

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
Tuesday, 12th December 2006 at 7.00 pm

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

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Singh and Powney (alternate for Singh)

Councillors Bessong, Blackman, V Brown, Malik, Mistry, Moloney, Shah and Shaw also attended the meeting

1. Declarations of Personal and Prejudicial Interests

Item 2/05, 8 Deerhurst Road NW2 4 DE (Reference 06/2033).

Meg Hirani the Planning Manager (South Team) declared a personal interest in this application as a worshipper, left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion.

2. Minutes of Previous Meeting held on 21st November 2006

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the meeting held on 21st November 2006 be approved as an accurate record subject to Councillor Dunwell's dissent.

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

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

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

This application was deferred by Members from the meeting on 31st October 2006 for a site visit in order to assess the planning impact of the application. The Team Manager (South Area) submitted that the proposed extensions complied with the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policies and the guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (SPG) 5 in terms of the large set back from the boundary of 4.2 metres and its height. In addition the design was considered to be in keeping with the character of the building and the surrounding Trevelyan Gardens area.

Mrs Sandra Saidi in objecting to the application stated that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on her privacy and cause loss of light to habitable rooms. She added that in view of the narrowness of the gap between houses, the proposal would create a terracing effect and alter the general character of the streetscene.

Mr Cheeseman speaking in similar vein stated that the application would fail to comply with SPG 5 and the Council's UDP by its failure to compliment with existing houses and the streetscene. He added that the proposal would set a precedent for future undesirable developments in the area.

Mr Middlehurst the agent submitted that the application which had been substantially revised, complied with the requirements of the UDP. He added that the proposal would not lead to overlooking, loss of privacy, lighting or a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Shaw, a ward member, stated that she had been approached by both the applicant and the objectors. Councillor Shaw urged the Committee to refuse the application on the grounds of its proximity to adjoining houses, loss of sunlight, changes to the local character and streetscene as well as its failure to comply with the Council's UDP and SPG5.

In response to a member's question, the Planning Manager confirmed that some of the features raised by objectors were regularly dealt with by applying SPG 5 and furthermore similar applications had been granted planning permission in the past by the Committee.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

NORTHERN AREA

1/01 06/2055 43 Shaftesbury Avenue, Harrow, HA3 0RA

Retention of pergola in rear garden of dwellinghouse (Article 4 Direction)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as amended in condition 2.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

1/02 06/2466 Land & Garages R/O 96-134, Barnhill Road, Wembley, HA9

Demolition of existing garages and proposed construction of 4 two-storey buildings, comprising 7 houses (6 semi-detached, 1 detached), with hard and soft landscaping, 7 on-site parking spaces, and erection of 1.8m boundary fence around site (as amended by plans received 06/11/2006)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 (s106) or other legal agreement and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor

The Planning Manager (North Area) clarified that under the heads of terms of the s106 agreement a contribution of £15,000 would be sought from the applicant in respect of tree removal and replacement, including landscape improvements. He provided an update on the tree officer's inspection in response to members' concerns about the loss of mature trees. He stated that there was a large amount of dead wood whilst other trees were at the latter end of their life expectancy and thus appropriate tree works would benefit the site. In respect of the presence of asbestos on the existing garages, he recommended a condition as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting, to replace an informative previously suggested.

The legal representative suggested the addition of the following wording to the end of condition 2:- "in accordance with approved details".

Mr George Hodson objected to the application on grounds of overlooking, loss of privacy and narrowness of the road which would make it unsuitable for emergency and service vehicles. He added that as the main sewer would be directly underneath the proposed development, comments should have been sought from Thames Water on the appropriateness of the development on the site.

Mrs. Dowling also objected on grounds of loss of privacy and residential amenities.

Mr Steene, the applicant's agent stated that as the garages had become disused and derelict and the site heavily overgrown, it had become an illegal dumping area for fly tipping. As a result the proposed development, which complied with the Council's guidelines and policies, would benefit the area.

