

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 31st October 2006 at 7.00 pm

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

Apologies for absence were given on behalf of Councillor Cummins.

Councillors Bessong and Detre also attended the meeting.

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

1-23 (inclusive) John Barker Court, Brondesbury Park NW6 (reference 06/2115)

Councillors Dunwell and J Long declared a prejudicial interest in this application as board members of the applicant, Brent Housing Partnership (BHP), and therefore vacated the meeting room and did not take part in discussion or voting on the application.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 10th October 2006

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 10th October 2006 be received and approved as an accurate record

3. Requests for Site Visits

None made at the start of the meeting.

1. 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
----------------	-----------------------	---

APPLICATIONS DEFERRED FROM THE LAST MEETING

0/01	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: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

At the last meeting on 10th October 2006 Members were minded to grant planning permission for this application and the subsequent application for Northwick Park Golf Club, contrary to officers' recommendation and, **in accordance with the Planning Code of Practice**, asked that a report be submitted to this meeting setting out conditions for approval.

The Head of Area Planning informed the Committee about objections from occupiers of 1 Greens Cottage reiterating the various points in previous reports and also from Sudbury Court Residents' Association to the retention of the internally illuminated sign at either side of site entrance on the grounds that it would only serve to encourage dangerous driving around the traffic island. They contended that the size of the signs should be considerably reduced, simplified to refer to approved uses only. Although he reiterated the recommendation for refusal he added that if Members were still minded to approve the application it should be subject to conditions as set out in the report.

The Head of Area Planning also updated Members on the objections received to the second application (the retention and modification of hard surface and lighting to the north of the club house to create an overflow car park of 40 cars and a grassed area of special events parking, with two lighting columns and associated landscaping) which were set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. He recommended approval of the application subject to conditions as amended following observations from Legal Services and as set out in the supplementary.

Mrs Gaynor Lloyd from Northwick Park Golf Course Working Group reiterated their objections to the applications on the following grounds;

- i) the size of the signs should be considerably reduced and simplified to refer only to approved uses;
- ii) as the use of the car park was unregulated, it could become a public car park for those going to Northwick Park hospital;
- iii) there could be excessive lighting of the car park from lighting columns which were quite high and thus inappropriate in a Metropolitan Open Land and public open space;
- iv) there was no clarity on what would constitute 'special events';
- v) the applicant should be asked to carry out whole landscaping of the frontage as the current level only provided partial screening.

Mrs Lloyd requested that the application for the car park be deferred until after the management plan had been negotiated and agreed upon by all parties.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice Councillor Detre, a ward member stated that he had not been approached since the last meeting. He expressed that it was essential for a reasonably sized sign to be put up and a car park provided for the golf course. Councillor Detre welcomed the conditions recommended for the grant of planning permission for both applications and urged members for approval.

In response to Councillor Detre, the legal adviser clarified the call-in procedure to the Mayor of London confirming that for technical and legal reasons, both of these applications would have to be referred to the Mayor.

Members discussed the applications during which differing views were expressed about the need for the management plan to come back to the Committee for its decision and whether the signs could set an undesirable precedent. The Head of Area Planning stated that the applicant had not yet submitted the proposed management plan for consideration and advised that members could either ask for it to come back to Committee or give delegated authority to officers to decide on the plan. Members voted by a majority to grant delegated authority to officers to decide on the management plan when it was submitted.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

In accordance with clause 29 of the Planning Code of Practice, voting on this application was recorded as follows;

FOR:	Councillors Singh, Anwar, Dunwell, Hashmi, Hirani, Matthews, R Moher and H M Patel	(8)
AGAINST	Councillor J Long	(1)
ABSTENTION	Councillor Kansagra	(1)

Councillor J Long asked that her dissent from the above decision be recorded.

0/02 06/0768 Northwick Park Golf Club, 280 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TZ

Retention and modification of hard surface and lighting to the north of the club house to create an overflow car park 40 cars and a grassed area of special events parking, with two lighting columns and associated landscaping

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

See above for preamble.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions and delegated authority to the Director of Planning to decide on the management plan when submitted.

