



LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday, 16 September 2009 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Kansagra (Chair), Powney (Vice-Chair), Anwar, Baker, Cummins, Green, Hashmi, R Moher, Thomas and Steel

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Uma Fernandes, Councillor Reg Colwill, Councillor Mary Arnold and Councillor Robert Dunwell

Apologies for absence were received from Hirani, J Moher and HM Patel

1. Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests

17 09/1312 GEKO House, Kimberley Road, London NW6 7SG

Councillor Green declared that he lived few metres away from the application site. He withdrew from the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or voting during consideration of this application.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26 August 2009 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to the following amendments:-

09/1414 4 Beechworth, Willesden Lane NW6
In paragraph 4, delete "J Moher" and insert "R Moher".
Delete "Councillor Hirani" from the voters list.

09/1419 979-981 Harrow Road Wembley HA0
Show "R Moher" as having voted FOR and amend the figures accordingly.

3. 24 Valley Drive, London NW9 9NP (Ref. 09/1556)

09/1556 Retention of single storey rear extension, two storey side to rear extension to dwellinghouse and conversion of garage into a habitable room (variation to scheme approved on 04/07/2006 - Ref: 06/1275).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

With reference to the supplementary information the Head of Area Planning Steve Weeks informed the Committee that as the additional rear extension at the application site was flush with the extension at No. 22 Valley Drive and set away from the boundary with no.26, it was not considered to adversely impact upon the

amenities of neighbouring occupiers. In reference to the application for No. 26 Valley Drive which was not recommended for approval, he clarified that the rear extension would have been in excess of 3.0m in depth against its neighbouring property, No. 28 Valley Drive which did not have a similar extension along the boundary.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

4. 49 Alington Crescent, London NW9 8JL (Ref. 09/1836)

09/1836 Single and two storey rear extension, first floor side extension, rear dormer window and 1 front rooflight to dwellinghouse

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

Mr Daniel Kneafsey speaking on behalf of his parents and in objection to the application stated that the proposed two-storey rear extension would lead to loss of light to their main living area and kitchen area thus forcing the family to rely more heavily on unnatural light. He added that the proposed development which would have a dominant effect on their lives would have a detrimental impact on their visual amenity. He continued that the additional 2 bedrooms would lead to an increased demand for parking in a section of the road that was already overcrowded. For the above reasons, Mr Kneafsey urged members to consider a site visit before deciding on the application.

During debate, Councillor Baker moved an amendment for a site visit which was put to the vote and declared carried.

DECISION: Deferred for a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposal.

5. 61 Beverley Gardens, Wembley HA9 9RB (Ref. 09/1888)

09/1888 Erection of two-storey, end-of-terrace dwellinghouse with roof extension and 1 rear rooflight, installation of vehicle crossover, provision of car-parking, refuse storage to front and landscaping to site.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning consent in principle subject to the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 legal agreement and request that Members delegate authority to the Chief Planner, or duly authorised person, to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor; but if the agreement has not been entered into within a time to be agreed, to refuse permission but delegate authority to the Head of Area Planning to grant permission in respect of a further application which is either identical to the current one or, in his opinion, not materially different, provided that a section 106 agreement containing the above terms has been entered into.

With reference to the tabled supplementary information, the Planning Manager Geoff Hewlett informed the Committee about an additional letter of objection from Barnhill Residents' Association reiterating its members' concerns about the works

not being implemented in accordance with the approved plans and their suspicion that the house was likely to be converted into flats. He stated that the issues raised by the Association had been dealt with in the main report. He clarified the description of the proposal by correcting the description to the "erection of two-storey, end-of-terrace dwellinghouse with single storey rear extension and front porch, installation of vehicle access, provision of car-parking, refuse storage to front and landscaping to site".

Mrs Patricia Marcar objected to the proposed development on grounds of its massing, density, loss of outlook, views and sunlight and parking problems. She added that the proposal would follow the undesirable precedent set at No. 63 Beverley Gardens which was noted for its unauthorised use.