The Planning Manager, in responding to issues raised, submitted that the scheme complied with policies and that the road would be wide enough to allow turning area for service vehicles. In respect of the sewer, he said that Thames Water had raised no objections to the application, however he suggested an informative that any consequent concerns would be addressed through building regulations. He added that following the applicant's submission of flood risk assessment, the Environment Agency had withdrawn their objections to the scheme. In response to a member's query about possible future building work on the site, the Planning Manager drew the Committee's attention to condition 10 which sought to address that.

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

1/03 06/2492 72 Teignmouth Road, London, NW2 4DX

Retention and relocation of timber play structure in rear garden.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

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

SOUTHERN AREA

2/01 06/2127 71, 71A, 73, 73A, 75 & 75A, Chevening Road, London, NW6

Demolition of an existing building and erection of a 3 storey building comprising 12 (7 x 1 and 5 x 2) self-contained flats, communal refuse room, car parking and associated landscaping.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

DECISION: Planning permission refused including an additional reason relating to highway issues as set out in the supplementary information.

2/02 06/2932 Lonsdale House, 43-47 Lonsdale Road, London, NW6 6RA

Change of use of premises from printing press to delicatessen food shop (Use class A1) including alterations to elevations and provision of 4 car parking spaces to the front of premises (as revised by plans received on 22 November 2006).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager (South Area) updated the Committee that on the advice of the Borough Solicitor, condition 5 had been amended to restrict the premises to Use Class A1 (shops) and for no other purpose without prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Councillor Cummins submitted that the proposed use would be inappropriate for the site as Lonsdale Road, an un-adopted road and fully parked during office hours, was narrow in size with inadequate provision for pedestrians and no street lighting. He therefore urged refusal of the application.

In view of Councillor Cummins' submission Members decided to defer the application for a site visit and to enable officers to obtain further information on employment impact and to receive input from Environmental Health Services and the Director of Transportation.

DECISION: Deferred for site visit in order to assess its general and employment impact and to receive input from Transportation Unit and Environmental Health Services

2/03 06/2951 Land N/T 864, Harrow Road, London, NW10

Erection of 3 storey building comprising of 14 self-contained flats with associated landscaping, as accompanied by Planning Statement (October 2006), Transport Statement (October 2006) and Design & Access Statement (October 2006).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

In reference to the supplementary information circulated at the meeting, the Planning Manager (Southern Area) reiterated concerns about the scale, height and massing of the proposed development and refuted the applicant's claims that the proposal had been drawn up following detailed consultation with officers. Although the applicant's revised plans had dealt with concerns about elevational treatment of the building, the scheme did not provide for a s106 agreement on matters such as sustainability and transport improvements. For those reasons he recommended the deletion of a reason (3) and the inclusion of 2 additional reasons (to reinforce the recommendation for refusal) on grounds of failure to comply with the principle of sustainable development and pressure on transport infrastructure without any contribution, as set out in the supplementary information.

Mr Mark Pender the agent expressed his disappointment at the recommendation for refusal following revisions made by the applicant to achieve acceptable design, height, level of light and outlook. In urging the Committee to approve the application, Mr Pender undertook to address the matters for which additional reasons for refusal were given by the Planning Manager. In response to a member's enquiry, Mr Pender stated that the previous scheme for 9 flats made inefficient use of the land in contrast to the current scheme for 14 flats.

In responding to the issues raised, the Planning Manager submitted that 2 key issues relating to the impact on residents in the vicinity and the quality of the development remained unresolved. Although the height differential was 0.4m, it was not in keeping with the requirements of the SPG 17.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with additional reasons and the deletion of reason 3 as set out in the supplementary information.