In accordance with Clause 29 of the Planning Code of Practice voting on this application was recorded as follows;

FOR:	Councillors Kansagra, Singh, Anwar, Dunwell, Hashmi, Hirani, Matthews, R Moher and H M Patel	(9)
AGAINST	Councillor J Long	(1)

NORTHERN AREA

1/01 06/2430 1 Ebrington Road, Harrow, HA3 0LP

Single-storey and two-storey side and rear extension to dwellinghouse as revised by plans received 9th October 2006

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/02 06/2730 John Billam Youth Sports Centre, Woodcock Hill, HA3 0PQ

Details pursuant to condition 3(b) details of car park, (c) overspill car park, (d) surfacing materials, (e) disabled parking, (f) loading and unloading, (g) refuse-collection, (h) lighting, (i) screening and condition 4(a) (siting and design of signs) of planning permission references 02/2671, 03/2865 and 06/1337 for erection of first-floor and single-storey rear extensions, internal and external modifications and change of use to include Use Class D1 (D2 existing) (as revised 27/06/2006), as set out in letters dated 12/09/2006 and 24/09/2006

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/03 06/2279 79 Shaftesbury Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0RB

Erection of a first-floor side extension and rear dormer window to the dwellinghouse (revised application)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/04 06/2398 84 Uxendon Hill, Wembley, HA9 9SJ

Demolition of existing garage, erection of single rear and two storey side extension and new garage at side of dwellinghouse,

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions

The Planning Manager (Northern Area) stated that the concerns expressed by neighbouring residents about the potential for an intrusive bulk of the building during the site visit had been addressed in his report. He added that in respect of issues about the use of matching bricks, site levels and to ensure a satisfactory development, he recommended an amended condition 2 on further details as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

Mrs Goltman-Sheldon raised objections to the rear extension of the proposed development for reasons of over-powering, over-dominance, obstruction of sunlight to a habitable/family room of her property at No. 86. She added that the extensions which would be disproportionate and out of character with the streetscene was likely to create an adverse impact on wildlife and plants along the fence line.

In responding to an enquiry from Councillor Dunwell, the Planning Manager submitted that the requirement for 50% of frontages to be landscaped was not unique to conservation areas. He added that the proposed development complied with the Unitary Development Policies and the Supplementary Planning Guidance in terms of its height, depth and width.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01 06/2115 1-23 Inc, John Barker Court, Brondesbury Park, London, NW6

Replacement of existing windows with double glazed aluminium windows to residential block.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

2/02 06/2294 9 Trevelyan Gardens, London, NW10 3LA

Erection of a part single-storey, part two-storey side extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (Southern Area) stated that the request from the ward members for deferral of the application for a site visit was received after the agenda had been published. He submitted that the proposed extension fully complied with the Council's policies and standards as set out in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and Supplementary Guidance (SPG) and was of the type that had been approved on numerous occasions across the borough. The Head of Area Planning suggested that the Committee first agree whether they wished to make a site visit in these circumstances and they decided that, in principal, they did not.

Mrs Saidi in objecting to the application stated that it would lead to loss of light, obstruction to her views and an encroachment on her privacy. She requested a site visit as she alleged she had not been consulted about the revised plans.

Mr Phil Cheeseman speaking in similar vein added that the proposal, which was contrary to SPG5, would adversely affect the character and streetscene and was likely to set an undesirable precedent in the area. He urged members to defer

the application for a site visit in order to assess its impact.

Mrs Zoe Brewer the applicant said that the application complied with the Council's SPG5 in all respects and that the development would respect and be sympathetic to the streetscene of Trevelyan Gardens.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Shaw said that she had been approached by the objectors. She objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would lead to loss of light and loss of privacy. She added that by its considerable infilling and scale, the proposal would alter the streetscene and the character of Trevelyan Gardens and thus set a precedent for future developments in the area.

Having considered the representations and the officer's submissions, Members then voted by a majority to defer the application for a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposed development.

DECISION: Deferred for a site visit.

2/03 06/2144 117, 119A & 119B, Malvern Road, London, NW6

Outline planning permission for erection of a four-storey and five-storey building consisting of 58 residential units (13 studio flats, 27 one-bedroom flats, 15 two-bedroom flats and 3 three-bedroom flats), 20 of which would be affordable, along with provision for 12 car-parking spaces, refuse stores and associated landscaping (matters to be determined: siting and means of access only): revised application following refusal of planning application 06/0132 which proposed 60 flats

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission had the applicants not already appealed against non-determination.

