
REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 5 NOVEMBER 2003

Chair: * Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Kara
 * Mrs Bath * Miles
 * Billson (1) * Mrs Joyce Nickolay
 * Choudhury * Thammaiah (3)
 * Idaikkadar * Thornton

* Denotes Member present
 (1), (3) Denote category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor John Cowan and Councillor Navin Shah also attended this meeting in a participating role. See Minute 419].

417. Attendance by Reserve Members:

RESOLVED: To note the attendance at this meeting of the following duly appointed Reserve Members:

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Knowles Councillor Bluston	Councillor Billson Councillor Thammaiah

418. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: To note the following declarations of interests arising from the business to be transacted at this meeting:

- (i) Items 1/04, 1/05 and 1/06 – North London Collegiate School, 90 Canons Drive, Edgware

Councillor Idaikkadar declared a personal interest in the above applications arising from the fact that his daughter attended the North London Collegiate School. He chose to leave the room and took no part in the discussion or voting on these items.

- (ii) Item 2/06 – Peterborough and St Margaret's School, Common Road, Stanmore

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the above application, which was subsequently deferred from consideration and determination at the meeting.

- (iii) Item 2/16 – 102 High Street, Harrow-on-the-Hill (Park House)

Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that she had spoken to the Borough Solicitor regarding the position of the Conservative Group Members on this Committee in relation to the above application which had been submitted by a relative of a Member of the Conservative Group. She mentioned that the advice received from the Borough Solicitor was that the Members' Planning Protocol stated that where the matter under consideration related, for example, to land owned by a Member's relative, Members of the same political party should not consider themselves to have a prejudicial interest.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest on behalf of the Conservative Group Members on the Committee but sought further legal advice on the contents of the letter sent to her by the Borough Solicitor.

The Council's legal representative at the meeting responded that it was for each individual Member to make up his/her own mind on whether he/she had a prejudicial interest by applying the public perception rule i.e. where a Member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that she did not consider herself as having a

prejudicial interest in this item. Councillor Mrs Bath stated that she would be leaving the room during consideration and determination of this application. She was of the view that she had personal and prejudicial interests on this application. Accordingly, she left the room and took no part in the discussion or voting on this item.

Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Billson, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay remained and took part in the voting and discussion on this item.

(iv) Item 2/08 – 24 Uxbridge Road, Stanmore

Councillor Marilyn Ashton queried if Members of the Labour Group were prejudiced by virtue of the comments made by the local MP on the above application in which he appeared to have taken sides. In this case they should leave the room. Councillor Marilyn Ashton sought the advice of the Council's legal representative present at the meeting.

In response, the Council's legal representative stated that

- a Member must declare personal interest if the decision might reasonably be regarded as affecting, to a greater extent than other Council Tax payers, ratepayers or Harrow inhabitants, the well-being or financial position on him/herself, a relative or friend;
- a Member also has a prejudicial interest where his/her interest is one which a member of the public with the knowledge of the relevant facts would regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.

The Chair stated that she did not consider herself to have been prejudiced by the comments of the local MP and stated that this was very similar to Ward Councillors/colleagues of the same party expressing views on planning applications.

Councillor Joyce Nickolay enquired why the MP's comments had been included in the report and stated that the representations made by Ward Councillors should therefore also be included.

In response, the Chair stated that this issue ought to be taken up further.

Councillor Mrs Bath commented that the real test was the perception of the general public.

The Chair stated that the Development Control Committee was not whipped and that the real issue was what comments ought to be included in the reports.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton asked who would be held liable if the statement included in the report was not true. The Chair stated that the comments included in the report were part of the statement provided by the applicant and that she did not know if the applicant had sought permission of the local MP. She added that the Development Control Committee was not the forum to discuss the issues raised and that this was a matter for the legal officer to consider outside the meeting.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton asked if Members of the Committee would be prejudiced by comments made for example, by an applicant at the meeting, saying that Ward Councillors had supported the application.

The Chair reiterated that she did not have a prejudicial interest in respect of this item. She asked that the legal officer discuss the issues raised with the Borough Solicitor.

Councillor Idaikadar stated that he did not consider that the comments of an MP would affect/influence others.

Accordingly, the Labour Group Members on the Committee remained and took part in the voting and discussion on this item.

419. **Rights of Members to Speak:**

RESOLVED: That in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, Councillors John

Cowan and Navin Shah, who are not Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on items 2/01 and 20 respectively.

420. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following items be admitted to the agenda by reason of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency stated:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's despatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

[Note: That in admitting the addendum to the agenda, (i) Members agreed that agenda item 2/06 – Peterborough & St Margaret's School, Common Road, Stanmore – be deferred for the reasons set out in the addendum report.

(ii) Councillor Mrs Ashton stated that agenda item 2/10 – 105 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware – not be deferred. She was of the view that sufficient information was available that evening to consider and determine the planning application. She was of the view that the reason, as set out in the addendum, did not warrant a deferral at the meeting.

In response, the Chair stated that the UDP Advisory Panel was due to consider the policy on conversion and therefore consideration of the application ought to be deferred.

Councillor Ashton stated that the Council had an existing policy under which the application could be considered that evening. She added that the Inspector had not agreed with a number of issues and not just on the policy on conversion.

The Chair moved that the application be deferred and upon being seconded and put to a vote, it was agreed that consideration of the application be deferred at the request of the officers in order to take account of the decision of the UDP Advisory Panel in relation to the Inspector's recommendations, in particular the policy on conversion.]

20 – Urgent Item – Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – 99 Stanmore Hill – as reported in the Addendum	Councillor Marilyn Ashton had expressed concern that the application regarding 99 Stanmore Hill was not on the agenda for this meeting and had requested that this be discussed as a matter of urgency.
21-3 Kenton Avenue, Harrow 22-8 Kenton Road, Harrow	Members had requested at the previous meeting (15 October 2003) that reports be submitted on these matters but due to the short period of time between the previous meeting and the distribution of the agenda for this meeting, it was not possible to include these reports on the main agenda.

(2) items 21 (3 Kenton Avenue, Harrow) and 22 (8 Kenton Road, Harrow) be considered with the press and public excluded because they contained confidential information as defined in the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985;

(3) that apart from items 21 and 22, all remaining items be considered with the press and public present.

421. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: (1) That, having been circulated, the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2003 be signed as a correct record of that meeting subject to the following amendments:

Minute No. 383 (Item 1/05 – Enterprise House, 15 St John's Road, Harrow – in the schedule) – para (1)(i), line 2 to read 'and dedication of that element of the service road within the site to the ...'

Minute No.383 (Item 2/08 – Timbers, 41 Brookshill, Harrow Weald - in the schedule) to include 'That officers be requested to report back on the number of traffic accidents that had taken place at this site'.

[Note: The above amendments are in addition to the following amendments made to the 10 September minutes at the 15 October 2003 meeting of the Committee:

It was noted that Councillor Arnold should be listed as the fourth Reserve member rather than the first Reserve Member and it was also noted that the second line of minute 379 should be amended to refer to '2 Kenton Road, 8 Kenton Road and 3 Kenton Avenue' rather than '2 Kenton Road, 9 Kenton Road and 3 Kenton Avenue'.]

(2) that, having been circulated (but not yet bound in the Volume), the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2003 be signed as a correct record of that meeting.

[Note: During (2) above, Councillor Marilyn Ashton referred to Minute 402 – Item 2/09, 99 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore – and stated that the application had been deferred on the basis that the application would be submitted to the 5 November meeting (i.e. that evening). She was concerned that this had not been minuted. She added that had she known that the application would not be before the meeting that evening, she would not have supported a deferral.

In response, the Chair stated this understanding was on the basis that there were no other additional problems that needed to be resolved. She further added that minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings of a meeting and stated that further discussions on 99 Stanmore Hill should take place under item 20, details of which had been reported in the Addendum report.

Councillor Mrs Bath stated that the discussion at the meeting on 15 October 2003 had included concerns on the implications of 'non-determination' of the application and that, at the time, she had been informed that Members would have only 3 weeks to wait in order to determine the application].

(Also see Minute 437(i)).

422. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no public questions to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18.

423. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no petitions were presented at the meeting.

424. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no deputations to be received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

425. **References from Council and other Committees/Panels:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no references from Council or other Committees or Panels to be received at this meeting.

426. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations from Members of the public be received in respect of items 1/04 (including 1/05 and 1/06), 2/01 and 2/08 on the list of planning applications.

427. **Planning Applications Received:**

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Chief Planning Officer to issue the decision notices in respect of the planning applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

428. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - the area known as "The Spinney" running along the Western boundary of the Headstone Lane Sports Club, Headstone Lane, North Harrow:**

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

- (1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 672, Headstone Lane Sports Club (No. 2), Headstone Lane, North Harrow, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer's report; and
- (2) revoke TPO 619 Headstone Lane Sports Club (No. 1), Headstone Lane, North Harrow on confirmation of the above TPO.