2/04 06/2840 117, 119A & 119B, Malvern Road, London, NW6

Erection of 4 storey building comprising 53 self contained dwelling units consisting of 10 studio flats, 28 one bedroom flats, 11 two bedroom flats and 4 three bedroom flats (37.7% to be affordable). Provision of 58 bicycle storage spaces, 8 car parking spaces, 4 motorcycle spaces, bin stores, alteration to existing vehicular access, hard and soft landscaping to site (as accompanied by Daylight & Sunlight report (22 September 2006), Planning Statement (October 2006), Sustainability Strategy (September

2006) and A3 sized “outline planning application” report (undated).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Planning Manager (South Area) submitted that the application failed to comply with the principles of sustainable development and thus harmful to the aims and objectives of the Council. In addition, there was no legal agreement in place for contribution to address the increased demand for school places within the Borough and to alleviate pressure on transport infrastructure and the use of existing open space. He therefore recommended 2 additional reasons for refusal as set in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting.

During debate, an amendment in the name of Councillor Dunwell to add an additional reason for refusal on grounds of inadequate car parking spaces on site fell.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with additional reasons and an informative as set out in the supplementary information.

2/05 06/3033 8 Deerpark Road, London, NW2 4DE

Single storey side and rear extension, conversion of garage to form habitable room and conversion of dwellinghouse to form 4 self contained flats.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Head of Area Planning informed the Committee that although 2 additional letters of objection had been received, these did not raised new grounds for concern. In responding to requests for details on soft/hard landscaping and levels of parking, he stated that under SPG 5 a balance of 50/50 between soft and hard landscaping was normally sought. On car parking, he said that there was adequate space to provide two parking spaces and although there were no details available regarding the level of on-street parking when the temple was in use, the Council’s Transportation Unit had confirmed that they had no objection to the principle of the conversion. He referred to the agent’s latest correspondence and submitted the following responses;

1. It was not normal practice to pursue small scale 'car free' schemes for house conversions as these raised difficulties of management and enforcement.
2. The limited light and outlook to the a living room failed to comply with SPG 17 and illustrated the over-intensive use of the dwellinghouse.
3. The stacking of rooms to limit noise nuisance in flat conversions was a requisite of Policy H18 of Brent Council's UDP 2004.

Mr Harein Patel the applicant’s agent, in reference to the reasons for refusal, submitted that the proposed development which he felt would not alter the character of the streetscene, would provide adequate standard of accommodation for people with desperate need and thereby assist with the Borough’s housing needs He

submitted that the proposal complied with the Council's UDP policies and that similar schemes had been granted planning permission by the Committee. Mr Patel said that the applicant proposed to provide sufficient bicycle storage and bin stores for a development which would be car free and that additional landscaping could be achieved through the imposition of conditions. In response to members' queries, the agent stated that issues about the fire escape would be dealt with via building regulations. He added that although the ground floor would be designated for disabled persons, further provisions could be made when the tenants' needs were known.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Mistry (ward member for Queensbury) stated that she wished to speak as she had been approached by some of the worshippers who were also her constituents. She referred to the applicant's submission for a car free development on a site that could be redesigned for 2 car parking spaces with improved landscaping and room sizes that would comply with Building Regulations to ensure that stacking and noise would not be an issue. In her view, these would address officer's concerns about the proposal. In urging the Committee to give approval, Councillor Mistry stated that the applicant was willing to work with the Council, employing experienced community carers to care for the elderly occupants to the benefit of Brent community cohesion.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Malik (ward member for Queensbury) stated that he wished to speak as he had been approached by some of the worshippers who were also his constituents and the applicant. Speaking in a similar vein, Councillor Malik urged the Committee to approve the application.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Moloney (ward member for Stonebridge) stated that he wished to speak as he knew a lot of the worshippers although he had not been approached. Councillor Moloney suggested a deferral of the application to enable minor points of differences to be resolved.

During discussion Members raised issues about the footprint of the proposal, its compliance with Policy H18 and SPG17, its amenity space, the visual impact in relation to the dwelling house and the streetscene and the standard of accommodation. It was suggested that the application in its present form should be refused and when all matters had been fully resolved it could be submitted for the Committee's re-consideration.