DECISION: Planning permission would have been refused had the applicants not already appealed against non-determination.

2/04 06/1973 R/O 9 Nicoll Road, Car Park R/O 14, High Street, London, NW10

Outline Planning Permission for demolition of existing garage and warehouses and erection of 4-storey building comprising 25 self-contained flats (matters to be determined: siting and means of access only)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

DECISION: Planning permission refused.

2/05 06/2572 College Of North West London Willesden, Denzil Road, London, NW10 2XD

Erection of new 4-storey technology building and associated

storage compound to be located at the western end of the site, the refurbishment and re-planning of the front entrance to the College and new parking arrangements along Denzil Road (incorporating a Design Statement dated August 2006 and as clarified by letter and plans received on 26/09/2006 and further information on sustainability dated 17 October 2006)

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

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

2/06 06/2307 45 Clement Close, London, NW6 7AN

Erection of first floor extension to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (Southern Area) stated that the proposed extension would respect the forward and rear building lines of the adjoining houses and as a result there would be no loss of light, outlook or adverse visual impact significant to warrant refusal. He submitted that the scheme accorded with Unitary Development Plan policies and the guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 and reiterated the recommendation for approval subject to conditions.

Mrs Marian Davey, an objector stated that the proposed development would cause loss of light to and views from her property, in particular the presence of a 40 feet tree in the back garden of No 45 Clement Close. She urged members to defer the application for a site visit in order to assess its impact.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

2/07 06/2359 28C Christchurch Avenue, London, NW6 7QN

Installation of proposed stainless steel spiral staircase and railings to enclose new roof terrace.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (Southern Area) stated that in order to address issues raised at the site visit about overlooking and visual appearance of the roof terrace, he had recommended an additional condition as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. He also added an informative that the applicant should comply with building regulations in respect of the strength of the roof and balcony for their use

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

WESTERN AREA

3/01 05/2714 63 & Builders Yard N/T 61, Station Grove, Wembley, HA0

Demolition of existing builders' yard, offices and warehouse, erection of four-storey building consisting of 24 self-contained flats, with three screenprinted glass features to front elevation, glazed and screenprinted cladding to rear elevation, bicycle racks, bin stores, street benches and associated landscaping

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Head of Area Planning informed members that although the proposed development made provision for 7 new on-street spaces along Station Grove, Transportation objected as there was no proposal to control any demand over this level. The Director of Transportation however, would have no objection to a 'car free' proposal if the applicant entered into a s106 agreement, which would remove the rights of future residents to obtain residents parking permits. The Director also confirmed that there were no current proposals to change local traffic or access arrangements. The Head of Area Planning however clarified that the applicant had not committed themselves to a car free scheme. He also submitted that the visual impact of the proposed building was considered to be unacceptable and reiterated the recommendation for refusal.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an additional reason on grounds of inadequate parking facilities with consequences on densities.

3/02 06/2320 63 & Builders Yard N/T 61, Station Grove, Wembley, HA0

Outline planning permission for demolition of existing builders' yard, offices and warehouse and erection of 30 apartments in 1 three-storey and 2 four-storey blocks with associated ancillary development (reserved matters for determination: none)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

In respect of this and the next application the Head of Area Planning stated that although no detailed matters had been submitted as reserved matters (simply the principle of the development) the illustrations indicated that the scheme would have unacceptable visual impact. He again reiterated the recommendation for refusal of all 3 applications.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Bessong said that he had been approached by objectors to the application. He circulated a petition from residents which endorsed officers' recommendation for refusal of the applications on grounds of problems with parking, transportation and congestion. He added that the 'car free' development suggested by the Director of Highways would not be appropriate as currently there were problems with exit to and egress from Station Grove.

Members discussed the application during which an amendment in the name of Councillor Dunwell for an additional reason for refusal on grounds of inadequate parking facilities was agreed.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an additional reason on grounds of inadequate parking facilities..

3/03 06/2660 63 & Builders Yard N/T 61, Station Grove, Wembley, HA0

Outline planning permission for demolition of existing builders' yard, offices and warehouse and erection of 32 apartments in 3 four-storey blocks with associated ancillary development (reserved matters to be determined: none)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

See above for preamble.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with an additional reason on grounds of inadequate parking facilities.

