



## Planning Committee - Supplementary

**Tuesday, 8 June 2010 at 7.00 pm**

Committee Rooms 1, 2 and 3, Brent Town Hall, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9HD

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

R Patel (Chair)  
Sheth (Vice-Chair)  
Adeyeye  
Baker  
Cummins  
Daly  
Hashmi  
Hossain  
Kataria  
McLennan  
CJ Patel

#### first alternates

Councillors:

Kabir  
Mistry  
Long  
Steel  
Cheese  
Naheerathan  
Castle  
Thomas  
Oladapo  
J Moher  
Lorber

#### second alternates

Councillors:

Kataria  
Mitchell  
Mashari  
HM Patel  
Allie  
Ogunro  
Clues  
Van Kalwala  
Powney  
Moloney  
Castle

**For further information contact:** Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer, 020 8937 1354

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:

[www.brent.gov.uk/committees](http://www.brent.gov.uk/committees)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

**Members' briefing will take place at 6.15pm in Committee Room 4**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
11. 30 Hopefield Avenue, London, NW6 6LH (Ref. 10/0290)	Queens Park;	1 - 2

**Supplementary Information  
Planning Committee on 8 June, 2010**

Item No.           **11**  
Case No.           10/0290

---

Location       30 Hopefield Avenue, London, NW6 6LH  
Description    Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single-storey side infill extension to dwellinghouse

**Agenda Page Number: 95**

A further letter of objection has been received from the Queens Park Residents' Association (QPRA). They endorse the recommendation to refuse this proposal, which is an example of the kind of insensitive development which the Conservation Area should aim to prevent. The letter expands on previous objections, already covered in the main report, relating to the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Queens Park Conservation Area and amenity of adjoining occupiers.

The applicant believes that the current proposal is a sympathetic development, that it would relate to the house and the area, that it would not compromise the amenity of neighbours and that there is a well-established precedent for this type of development in the Conservation Area. These issues are dealt with in the main report.

**Recommendation:** Remains Refusal

DocSuppF

This page is intentionally left blank