In response to the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning submitted that the proposal failed to comply with Policy H18 and the sub-division into four flats was considered an over-intensification of the site. He added that although the proposed extensions may normally be acceptable under SPG 5, they were required in this case to provide additional flats and contributed to some the concerns about their layout and would therefore fail to comply with UDP guidance. The Chair made reference to the fact that similar applications had been approved by the Committee adding that this particular application which was not within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) area had addressed the parking requirement. He added that lighting was adequate. In respect of sound proofing and stacking he expressed a view that as the flats would be sheltered accommodation for vulnerable persons, the applicant

could be required to address those issues. The Chair urged other Members to be minded to approve the application.

Members voted by a majority to be minded to approve the application and therefore deferred the application to the next meeting for a report setting out conditions for approval for the following statement of reasons; light was adequate, parking requirement addressed within an area with no CPZ provisions and issues about stacking to be addressed via insulation.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice paragraph 29 (i) voting on the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission was recorded as follows;

FOR: Councillors Cummins, Dunwell and J Long (3)

AGAINST: Councillors Kansagra, Hashmi, Hirani and H M Patel (4)

ABSTENTION: Councillors Anwar and R Moher (2)

DECISION: Minded to approve contrary to officers recommendation and therefore deferred to the next meeting for planning reasons setting out conditions for approval.

WESTERN AREA

3/01 06/3005 Land R/O 44 St Johns Road & 21-22, Princes Court, Wembley, HA9 7JJ

Outline application for proposed demolition of 21 and 22 Princes Court and outbuildings on land to rear of 44 St Johns Road, erection of 14 new dwellings in 2 x two-storey blocks, each comprising 7 self-contained flats, consisting of 4 x two-bed flats and 3x three-bed flats, provision of new turning-head and vehicular access, new pedestrian access, 14 parking spaces, 2 cycle stores, refuse and recycling stores, hard and soft landscaping to site and erection of 1.8m fence to boundary

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Head of Area Planning drew attention to the amended description of the proposal as set out in the supplementary information circulated at the meeting. As the revision to the scheme decreased the number of large family units thus providing larger sized areas of private amenity space, he recommended the removal of reason 3 for refusal. He submitted that the proposal which was within a CPZ operation area would fall short of 2 spaces below the maximum parking standard and that the turning head for refuse vehicles was too proximate to one of the buildings. He referred to the sustainability rating which was considered inadequate and the absence of a legal agreement to control it and accordingly recommended 2 additional reasons for refusal as set out in the supplementary information.

Mr Michael Gornall in objecting to the application stated that the proposal was situated in an Area of Distinctive Residential Character (ADRC) characterised by

owner-occupier homes. The proposal, which would lead to increased noise, loss of light and loss of privacy would compromise the nature and character of the area. Mr Gornall added that these adverse effects could not be protected by the mere fact that the development would be “gated”.

Mr Rashid Randeree objected to the proposal on the following grounds;

- i) Loss of privacy.
- ii) Detrimental impact on the streetscene and the community.
- iii) Detrimental impact on the amenity and character of the area.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Bessong (ward member for Wembley Central) stated that he wished to speak as he had been approached by the objectors. In objecting to the proposal, Councillor Bessong said that due to its proximity to the local primary school, the proposal would lead to increased traffic congestion in the local area. The high density of the development would lead to environmental problems, thus adding to the detrimental impact on the character of the area which was within an ADRC. He therefore urged members to refuse the application.

During discussion, an amendment by Councillor Dunwell for the removal of “gated” in condition 8 fell.

DECISION: Planning permission refused with additional reasons as set out in the supplementary information and the removal of condition 3 as set out in the report.