3/04 06/2387 12 Steele Road, London, NW10 7AS

Change of use from offices (Use Class B1) to cafe (Use Class A3) with ancillary take away service.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

3/05 06/2192 226 Watford Road, Harrow, HA1 3TY

Erection of part single-storey and two-storey side and rear extension, rear dormer window extension and installation of 3 front rooflights to dwellinghouse

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Head of Area Planning referred to additional objections from the Sudbury Court Residents' Association on the grounds of over-development of the site, the need for a usable garage and additional off-street parking and design. In responding to those, he said that 2 off-street parking spaces would be provided, designed in accordance with the "Parking in Front Garden" standards set out in SPG 5. As the property adjoined the Sudbury Court Conservation Area to the rear there was no policy basis to require the retention of a garage on design grounds. He added that the set in from the side boundary and the set back with the ground-floor and first-floor side extension were in accordance with the Council's SPG 5. He also added that the rooflights to the dwellinghouse could be installed under permitted development without the need for planning permission.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

3/06 06/2571 Heron House, 109-115 Wembley Hill Road, Wembley, HA9 8DA

Erection of first-floor extension and lower ground and two-storey extension to front of lower wing of office building, alterations to steps of existing entrance and erection of additional canopied front entrance, erection of ground and first-floor South side bay-window extension, alterations to rear lower ground-floor elevation, cladding over brickwork on remainder of building, extension to car-parking area on front corner and erection of boundary gates and railings and modification of landscaping (as accompanied by Design and Access Statement by Cunnane Town Planning and Daylight and Sunlight Report Option A dated 13 September 2006 by GIA)

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

The Head of Area Planning informed the Committee that the applicants had agreed to provide servicing arrangements which would be achieved through reconfiguration of the parking spaces. Details of the alterations would be required through condition 6. The applicant had also submitted additional extract drawings detailing alterations to the lift shaft, reducing the height of the extension and the impact on nearby residents. Details of this would be achieved through condition 10 and an amendment in condition 5. He referred to additional objections received to the application and the officer's responses as set out in the supplementary information. He submitted that the applicants had demonstrated that the proposed development would not have an unduly detrimental impact on the amenities of those residents. In response to concerns about how the section 106 developer contributions would be spent he clarified that transportation contributions would be spent "in the vicinity of the land" while the landscaping contributions would be spent in the local area

Mr T Cambeiro in objecting to the application stated that the proposed development would irreversibly damage the High Street Conservation Area with wider consequences for the entire community. In his view the proposal would not preserve, enhance the character and the appearance of the conservation area. He did not share the officer's submission that the proposal would not be detrimental to the adjoining conservation area. In urging members to refuse the application, Mr Cambeiro emphasised the need for the Council to protect the quality of life of the residents in the adjoining conservation area.

Mrs. Bevis-Smith also objected to the application on the grounds that as her habitable rooms were directly facing the application site, it would have practical detriments to her property in terms of loss of light, overlooking, over-dominant and overshadowing. She added that the development would lead to loss of community spirit in the area.

Mr Joe Cunane the agent submitted that the proposed changes to Heron House would vastly enhance the building without any detrimental or irreversible impact on the area. He referred to the revisions made including the lift shaft and the servicing arrangements adding that the scheme fully complied with the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). He also drew attention to the section 106 agreement which would add to the general improvements to the area.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement.

5. ENFORCEMENT OF PLANNING CONTROL

This report from the Director of Planning set out the number of enforcement notices issued and direct actions taken for the period 1st July to 30th September 2006. The report which also gave comparative figures for the previous year and showed that the Enforcement Team were on target to issue more than 130 enforcement notices this financial year, making Brent Council's enforcement team one of the most active within the country. The Head of Area Planning undertook to look at further ways of developing the information for Members information. The Planning Committee welcomed the regular review and update provided by the report and noted the level of enforcement activity that had been undertaken. RESOLVED:-

That the report on planning enforcement control be noted.

6. **Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would take place on Tuesday, 21st November 2006 and the site visit would take place the preceding Saturday, 18th November 2006 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 9.40 pm.

S KANSAGRA
Chair