In responding to the issues raised about possible conversion into flats, the Head of Area Planning Steve Weeks stated that the layout of the floor plans did not suggest that the property would be converted into flats and that planning permission would be required for a change of use from a single family dwellinghouse. He added that the change of use of this property to flats would be unacceptable as it would fail to comply with the Council's policies for flat conversions in heavily parked streets which required a minimum original floor area of 140sqm. He continued that, aware of the unauthorised works which were currently taking place at No. 63 Beverley Gardens, enforcement action had been authorised for both the unauthorised conversion of the property into four self-the Head of Area Planning stated that whilst concerns over the impact of development were noted, on balance the scheme was considered an acceptable response to providing much-needed family housing without causing harm to either the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring and future occupants.

In the discussion that followed, Councillor Cummins moved an amendment for a site visit in order to assess the impact of the development at the site and at No. 63 Beverley Gardens on amenities. This was put to the vote and was declared carried.

DECISION: Deferred for a site visit in order to assess the impact of the proposed development and the impact of the unauthorised use of No. 63 Beverley Gardens on residential amenities of the area.

6. 15 Greenfell Gardens, Harrow, HA3 0QZ (Ref. 09/1750)

09/1750 Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of two storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension to dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions. The Planning Manager, Geoff Hewlett, referred to an additional representation from a neighbour requesting the existing hedge to be replaced with a structure of approximate equal height in order to preserve privacy and security. In response he confirmed that the hedge and the existing fence of 1.8m would be retained as part of the proposal. In order to reinforce this requirement, he recommended an additional condition as set out in the tabled supplementary information that

required the applicant to submit details of the boundary treatment in order to minimise impact on privacy. Mindful of the impact of the level differences in the rear garden he also recommended an additional condition requiring the applicant to submit for approval, further details of the patio area and access arrangements.

The applicant, Mrs Soneji expressed satisfaction with the additional conditions and therefore withdrew her request to address the Committee.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and additional conditions requiring the applicant to submit details of the boundary treatment and further details of the patio area and access arrangements for approval.

7. Tenderden Sports Grounds, Preston Road Harrow (Ref. 09/2097)

09/2097 Details pursuant to Conditions 2 (Details of colours and finishes), 3 (Positioning of Multi-Use Games Area, MUGA), 4 (Landscaping), 5 (Cycle stands) and 7 (Drainage) of Deemed (Reg3 Council's own Development) reference 08/2537 dated 15 January 2009, for proposed Multi-Use Games Area and 5 cycle stands.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission.

With reference to the tabled supplementary information, the Head of Area Planning addressed the concerns raised by residents at the site visit. He continued that the issue of anti social behaviour was discussed with Borough's Police's Crime Prevention Design Advisor who raised no objection to the proposal, its siting and location but made a suggestion about lighting along the west-east footpath so as to avoid light spillage into the MUGA. This would be added as an informative. He reported that PC Mark Kirby from the Safer Neighbourhoods Team had advised that they had no issues with the Tenderden Car Park and playing fields and that complaint received about drug-dealing and other anti-social behaviour in the area had not been confirmed. The Head of Area Planning added that the main concern expressed by the residents of Silverholme Close was in connection with Sunday league footballers' parking in Silverholme Close and the difficulty by emergency vehicles in accessing the site.

In response to additional comments from Sport England on siting and representations from Forest United FC about the use of the site for football clinic, the Head of Area Planning stated that the siting of the MUGA had been relocated so that it was 10m away from the north/south footpath and east/west footpath at its closest point. This would allow space for the continued use of the area to the west by Forest United FC for their "football clinic" and would also allow space to the north of the MUGA for a seven-a-side pitch. He added that the MUGA would not affect the pitch used by Brent's NALGO.

Mr William Kemp an objector stated that whilst he agreed with the principle of MUGAs, he felt that this MUGA would lack the requisite openness, and by being proximate to residential properties, it would obscure views from Woodcock Hill and result in loss of residential amenities. He emphasised that the MUGA would result in an anti social behaviour within the site and the public area around it, contrary to the views expressed.