(REASON: To accord with current policy as set out in paragraph 6.2 of the officer's report.)

429. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - Properties 73, 75, 77, 79, 81, 83, 85, 87, 89 Love Lane, Pinner and 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 Waxwell Lane, Pinner:**

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

- (1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 673, Love Lane (No. 5), Pinner, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer's report; and
- (2) revoke TPO 599, Love Lane (No. 3), Pinner on confirmation of the above TPO.

(REASON: To accord with current policy as set out in paragraph 6.2 of the officer's report.)

430. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - 'Shaps Corner', 'Greenwaters' and 'Mauray', Green Lane, Stanmore Park and Culverlands Close, Stanmore Park:**

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

- (1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 676, Culverlands Close (No. 2), Stanmore Park, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer's report; and
- (2) revoke TPO 15, 'Culverlands', Green Lane, Stanmore on confirmation of the above TPO.

(REASON: To accord with current policy as set out in paragraph 6.2 of the officer's report.)

431. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - Leefe Robinson Bar and Restaurant (76 Uxbridge Road), including the land adjacent to Leefe Robinson Bar and Restaurant, to be known as 78 Uxbridge Road, Harrow Weald:**

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

- (1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 678, Uxbridge Road (No.39), Harrow Weald, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer's report; and
- (2) revoke TPO 309 Uxbridge Road (No.19), Harrow Weald on confirmation of the above TPO.

(REASON: To accord with current policy as set out in paragraph 6.2 of the officer's report.)

432. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - 114, 116, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128 Uxbridge Road, (Harrow Weald). 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, 35, 37 West Drive. 1, 3, 5, 7 West Drive Gardens and 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 Lakeland Close:**

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

- (1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 680, West Drive (No.4), Harrow Weald, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and

Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer's report; and

- (2) revoke TPO 10, Area 32 on confirmation of the above TPO.

(REASON: To accord with current policy as set out in paragraph 6.2 of the officer's report.)

433. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which linked those appeals being dealt with, those awaiting decisions and those (since 1 August 2003) where decisions had been made.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

434. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance. Members noted the comments made in relation to 93 Stanmore Hill.

The Chair requested that a copy of the appeal decision in respect of East End Farm be sent to all Members of the Committee, as some Members appeared not to have received it.

435. **Telecommunications Developments:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no telecommunications applications which required consideration.

436. **Determination of Demolition Applications:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no demolition applications which required consideration.

437. **Any Other Business:**

- (i) Item placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – 99 Stanmore Hill

(Also see Minute 421)

Councillor Marilyn Ashton expressed regret that she had to bring this matter up that evening under 'Any Other Business'. She added that when the application was deferred at the meeting on 15 October 2003, it was on the understanding that it would not take very long before it was submitted to the Committee again and pointed out that it was outrageous that the Committee had not determined this application.

She mentioned that she had learnt that there was a difference of opinion, between the planning officers, on this application and that, therefore, the Committee would have to wait until the December meeting to consider and determine the application. She reiterated that had she known this, she would not have supported the previous deferral.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton also mentioned that she had spoken to the Portfolio Holder for Planning, Development, Housing and Best Value in respect of this matter. She enquired why there had been a delay in resubmitting the application.

In response, the Development Control Manager stated that the delay had been due to a number of factors, which were as follows:

- that officers were seeking amendments to the proposal and were expecting to receive these before the December Committee meeting;
- that officers had wanted to discuss the amendments with the applicant;
- that local residents would have to be renotified of the amendments.

The Chair stated that she was satisfied that the application would be resubmitted to the next meeting or the next appropriate meeting of the Committee.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton referred to a letter from the Executive Director (Urban Living) dated 20 October 2003, addressed to an objector. She read out a paragraph from that letter, which had been sent out 5 days after the October Development Control Committee meeting, and therefore she could not understand why there had been a delay in re-submitting the application for Members' consideration.

She was of the view that to keep both the objectors and the applicant waiting was an infringement of their human rights. She was also concerned that there was disagreement between officers about this application.

The Development Control Manager stated that he had had discussions with the case officer for this application and confirmed that revised plans and amendments to the side and rear elevations had not yet been received. In response to a question from Councillor Mrs Bath, he stated that should the applicant appeal against non-determination of this application, the applicant could submit revised plans to the Inspector for consideration. He mentioned that the existing application would be re-submitted to the December meeting of the Committee, if the revised plans had not been received.

Finally, the Chair stated that it was up to the applicant to re-submit a revised application and that no promises or guarantees could be made by officers.