3/02 06/2749 2 Spencer Road, Wembley, HA0 3SF

Erection of first floor side & rear extensions to dwelling house

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Head of Area Planning referred to additional objections by Mr Manches representing Sudbury Court Residents' Association who alleged that the roof detail of the proposed first floor extension was incorrect and that the rear extension would cast shadows across his rear garden. In response to that, the applicant's agent had re-examined the roof plan and submitted a revised plan which was in keeping with the character and appearance of the original house and the streetscene within an ADRC. Mr Manches had been informed about the latest revised plan. The Head of Area Planning added that the proposed first floor rear extension would comply with the Council's normal guidance for the rear projection of the first floor element and reiterated the recommendation for approval.

Mr Frank Manches reiterated his objections to the proposal on grounds of loss of light, over-shadowing to his lawns and the need to reduce the height of the roof.

In responding the above, the Head of Area Planning submitted that the amended plans addressed the issue about the height of the roof. He added that as the issue about sunlight related to a small garden area and the application complied with SPG 5, it would be difficult to justify its refusal if the applicant lodged an appeal.

The legal representative suggested an amendment to condition 3

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

3/03 06/2594 593A-D, Harrow Road, Wembley, HA0

Outline planning application for the demolition of the rear part of the building and side extension and erection of second floor and three storey rear and side extension building to form three storey building comprising six one bedroom flats and three studio flats, with the provision of 4 car parking spaces (2 disabled), refuse and recycling area and cycle stores to the rear (matters for determination : siting, design and means of access)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

The Committee agreed to take representations on this and the succeeding application together but to decide on each individually.

The Head of Area Planning informed the Committee about revised comments from the Council's Landscape Design Team on the amended amenity spaces. He submitted that although the amenity spaces for the proposals were slightly below requirements, in respect of 593A-D Harrow Road, the space was too small and close to the windows of the ground floor flats and as a result all flats above the ground floor would have very limited usable amenity space. In the case of 591 Harrow Road, the location of the amenity space to the rear of the property would make it unusable despite the re-arrangement of refuse and recycling stores to the front of the property. He added that due to size of the units and the restricted private amenity space, the proposal would not provide a particularly desirable form of accommodation for the prospective residents.

Mr Terence Peacock objected to the applications on grounds of scale, inadequate provision for car parking and loss of natural lighting to his property.

Mr Mahmut Hilmi, the agent stated that the extension previously carried out to the properties were badly done and uncharacteristic. The current proposals, using matching bricks and windows original to the fire station to achieve a scheme smaller in scale would be a remarkable improvement. It would incorporate good quality landscaping and provide secure storage areas. He added that the scheme complied with amenity space requirements and accorded with Brent's policies. In response to questions, Mr Hilmi stated that concerns about parking could be addressed through a s106 agreement. He also stated that the scheme was supported by Shepherds Bush Housing Association and that the tenants at 593 Harrow Road were happy to renew their tenancy agreements if planning permission was granted.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor V Brown (ward member for Wembley Central) stated that she had not been approached. Councillor V Brown said that there was every reason to preserve the character of the houses and that an extra storey which would result from the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area and the setting of the adjacent Listed Building. She therefore urged Members to refuse the application as recommended.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Moloney (ward member for Stonebridge) said that he had not been approached. In urging approval the Councillor stated that the proposal which could act as a lever to get underused properties on the market complied with UDP policies. In addition, the Director of Transportation had not raised objections to the proposed development.

Members discussed both applications during which an amendment in the name of Councillor Cummins for a deferral for greater clarity of the applicant and design was voted upon and declared carried.

DECISION: Deferred for site visit and to receive clarity on design and the involvement of the Registered Social Landlord (RSL).

3/04 06/2597 591 Harrow Road, Wembley, HA0 2EF

Outline application for proposed demolition of rear part of existing building and erection of second floor and three-storey rear extension to form three-storey building comprising 3 one-bedroom flats and 3 studio flats, with provision of 2 disabled car-parking bays, landscaping, recycling area and 2 cycle stores (matters for determination: siting, design and means of access)

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission.