Mrs Karen Flann Secretary of Preston Amenities Protection Association (PAPA) also stated that whilst she supported the MUGA in principle, there were serious concerns expressed by residents which needed addressing. These included the need to lock the MUGA at night, the exclusive use of the MUGA by Forest United Football Club, drug taking and other criminal activities.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice Councillor Colwill, a ward member stated that he had not been approached in connection with the MUGA. Councillor Colwill informed the Committee that he was not aware of any complaints from residents about the MUGA. In endorsing the views expressed by the officers, Councillor Colwill added that the nuisance and the anti social behaviour to which the objectors had referred, emanated from the scout hut which had since been demolished.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Mrs Fernandes, a ward member stated that she had not been approached in connection with the MUGA. She emphasised the need for the Committee to consider the views of local residents on crime and environmental issues. Councillor Mrs Fernandes also emphasised the need for the Council to provide for the growing number of young people in the area.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Dunwell stated that he had spoken to the applicant and had been approached by objectors in connection with this application. Councillor Dunwell claimed that Sport England did not support the present location of the MUGA, highlighting the impact of overlooking and the consequent anti social issues. He continued that this MUGA was no comparison with the one in the Roe Green area. He added that the proposed relocation of the sports clinic would not suit the age range of the users (age 4-7) and requested that specific requirements should be sought from Forest United FC before a decision on the application was made.

The Director of Parks Service and the applicant Shaun Faulkner started by saying that the location of the MUGA was selected following a series of visits to the site and in response to the need to address the prevailing anti social behaviour. In continuation he stated that experience had shown a marked reduction in anti social behaviour in areas within Brent where there was a MUGA, as children had somewhere purposeful to go to and to exercise their energies and stay focussed instead of resorting to vandalism and graffiti. He added that the site would adequately accommodate Forest United FC, providing benefits to the Club and the local youth in general.

During debate, Councillor Anwar expressed a view for further consultations with the local residents. Officers advised that there was no gain to be had from another round of consultation but that a close liaison with Safer Neighbourhood Team as suggested by Councillor Thomas would be healthy to the use of the MUGA.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to an informative on lighting.

8. 169 Melrose Avenue London NW2 4NA (Ref. 09/1708)

09/1708 Erection of a single storey side extension, timber fence and gates and formation of new vehicular access to rear garden of dwellinghouse (as accompanied by 3 pages of site photographs).

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.

The Planning Manager Geoff Hewlett reported that since the main report was written, the applicant had amended the application. This had resulted in the removal of the proposed vehicle gates onto Gay Close and the provision of pedestrian access onto the highway. He then referred to the objections raised and the officer's responses to them, as set out in the main and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting. He added that the Council's Highways and Transportation Unit had confirmed that they had no objections to the amendments to the scheme including the removal of the proposed vehicle access. In view of the changes to the scheme, he recommended an amendment to condition 5 and the deletion of conditions 2 and 4 as set out in the tabled supplementary information.

Mr Richard Lacey stated his objections to the pedestrian access from Melrose Avenue to Gay Close adding that the access would materially affect the character of Gay Close. He added that by allowing pedestrian access via the gates to Gay Close, the proposal would set a precedent for similar undesirable developments in the area. Mr Lacey also objected on grounds of possible increase in car parking in the area. He urged members to refuse the application for the above reasons.

Ms Tamala Anderson the applicant, confirmed that there would be no right of way from her property and/or Melrose Avenue to Gay Close and therefore residents' objections about adverse impact on the character of the area were not valid. She added that the gates and fence would match those of No. 167 Melrose Avenue, thus maintaining consistency of character. In response to a member's question, Ms Anderson confirmed that the property would remain a single family dwelling.

In responding to some of the issues raised, the Head of Area Planning clarified that planning permission for a vehicular access would not be required as it did not lead into a principal road and that the report considered the implications of controlling access points to limit the impact on parking and servicing.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and informatives as amended in condition 5, the deletion of conditions 2 and 4 and amendments to the proposal and plan numbers.

