

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
10th October 2006 at 7.00 pm

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

Councillors Baker, Detre, Malik and Shaw also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

41 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA3 0LN (Reference 06/2188)
Councillor Kansagra declared a personal and prejudicial interest left the meeting room and did not take part in the discussion and voting on this application. Councillor Singh (Vice Chair) took the Chair for this application only.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 5th September 2006

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 5th September 2006 be received and approved as an accurate record.

3. Requests for Site Visits

None 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 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
	(1)	(2)

APPLICATIONS DEFERRED FROM THE LAST MEETING

0/01	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

This application and the succeeding 3 applications for the Northwick Park Golf Club were deferred at the Committee meeting on 28th June 2006 at Members' request to enable officers to undertake further discussions and negotiations with the applicants and the agents. The Assistant Planning Manager (West Area) updated members that following discussions, the applicants had indicated that in addition to their previous offers to paint the concrete base to an agreed colour, they would agree to the following; the provision of additional landscaping to provide more screening; a condition to switch off the lighting to this area at 21-00; a reduction the height of the cage but only up to a maximum of 3 metres as any further reduction in the would have an adverse effect on the operation of the facility; mature landscaping which would not make the netting visible from Watford Road. The applicants added that the structures for the caged baseball batting court and kiosk were considered to accord with the open space policies relating to essential facilities within Metropolitan Open Land (MOL).

The Assistant Planning Manager in responding to the above submitted that the applicant's offer to paint the base would be of limited impact that would not address the objections raised. He added that as the proposed landscaping would take a considerable time to become established, it would not provide effective screening of the structure as was the suggested reduction in the height of the structure which would not be sufficient to offset the visual impact of this structure. In addition to the dominant feature of the lighting, the netting and structures within and adjacent to the land would not preserve the open character of this land which had been designated as a MOL.

The Assistant Planning Manager made references to further objections received from the London Borough of Harrow, Councillor Narinder Mudhar of Harrow and Sudbury Court Residents Association and drew the Committee's attention to the responses as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. In reiterating the recommendation for refusal, he added that if Members were minded to grant permission in contrary, the application would have to be referred to the Government Office for London (GoL) and the Mayor of London before a decision notice could be issued.

The Committee agreed to give extended speaking times to the objectors and the agent to enable them to cover all 4 applications in their representations.

Mrs Sara Bishop objected to the applications on the grounds that the siting of the golf course on MOL would constitute a radical departure from the Council's planning policies which could set an undesirable precedent for others to follow in future. She added that a previous application (reference 99/2397) did not include proposals for car parking provision as the latter had been expressly refused by the Mayor of London. In answer to a question, Mrs Bishop re-stated that the MOL was an inappropriate site for the batting cage.

Mr Keith Perrin representing the Golf Course Working Group and speaking in similar vein stated that most of the local residents were opposed to the applications in all respects. He said that the floodlight and base were undesirable intrusions into the MOL as was the extra parking which would attract additional vehicles thus causing traffic congestion and chaos. He added that

adventure golf would be unsafe for children and urged Members to refuse the applications.

Ms Gaynor Lloyd in objection stated that the applications would result in congestion and traffic chaos in the area. The illuminated signs on steel support poles at the main entrance were not only a distraction to motorists but also inappropriate within a metropolitan open land. She objected to the batting cages as they did not enhance the site. Ms Lloyd did not accept the applicant's proposal for landscaping as it would not provide adequate screening until the trees were fully matured. She referred to the applicant's correspondence to members of the Committee which asked them to support the applications and submitted that this could prevent those members from participating in the consideration of the applications.

Ms. Sophie Seifalian membership secretary of the Sudbury Court Residents' Association stated that although the Association was in favour of the golf course, they were strongly opposed to the applications before the Committee for the following reasons;

- a) The batting cages were visually obtrusive, and their impact virtually impossible to mitigate with landscaping. They were totally detrimental to the area, especially when lit, causing nuisance to neighbours, and loss of amenity to local residents.
- b) The overflow car park, a vacant, hard surfaced area with ancillary lighting would cause a nuisance to neighbours and a lack of amenity to residents.
- c) The signage was visually intrusive, a nuisance to neighbours, a distraction to drivers and would cause loss of amenity to residents. They were inappropriate on metropolitan open land due to their size and prominence.
- d) The adventure golf, on top of a bank several metres high, had increased its visual impact. As there was plenty of space available on the site for a less obtrusive positioning, the golf course should be relocated.