DECISION: Deferred for site visit and to receive clarity on design and the involvement of the RSL.

3/05 05/0186 19 Brook Avenue, Wembley, HA9 8PH

Part retention of works and alterations to form modified part single-storey and two-storey side and part single-storey and two-storey rear extension and alterations to roof to provide rear dormer extension and one roof-light to the front, side and rear roofslopes and works to front elevation of dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

In reference to the supplementary information, the Head of Area Planning set out the differences between the extensions as built for which the applicant was seeking to regularise and the proposals. He also set out the history of enforcement against the development and related planning applications resulting in refusal by the Brent and on appeal. He added that the development as built did not have approval for Building Regulations and was rejected due to the requirement for additional details. He submitted that although the current application proposed to retain a rear projection only 100mm larger than the scheme previously considered under reference 99/2269, given its broad compliance with the 1:2 rule and the provisions of SPG5, it was unlikely to significantly change the impact on the light or outlook of the adjoining properties. In recommending approval, the Head of Area Planning added that the applicant could be given a limited time for implementation in order to improve the appearance of the site.

Miss P Saunders in objecting to the proposal stated that the applicant had consistently carried out sub-standard work to the property before applying for planning permissions which were all refused. She submitted that the current application which was a mere repetition of the previous applications that had been refused planning permission would set a precedent for similar undesirable developments in the area.

Mr Al-Taheri objected to the application on the grounds that it was similar to those that had been refused planning permissions and enforcement notices had been served, albeit the applicant had consistently failed to comply. He stated that the development had created a terracing effect with detrimental impact on the character and the streetscene and contravened the Council's UDP policies. He added that the extensions and the rear dormer windows as built were lacking in design terms and resulted in a detrimental visual impact to the rear outlook of the adjoining houses. The drawings submitted for the retention of the unauthorised development were inaccurate. Mr Al-Taheri submitted that the excessive projection of the side extension had caused problems with maintenance and resulted in loss of privacy.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Blackman (ward member for Preston) said that he had been approached by the objectors. He objected to the application on grounds of over-development of the site, excessive bulk and its terracing effect. He added that the reduction of the frontage only exacerbated the problems highlighted by the objectors and which the applicant had flagrantly refused to comply. In urging Members for refusal, Councillor Blackman submitted that the applicant should be required to remove the unauthorised developments and urged to re-apply for planning permission before building work could commence.

During debate, members expressed a view to be minded to refuse the application contrary to the officer's recommendation for the following statement of reasons; the proposal failed to comply with original plans; the rear first floor extension was bigger than the ground floor projection and height and also had a massing effect which was out of character with the house and the surrounding properties.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice paragraph 29 (i) voting on the officer recommendation for approval was recorded as follows;

FOR:		(0)
AGAINST:	Councillors Kansagra, Anwar, Cummins, Dunwell, Hashmi, Hirani, H M Patel and R Moher	(8)
ABSTENTION:	Councillor J Long	(1)

DECISION: Planning permission refused on grounds of failure to comply with original plans, to comply with SPG5, massing effect and out of character with surrounding properties.

3/06 06/2394 60 Vivian Avenue, Wembley, HA9 6RG
Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of
dwellinghouse into two self-contained flats

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 the period 1st to 30th September 2006.

RESOLVED:-

that the following list of planning and enforcement appeals for the period 1st to 30th September 2006 be noted:-

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

6. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would take place on Tuesday, 23rd January 2007 and the site visit would take place the preceding Saturday, 20th January 2007 at 9.30 am when the coach leaves from Brent House.

The meeting ended at 10.50 pm.

S KANSAGRA
Chair

Notes:

1. **At 9.00 pm the meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes.**
2. **At 10.30 the Committee voted unanimously to disapply the guillotine procedure to enable all applications to be considered on the night.**

S:\COMMITTEES\MINUTES\Minutes 06-07\Council\Planning\12 Dec 06.doc