(ii) Members' Site Visit to Doctors' Surgery, William Drive, Stanmore

Following discussion, it was agreed that the Members' site visit to the above property would take place on Saturday 6 December 2003 and that Members would meet at the site at 10.00 am.

438. 3 Kenton Avenue, Harrow:

The Committee received a confidential report from the Chief Planning Officer.

RESOLVED: That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to contact the owner of the property to negotiate the submission of a planning application for an appropriate form of residential use of the property.

Reason for decision: As set out in paragraph 10 of the officer's report.

439. 8 Kenton Road, Harrow:

The Committee received a confidential report from the Chief Planning Officer.

RESOLVED: That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to contact the owner of the property to negotiate the submission of a planning application for an appropriate form of residential use of the property.

Reason for Decision: As set out in paragraph 10 of the officer's report.

440. Extensions to and Termination of the Meeting:

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At (1) 10.00 pm to continue until 10.30 pm;

(2) 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(3) 11.00 pm to continue until 11.05 pm;

(4) 11.05 pm to continue until 11.10 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.09 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD
Chair

SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATION

LIST NO:	1/01	APPLICATION NO:	P/2018/03/CFU
LOCATION:	Templar House, 82 Northolt Road, South Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Broadway Malyan Planning for Lucky Angel Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Removal of Roof Plant, Additional Floor, Infill of Ground Floor Void & Conversion of Building to 84 Flats (Resident Permit Restricted) for Key Workers		
DECISION:	<p>(1) That the applicant be informed that the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement (Legal Agreement) within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on the application relating to:</p> <p>(i) the submission and approval by the Local Planning Authority of an affordable housing scheme to provide 6 units on the ground floor of the building as social rented housing, 16 units on each of floors one, two, three and four (being a total of 64) as key worker rented housing and 7 units per floor on floors five and six (being a total of 14) as shared ownership housing. The scheme shall include a nomination agreement with the Council</p> <p>(2) That a formal decision notice, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon completion of the aforementioned Section 106 Agreement (Legal Agreement).</p> <p>(Note: (1) During the course of the discussions on the above application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a severe under provision of parking which would give rise to a loss of amenity with the resulting overspill parking in the surrounding area, which is outside of the restricted parking zone. 2. The proposal would result in a loss of employment use which is contrary to the Council's adopted and revised deposit draft UDP policy which contains a presumption against the loss of land or buildings within employment use. 3. This proposal would be an over-development of the site by reason of its density which is well in excess of the Council's UDP standards and on the grounds that there is insufficient amenity space to support the scale and density of this development. <p>Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried</p> <p>(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached).</p>		

LIST NO:	1/02	APPLICATION NO:	P/2011/03/CRE
LOCATION:	93 Peel Road, Wealdstone		
APPLICANT:	Design & Build Services for Social Services Dept		
PROPOSAL:	Renewal of Outline Planning Permission EAST/915/00/LA3 for 2 Storey Community Resource Centre and 2 Residential Units, Access and Parking		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		

LIST NO:	1/03	APPLICATION NO:	P/1945/03/CFU
LOCATION:	1, 3, 5 & 7 Manor Road, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Howard, Fairburn & Partners for Laing Homes Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Redevelopment: Detached 3 Storey Block to provide 24 Flats with Access and 26 Parking Spaces at rear		
DECISION:	REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reasons and informatives reported.		

[Note: Members noted that the applicant had requested that determination of the application be deferred in order to allow the applicant to propose revisions to the scheme as set out in a letter copied to Members of the Committee. Members also noted that the revisions as suggested would not overcome the recommended reasons for refusal (Addendum report refers)].

LIST NO:	1/04	APPLICATION NO:	P/2028/03/CFU
LOCATION:	North London Collegiate School, 90 Canons Drive, Edgware		
APPLICANT:	N V B Architects for North London Collegiate School		
PROPOSAL:	3 Storey Auditorium with Foyer, Linked to Music School and Drama Studio, Relocation of Cello Room		
DECISION:	That the applicant be informed that the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement (Legal Agreement) within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:		

(i) the revision of the building envelope contained in the legal agreement which accompanied planning permission EAST/446/94/FUL (Appendix A to the Addendum report) to the form shown on the plan at Appendix B to the Addendum report.

(2) That a formal decision notice, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon the completion, by the applicant, of the aforementioned Section 106 Agreement (Legal Agreement).
(Also see List Nos 1/05 and 1/06 below)

(Note: (1) Prior to debating the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and a representative of the applicant, following which Members asked questions of the representative of the applicant.

