PRESENT: Councillors Denselow (Chair), Johnson (Vice-Chair), S Butt, Chappell, Mahmood, Maurice and Sangani

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hylton.

1. Declarations of interests

None.

Approaches.

Councillor Denselow informed the meeting that he had been approached by a number of residents and a ward member.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting - 21 August 2019

Prior to considering the minutes of the last meeting, the Councillor Denselow (Chair) informed the Committee that Mr Rushe (Chair of South Kenton and Preston Park Residents Association), one of the objectors to the Preston Library application had complained about the accuracy of the minutes relating to that application. Copies of the documents from Mr Rushe were circulated to members for information. The Chair stated that the intention of the minutes was to capture the essentials to reflect the meeting and record decisions but not to reproduce a verbatim account of it. With that caveat, he requested Members whether they wished to approve the minutes as circulated and direct the complainant to the Corporate Complaints procedure. All Members were in agreement with the Chair’s request except for Councillor Maurice who stated that Councillor Kansagra, his substitute for that meeting, having seen the draft minutes relating to the Preston Library application did not consider them to be an accurate record.

RESOLVED:

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21st August 2019 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting.

3. 758-760 Harrow Road (ref. 19/0670)

PROPOSAL: Erection of roof level extension to create 2 x self-contained flats with external balconies to 758 and 760 Harrow Road and provision of new refuse and bicycle storage.

RECOMMENDATION: To grant planning permission subject to conditions.
That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the matters set out within the Committee reports.

That the Head of Planning be granted delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the Committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the Committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the Committee.

Ms Victoria McDonagh (Development Management Team Leader) introduced the report and answered members' questions, reiterating that the proposal was for the erection of roof level extension to create 2 x self-contained flats with external balconies and provision of additional refuse and bicycle storage. She corrected the setback from the front elevation to 1.2m and not 2.6m as stated in paragraph 3.4 of the report and added that the proposed works were regarded as being modest in scale and sympathetically designed. Furthermore, the proposal was considered subservient to the original building, compatible with its neighbours and setting and thus compliant with relevant policies as set out within the Committee report. Members noted that there were 18 individual and 2 residents' association objections raised to the scheme all of which had been addressed within the Committee report.

In the ensuing question time, members raised issues relating to parking, waste management and control, cladding and fire safety considerations, wheel chair accessibility, daylight and sunlight assessment and the ongoing enforcement legal action between the leaseholders and the applicant.

Ms Victoria McDonagh responded as follows; with 12 car parking spaces for existing and proposed occupiers, high PTAL rating with excellent access to public transport and a condition for a permit free development, the parking provision was considered acceptable. The new bin stores proposed were also considered acceptable in highways terms. Members were advised that matters relating to cladding fell under the jurisdiction of Building Control Regulations and not within the remit of this Committee. It was clarified that as a private development with lift access, the proposal could be easily adaptable for wheel chair use. The daylight and sunlight assessment had been addressed within the report. Members were also advised that the application could be determined without impacting on further consideration of enforcing against any breach of planning control.

In welcoming the recommendation, Members added an informative that officers should continue to address the matters raised within the enforcement case, so as to give confidence to the residents.
DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended with an additional informative that officers continue to address the matters raised within the enforcement legal action.
(Voting on the recommendation was unanimous: For 7, Against 0)

4. **Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 6.25 pm

COUNCILLOR J. DENSELOW  
Chair