Mr Peter McEvoy on behalf of the applicant stated that the applicant had proposed additional landscaping to provide more screening and would accept conditions to switch off the lighting to this area at 21-00 and reduce the height of the batting cage to a maximum of 3 metres. He added that Northwick Park ought to retain the baseball batting cages for the benefit of the golf proposition given the fierce and sophisticated competition from other sporting activities. In his view, the open air operation was considered to accord with the open space policies relating to essential facilities within MOL.

In respect of the signage, Mr McEvoy submitted that although the applicant wished to retain the size of the sign and its illumination, the contents and wording had been amended. Copies of the amended signage were circulated at the meeting for information. He drew Members' attention to the applicants reduced provision of car parking spaces to 40, supported by a revised drawing. In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Detre a ward member said that he had been approached by both objectors and the applicant.

He spoke in support of the applications adding that the overflow car park was necessary to prevent displacement parking in neighbouring roads. There was a need for the signage to be given prominence so that those visiting the course by vehicles would not need to keep driving to and from John Lyon and Northwick Park roundabouts. He urged the Committee to approve the applications.

In response to Ms Lloyd's claim about the applicant's correspondence to members urging them to support the applications, the legal adviser stated that objectors and the applicant were not prevented from sending written materials to members. It was up to that member to declare, if applicable, that he/she had an interest of personal or prejudicial nature.

The Director of Planning stated that as the proposals involved a significant departure, some of the applications would have to be referred to GoL and the Mayor of London. He highlighted the progress made on the applications since the last meeting resulting in the submission of revised measures, however, he reiterated officers' objection to the signage. Members discussed the applications after they decided each application individually as set out in the respective decision columns.

DECISION: Planning permission refused

0/02 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.

The Assistant Manager informed Members that following discussions the applicants had offered to reduce the parking spaces to 40 and submitted a revised drawing for it. He added that the layout was considered to be inappropriate and not in the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality. In view of that officers request a Management Scheme covering an amendment to the layout, removal of the two lights for the special events car parking area, more landscaping, clarification on the use of the special events car parking area and the times and nature of the vehicles proposed to use this area. He therefore amended the recommendation to an approval subject to conditions, receipt of satisfactory drawings, landscaping and management plan to be reported to this Committee and a referral to GOL and the Mayor of London.

DECISION: Minded to grant planning permission subject to conditions, receipt of satisfactory drawings, landscaping and management plan to be reported to this Committee and a referral to GOL and the Mayor of London.

0/03 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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Assistant Manager reported that in respect of this application, the applicants had put forward the following proposals; to remove the existing picket fence and replace it with a 1 metre high post and 4 strands of wire fence; provision of a hedge or other landscaping on the Watford Road front of the site; replacement of high level lights with low level lighting around the perimeter within the development; removal of the wooden shed and its replacement with an equipment cabinet painted dark green; acceptance of conditions on landscaping and lighting to be turned off at 21 00. As a consequence, he reiterated the recommendation for approval, subject to a referral to GOL and the Mayor of London.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and a referral to GOL and the Mayor of London.

0/04 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.

Following negotiations, the applicants indicated their willingness to change the contents and wording of the sign but to retain its size and its illumination. Copies of the amended signage were circulated at the meeting for Members' information. The Planning Manager however maintained the concern about the provision of significant illuminated signage on a prominent frontage to one of the main routes through the Borough within an area designated as MOL.

Members were minded to grant planning permission contrary to the officer's recommendation and requested the Director of Planning to submit a further report to the next meeting setting out conditions for approval.

DECISION: Minded to grant planning permission granted subject to conditions and a report back to this Committee with conditions for approval.

NORTHERN AREA

1/01 06/2334 194 The Mall, Harrow, HA3 9TT

Erection of single storey rear extension to ground floor maisonette

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/02 06/2046 The Lancer, 177-179 Kenton Road, Harrow, HA3 0EY

Demolition and erection of a single-storey rear extension to the public house and alteration to the external staircase

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (North Area) stated that the conditions for the grant of planning permission had been amended as a result of consultation with the neighbouring occupiers. He added that fights and other anti-social behaviour outside the premises were an issue for the licensing authority and not this Committee.

Mr Jagdish Mehta in objecting to the application said that with only a wooden fence between his property and the application site, he was already having environmental problems, noise nuisance from amplified music and loss of privacy from the use of the premises as a club. He added that fights often broke out that required police attendance and that to grant planning permission for the application could only exacerbate those problems.