9. School Main Building, St Robert Southwell RC School, Slough Lane NW9 8YD (Ref. 09/0868)

09/0868 Demolition of detached garage, manager's house and mobile classroom accommodation and erection of single-storey extension to main entrance to create lobby, office, kitchen and disabled toilet, single-storey infill extension to rear courtyard to provide 2 classrooms and expansion of existing hall, two-storey side extension to provide a disabled lift, additional classrooms and library.

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

With reference to the tabled supplementary information, the Planning Manager Geoff Hewlett clarified the issue of potential impact of the proposal on existing trees and added that a Tree Protection Method Statement setting out details of appropriate measures to prevent further damage was recommended in condition 3. He continued that Transportation officers had requested the provision of a School Travel Plan to support the application in the interest of promoting sustainable travel and accordingly an informative had been added to that effect. He drew members' attention to amendments in conditions 3, 6 and 7 as set out in the tabled supplementary. The Head of Area Planning, Steve Weeks, also recommended a further condition to control construction methodology.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and informatives as amended in conditions 3, 6 and 7 and the imposition of additional conditions requiring the submission of a School Travel Plan and Construction Methodology.

10. 32 Windermere Avenue, London NW6 6LN (Ref. 09/1770)

09/1770 Erection of single-storey side infill extension and rear dormer window, installation of 1 rear and 1 front rooflights, creation of basement cellar and replacement of windows to front of dwellinghouse.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions. The Head of Area Planning Steve Weeks updated members that following the applicant's decision to amend the submitted proposals including the removal of the proposed rear extension, the objector had formally withdrawn, in writing, their objection to the application. As a result, Ward Councillors Emily Tancred and Will Motley had also withdrawn their "call-in" requests.

In noting the update, members asked the Head of Area Planning Weeks to satisfy himself that the proposed rear extension referred to in the supplementary information was shown as removed in the plans submitted by the applicant.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions provided that officers are satisfied that the proposed rear extension referred to in the supplementary information is shown as removed in the final plans submitted by the applicant.

11. Gaumont State Cinema 197-199 Kilburn High Road NW6 7HY (Ref.09/1508)

09/1508 Proposed change of use from theatre club (Use Class Sui Generis) to place of worship (Use Class D1); demolition and replacement of single-storey WC block to side of auditorium, demolition and replacement of single-storey and mezzanine meeting-rooms to front of site; 7 new rooflights to mezzanine, erection of new side entrance and WC extension, installation of metal "stage access" door and new metal mesh screen at rear of site; new vehicular access from The Terrace, new

refuse store and metal gates from Willesden Lane; re-landscaping of site, including 50 bicycle stores, 50 car-parking spaces and 3 disabled car-parking spaces, and restoration of front elevations facing Kilburn High Road and Willesden Lane.

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

The Planning Manager, Andy Bates referred to additional representations objecting to the proposed change of use on grounds of additional traffic and parking problems, the need to extend the existing CPZ hours of operation and the availability of an existing Christian Church offering a similar facility on the High Road. He stated that the objection about an existing Christian Church was not material to the determination of the application and that the rest of the objections had been addressed in the main report. He reported that the applicants had confirmed that a metal palisade fence which had been erected around the car-park, and which was not considered by Officers to relate well to the setting of the listed building, would be removed within a month. The Planning Manager drew members' attention to comments by the Borough Solicitor on the Heads of Terms of the Section 106 legal agreement, amendments to conditions 4 and 7 and an additional condition as set out in the tabled supplementary.

Mr Dicks objected to the proposed change of use on grounds of significant impact on noise from the lift shaft and motor on the residential amenities of Brondesbury Mews. He requested that the contractors' hours of work be limited to 09.00 to 17.00 hours in order to protect and safeguard the amenity and integrity of the Mews.

Mr Ed Fordham a supporter stated that the proposed change of use would bring back into use a building of historical significance within the Kilburn area and address the previous unsuccessful attempts for its use including cinema use.

Mr Richard De Boise the applicant's agent stated that with the provision of adequate parking spaces, traffic flow and parking in the vicinity would not be a problem unless the congregation exceeded 1,600 (600 more than the expected congregation). He requested the Committee to re-consider the requirement for the applicant to make a contribution of £20,000 to the Council for local transport mitigation as part of the s106 agreement. In response to members' questions, Mr De Boise confirmed that a Travel plan would be submitted as part of the application and that the building would be energy efficient as part of the sustainability measures.

