the master plan. He added that the proposal which had the full support of the Primary Care Trust (PCT) would provide a dramatic building within the streetscene that would deliver the health centre and community facilities as well as a shop and cafe as an integral element of the redevelopment of this estate. The building has been modified to provide an adequate standard of amenity for the residents of the development and the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

DECISION: Planning permission granted, subject to conditions, additional conditions 12-19 and an informative.

6. **Planning Appeals**

Members were requested to note the list of planning and enforcement appeals for 1st – 31st May 2006.

RESOLVED:-

that the following planning and enforcement appeals for 1st – 31st May 2006 be noted:-

- (i) Planning appeals received;
- (ii) Enforcement appeals received;
- (iii) Planning appeal decisions;
- (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions;
- (v) Selected planning appeal decisions list;
- (vi) Selected enforcement appeal decisions list;
- (vii) Copies of selected appeal decisions.

7. **Date of Next Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting of the Committee will take place on Wednesday, 12th July 2006 at 7.00 pm to consider policy issues only. There will be no site visit prior to this meeting. The next meeting to consider planning applications will take place on Wednesday, 26th July 2006 and the site visit for this latter meeting will take place the preceding Saturday, 22nd July 2006 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

NB:

At 9.15 pm the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes.

At 10.30 pm Members voted to disapply the guillotine procedure to enable all applications to be considered.

The meeting ended at 12.10 am

S KANSAGRA
Chair

Mins2006'07/Council/planning/pln28jn06