Dr Datani also objected to the application on the grounds that by increasing the club's dance floor by about 40 metres, he would suffer from increased noise nuisance and worsening anti-social behaviour as his property was in close proximity to the club. In addition, there would be congestion and parking problems in the area. In response to questions, Dr Datani said that insulation of the new development alone would not be adequate to address the problems.

During debate, Councillor Dunwell's request for a site visit was not agreed.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in conditions 2 and 8.

1/03 06/2188 41 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA3 0LN

Demolition and rebuilding of ground floor garage, erection of first floor side extension and front dormer window of dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (North Area) referred to the unusual design of the existing house and in his view it was preferable that a good design be maintained rather than adhere to the normal policy which would have resulted in an unsatisfactory solution.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/04 06/0736 Airglobe Holidays, Masons House, 1-3 Valley Drive, London, NW9 9NQ

Change of use from an office to a health & fitness centre (D2) as accompanied by revised Planning Statement received 25/8/06

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (North Area) reported that the applicant had undertaken to provide full adequate soundproofing to the second floor ceiling and that no amplified music would be played. In respect of these and the slamming of doors, additional conditions had been recommended as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. He reported the applicant's view that traffic generation would be minimal as most users would visit after 6.30 pm when the flow of traffic was reduced. He added that the applicant's offer to install a CCTV camera to cover the premises and the basement parking had also been made a condition for the grant of planning permission.

Mr Lawrence Segal objected on the grounds that the traffic problems that would result from the proposed change of use had not been addressed in the report.

During debate, members of the Committee sought clarifications on pedestrian access to the car park and the possibility of yellow lines on the kerbside to alleviate parking problems especially for disabled drivers. The Planning Manager stated that condition 11 would address any access problems. In respect of the yellow lines, the legal adviser said that traffic orders were required which were not within the remit of this Committee.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and additional conditions 9, 10 and 11.

1/05 06/1992 Warner Howard House, 2 Woodgrange Avenue, Harrow, HA3
Change of use of second and third floor offices to residential

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (North Area) informed the Committee that the applicant had agreed to provide some markings to define parking spaces for Pegasus Court and those for Warner Howard House. In order to ensure that residential parking standards were maintained, he recommended additional condition 8 requiring the applicant to submit further details of parking spaces for approval and a further condition 9 on the hours of use of the spaces as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and additional conditions 8 and 9 as amended in condition 3 and to a Section 106 agreement.

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01 06/2198 189 Willesden Lane, London, NW6 7YN

Erection of two storey dwellinghouse with habitable roofspace to rear of 189 Willesden Lane (revised scheme following allowed appeals 04/2793 & 04/2504).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (South Area) stated that the proposed changes to the approved house were considered to be relatively minor in nature and would not make the scheme acceptable. He advised Members to decide the application on its planning merits as the legal issues raised by residents in connection with access to the site were matters for the parties to resolve between themselves.

A resident submitted a letter that was read out to the meeting setting out her objections to the application on grounds of loss of light, outlook, privacy, increased traffic and pedestrian safety.

During discussions, Councillor Cummins commented that Bembridge Close had not been maintained by the applicants and was therefore in an appalling state. He added that the applicant be asked to re-surface the road in the interest of pedestrian safety. In agreeing the recommendations subject to conditions, officers were requested to inform Transportation Unit about the concerns raised about the maintenance of Bembridge Close.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

2/02 06/2043 Central Relief Service, 2 Scrubs Lane, London, NW10 6RB

Erection of a new 3-storey building comprising a nursery, a church and community facilities, provision of 4 parking spaces, bicycle stands and a refuse store, new vehicular and pedestrian access, hardstanding and landscaping (as accompanied by a Design Statement, Traffic Impact Assessment Report, Acoustic Consultancy Report, Travel Plan and Sustainability Checklist and as revised by plans received on 6 September 2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (South Area) informed the Committee that the application had already been approved by London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham within which the site was situated.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in conditions 3, 4, 8 & 10.

2/03 06/2354 68A & B, Harvist Road, London, NW6 6SH

Erection of a detached double garage at land to the rear of 68A & B Harvist Road

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in condition 2.