Councillor D Abrahams a member of Killburn Ward, London Borough of Camden speaking in favour of the application stated that the proposal would preserve and restore the historical glory of the building. He welcomed the community use of the building but requested that the hire rates for community uses should be set at a level that was affordable. Councillor Abrahams pointed out that there was a need to monitor the transport and parking impact of the application and with that in mind he suggested the setting up of a review group comprising of residents, church members and ward members.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Arnold a member for Kilburn Ward stated that she had been approached by residents and the applicant. Councillor Arnold welcomed the proposal which she said would overcome the negative impact of the building that had remained under-used and derelict for nearly 20 years. She continued that judging by the church's good reputation gained in the Brixton area, the proposed change of use would add value to the quality of life in the Kilburn High Road area. Councillor Arnold endorsed the suggestion for a review group but urged members to allow the parking and travel plan to work before the church was required to make a contribution of £20,000 to mitigate against local transport impact.

In accordance with the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Dunn a member for Kilburn Ward stated that he had been approached by residents and the applicant. Councillor Dunn welcomed the proposal which he added had won the support of local residents, in particular, the community use of the premises.

During member debate officers were asked to comment on the informative for a Considerate Construction Scheme (CCS), the request for a delay on the payment for £20,000 for transport mitigation and whether the S106 agreement could cover the suggestion for affordable community hire rates and the possibility of working in close association with their counterparts in Camden to ensure that parking was not an issue on both sides of Kilburn High Road.

In response, the Planning Manager stated that the setting up of the review group could be part of the Travel Plan and that a CCS would also be in place. He continued that the affordable community hire rates could be built into the S106 legal agreement but that a condition could not be imposed on hours of use due to its location. In echoing the comments above, the Head of Area Planning Steve Weeks advised that the contribution of £20,000 towards mitigating transport impact could not be delayed. He added that although noise of operation from the lift would be relatively low risk he could add a condition following an assessment of its risk.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to an conditions with an additional condition 9 as amended in conditions 4, 7, an informative, additional condition relating to noise attenuation measures in respect of the lift and the completion of a satisfactory Section 106 or other legal agreement (with additional heads of terms requiring a community use review group to be established and compliance with the Considerate Contractors Scheme) and delegate authority to the Director of Environmental Services to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

12. Gaumont State Cinema, 197-199 Kilburn High Road NW6 7HY (Ref. 09/1522)

09/1522 Listed Building Consent for demolition of single-storey element between Brondesbury Mews and side of auditorium, plus toilet block to west of auditorium fronting onto Willesden Lane, addition of lift and meeting-room extension between Willesden Lane block & Brondesbury Mews, along with single-storey backstage entrance and toilet extension to west of auditorium, landscaping around building, including entrance from Kilburn High Road and exit from Willesden Lane, with internal alterations to

building associated with the change of use of the building to a place of worship, including restoration of front elevations to both Kilburn High Road and Willesden Lane.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant listed building consent subject to conditions.
DECISION: Listed building consent granted subject to conditions.

13. 112A & B Brondesbury Road London NW6 (Ref. 09/1385)

09/1385 Proposed single storey rear extension.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.
DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions.

14. 44A Windermere Avenue, London NW6 6LN (09/1425)

09/1425 Alterations to existing rear dormer window as per revised by plans received 04/08/2009.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions and an informative.
DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions and an informative.

15. 66D Salusbury Road London NW6 6NR (Ref. 09/1723)

09/1723 Proposed erection of single-storey rear conservatory to ground-floor flat.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions.
The Head of Area Planning reported that the Council had received an amended plan indicating that there would be no sub-division of the garden area. He added that entry to the flat would be through Montrose Avenue and that refuse bins would be located behind the flank wall rather than being in the street.