Demolition of existing house and erection of 2-storey building comprising 10 self-contained flats over 3 floors with provision of cycle and bin store, 10 parking spaces, new vehicular and pedestrian access, hard and soft landscaping, and boundary fencing.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Planning Manager (South Area) informed the Committee that Transportation Engineers had confirmed that the proposal would not have a significant impact on highway and traffic safety, a concern which was expressed at the site visit. He referred to additional letters of objection from residents at Aylestone Avenue and Chudleigh Road adding that they did not raise new issues that had not been covered in the report. He submitted that an assessment of the applicant's sustainability checklist had failed to comply with the principles of sustainable development and would be harmful to the objectives of the Council, a further reason for recommending refusal.

Mr Higgs in objecting to the application submitted that it would compromise his quality of life as a resident. He endorsed the recommendation for refusal.

Ms. Marcia Mercia objected to the application on the following grounds;

- i) its size, scale and density would be visually imposing and out of keeping with the properties in the area
- ii) it would lead to loss of outlook and privacy
- iii) the car parking spaces, cycle shed and storage would result in loss of green space
- iv) it would lead to an increase in traffic, parking and congestion in an area which was already heavily parked, leading to an adverse impact on the safety of children in the 3 local schools.

Ms Rebecca Jubb the applicant's agent stated that there were precedents for converted flats in the area. She added that the provision for car parking had been reduced from 15 to 10 in order to comply with amenity and parking standards. In her view, the proposal would add to the variety of accommodation in the area and enhance the street frontage without raising adverse traffic issues.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Shaw, a ward councillor stated that she had not been approached by the applicant or the objectors. In objection she said that the proposed development, by being excessively dense, would create an adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy and outlook. She added that as there were no flat conversions in Aylestone Avenue, the proposal would set an undesirable precedent for future developments in the area and destroy its quality of life. Councillor Shaw also expressed concerns about highway safety particularly with the children in the 3 local schools

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an additional reason.

WESTERN AREA

3/01 06/0856 Land N/T 2, Atlip Road, Wembley, HA0

Extension of Atlip Road and erection of four buildings containing 5 commercial units (733 square metres) and 186 flats comprising 60 one- and two-bedroom private flats and 126 one-, two-, three- and four-bedroom affordable flats. The buildings on the northwest side of the access road are 4-storey and part 4- and 6-storey. The buildings on the southeast side are part 8- and 9-storey and part 10- and 14-storey. Provision of 54 car-parking spaces, cycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping, 2 children's play areas and footbridge over the canal.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Members support the reasons for which the application would have been refused had it been determined within the statutory time limit.

The Director of Planning informed the Committee that the applicant had lodged appeals against the Council's failure to determine the applications within the statutory time limit. The public inquiry into the appeals had been scheduled for 13th December 2006. He added that although the proposed mix of uses was generally accepted in principle, there were concerns about the development including the speculative commercial element and how this might interact with the residential uses, the extent of the development and the proposed parking provisions. He urged Members to support the reasons, as set out in the report, for which the application would have been refused had it been determined within the statutory time limit.

Mr D Reid the applicant's agent stated that the proposed development on a (derelict) major opportunity site complied with a number of key objectives of the Council. He submitted that the applicant's close cooperation with the Council had achieved a satisfactory development in terms of scale, density and uses which accorded with the policies of the Council. He added that Ujima Housing Association had secured funding from Housing Corporation for the development which would provide employment opportunities for the Borough. In response to questions about parking provisions, Mr Reid submitted that the existing controlled parking zone scheme in the area and the proximity of the site to public transport network would address any parking deficiency. He added that the site was not within a flood risk area hence the applicant was not previously requested to undertake flood risk assessment.

DECISION: Supported the reasons for which the application would have been refused, with an additional reason, had it been determined within the statutory time limit.

3/02 06/1871 Envirodot, 2 Liberty Centre, Mount Pleasant, Wembley, HA0 1TX
Change of use from B1 to B2 and installation of a louvered vent to

the front of building

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

3/03 06/1678 24 Ennerdale Gardens, Wembley, HA9 8QY

Erection of a part single and two storey side and rear extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

5. **Planning Appeals**

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

RESOLVED:-

that the following list planning and enforcement appeals for 1st to 31st August 2006 be noted:-

- (i) Planning appeals received
- (ii) Enforcement appeals received.
- (iii) Planning appeal decisions.
- (iv) Enforcement appeal decisions.

6. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would take place on Tuesday, 31st October 2006 and the site visit would take place the preceding Saturday, 28th October 2006 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm.

S KANSAGRA
Chair

S:\COMMITTEES\MINUTES\Minutes 06-07\Council\Planning\10 Oct 06.doc