Councillor Cummins remarked that as members had not seen the amended plans it would be difficult for them to visualise the development which was likely to take up majority of the rear garden area. In response, Steve Weeks explained the relationship of the conservatory extension to the building and garden and recommended a further condition to be imposed requiring detailing of refuse collection to be submitted.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions, an additional condition requiring detailing of refuse collection to be submitted and a revised plan number 2225/02 Rev in place of 2225/02.

16. Rathbone House Garages, Brondesbury Road NW6 (Ref. 09/1294)

09/1294 Change of use of 12 garages accessed off Algernon Road to general storage of hand carts to support the Veolia street-cleansing contract, along with formation of office, restroom & toilet facilities.

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

Steve Weeks informed the Committee that following with the applicants, Council officers and ward members, the applicant had formally requested that consideration of the application be deferred in order to allow for more time to consider the feasibility of alternative sites and options.

DECISION: Deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for more time to consider the feasibility of alternative sites and options.

17. GEKO House, Kimberley Road, London NW6 7SG (Ref. 09/1312)

09/1312 Creation of second floor to existing building to provide 5 self contained flats with terraces to rear and side, 3 new ground floor windows and refuse store doors to rear of existing warehouse and new shared entrance at rear, blocking up of door and window at ground floor and window at first floor side, provision of 5 car parking spaces and refuse & bicycle storage to rear of site.

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

With reference to the tabled supplementary information, the Planning Manager Andy Bates clarified the actual increase in height adding that in general, the proposed height of GEKO House would be approximately 3.3m lower than Kimberley Court and approximately 1m lower than the main roof of the top flats of Hoopers Yard. He also referred to a further letter of support from the applicant's agent.

Mr David Keighley objected to the proposed development on the following grounds:

- Loss of privacy
- Loss of security
- Overbearing
- Inadequate parking facilities
- Detrimental impact on residential amenities.

Ms Xenia Wall an objector stated that there was no material difference between this and a previous application that was refused by the Committee. She continued that the proposal which she considered to be an over-development of the site would lead to over-looking, loss of privacy and loss of daylight to living areas of her property. Ms Wall felt that she had not been given adequate information on the

changes to the plans for a proposal which would generate an increase in traffic and associated parking problems.

Mr Julian Sutton the applicant's agent stated that the proposal which complied with Supplementary Planning Guidance 17 (SPG 17) would have significant benefits including sustainability. He added that none of the windows would overlook other properties and therefore claims about loss of privacy and security were both unfounded and misplaced.

In addressing some of the issues raised, Andy Bates informed the Committee that the location of the windows coupled with obscure glazing would overcome the possibility of overlooking and loss of privacy. He added that changes to the scheme had resulted in less impact and enhanced the relationship of the proposal with other properties in the area. He confirmed that the proposal complied with SPG 17.

During discussion Councillor Baker expressed an opinion that there were inconsistencies in the plans and moved an amendment for deferral to enable interested parties to be re-consulted. In response to that Steve Weeks stated that amendments made to the scheme were not substantial and did not raise new adverse issues to warrant formal re-consultation with neighbours.

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 & Culture to agree the exact terms thereof on advice from the Borough Solicitor.

Note: Councillor Green declared that he lived close to the application site address. He therefore left the meeting room and took no part in the discussion or voting on this application.

18. 84 Paxford Road, Wembley HA0 3RH (Ref. 09/1677)

09/1677 Demolition of existing detached garage, erection of single-storey and two-storey side and rear extension, installation of rear dormer window and rear rooflight to dwellinghouse.

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

With reference to the tabled supplementary report the Planning Manager Andy Bates informed the Committee that additional revised detail submitted by the applicant was considered acceptable and consequently the wording of condition 4 had been amended to remove the requirement for further details of the parapet to be submitted.

DECISION: Planning permission granted subject to conditions as amended in condition 4 and informatives.

19. Appeal decisions August 2009

RESOLVED:

- (i) to note that no appeal decisions received in the preceding month of August had been upheld;
- (ii) that the appeal decisions and appeals received in August 2009 be noted.

20. Any Other Urgent Business

There were none at this meeting.

21. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 13 October 2009 at 7.00pm. The site visits for that meeting will take place on the preceding Saturday 10 October 2009 from at 9.30am.

22. Site Visits