The objector also spoke on behalf of 22 neighbouring residents who shared his concerns in respect of this development. He argued that the development would lead to an increase in traffic and parking in the area. He added that the proposed new building would be used for 'other' activities outside of school hours by various organisations as had been the case with the new gymnasium and the swimming pool. He was of the view that these 'other' uses would bring in up to 400 people to the area, most of who would be arriving by car with nowhere to park, except in residential streets. He stated that parking provision on the site was inadequate. He mentioned that during the school run, there were numerous traffic problems which resulted in cars driving on pavements. He urged Members to include a condition requiring the provision of 200 additional car parking spaces within the school grounds, should they be minded to grant planning permission.

The representative of the applicant assured Members that the proposed development – the auditorium and the school hall – would be used solely by the school and informed the Committee that performances for the parents whose children attended the school would continue.

(2) Following legal advice, Councillor John Cowan, who had expressed a desire to backbench on this application did not do so because he lived nearby and that his wife, Councillor Mrs Cowan, was a governor of the North London Collegiate School].

LIST NO: 1/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2029/03/CCA
LOCATION: North London Collegiate School, 90 Canons Drive, Edgware
APPLICANT: N V B Architects for North London Collegiate School
PROPOSAL: Demolition of Cello Room
DECISION: GRANTED conservation area consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informative reported.

(Also see List Nos. 1/04 above and 1/06 below)

LIST NO: 1/06 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2030/03/CLB
LOCATION: North London Collegiate School, 90 Canons Drive, Edgware
APPLICANT: N V B Architects for North London Collegiate School
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: New Auditorium and Foyer Link Between Existing Music School and Drama Studio
DECISION: GRANTED listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

(Also see List Nos. 1/04 and 1/05 above)

LIST NO: 1/07 **APPLICATION NO:** WEST/1103/02/FUL
LOCATION: 4 Waldrons Yard, Harrow, Warehouse (Former Abattoir)
APPLICANT: Christopher Wickham Assoc for A A Fisher (Properties) Ltd
PROPOSAL: Demolition of Existing Buildings and Provision of 3 Storey Building to Provide 12 Flats with Parking and Access, Re-location of Electricity Sub-station
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to:

(i) the conditions and informatives reported
(ii) the following additional condition and informative

Condition 15 – Construction works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall not take place outside the following hours:

Monday – Friday 0800 – 18.00 hours, Saturday 08.00 – 13.00 hours.

Reason 15 - In the interests of residential amenity.
(Also see List No. 1/08 below)

[Note: (1) During the course of the discussions on the above application, it was moved and seconded that a condition restricting the hours of work be included. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(2) List Nos. 1/07 and 1/08 were considered together].

LIST NO: 1/08 **APPLICATION NO:** WEST/1178/02/CAC
LOCATION: 4 Waldrons Yard, Harrow
APPLICANT: Christopher Wickham Assoc for A A Fisher (Properties) Ltd
PROPOSAL: Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of Existing Buildings

DECISION: GRANTED conservation area consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans subject to the condition and informative reported and the following additional condition and informative:

Condition 15 – Construction works in connection with the development hereby permitted shall not take place outside the following hours:

Monday – Friday 0800 – 18.00 hours, Saturday 08.00 – 13.00 hours.

Reason 15 - In the interests of residential amenity.
(Also see List No. 1/07 above).

[Note: (1) During the course of the discussions on the above application, it was moved and seconded that a condition restricting the hours of work be included. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(2) List Nos. 1/07 and 1/08 were considered together].

OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO: 2/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1784/03/CFU

LOCATION: Prince Edward Playing Fields, Edgware

APPLICANT: Mrs C Rice, Halcrow Group Ltd for Environment Agency

PROPOSAL: Flood Alleviation Works Involving Construction of Embankment + Ancillary Flow Control Structures (Revised)

DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to: (i) conditions 1-4 and 6 and informatives reported;

(ii) condition 5 being amended to read as set out in the Addendum report;

(iii) additional conditions 7 and 8, as set out in Addendum report, with Condition and reason 7 being amended to read as follows:

Condition 7 Construction works and associated traffic movements in connection with the development hereby permitted shall not take place outside the following hours, Monday – Friday 10.00 – 15.00 hours, Saturday 08.00 – 13.00 hours. There shall be no works or associated traffic movements on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason 7 In the interest of residential amenity, highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

[Note: (1) Prior to debating the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector. Following the submission, Members asked questions of the objector. There was no indication that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond.

The objector also spoke on behalf of the neighbouring residents and argued that Whitchurch Lane too would not be able to take the weight of the lorries. She pointed out that, recently, there had been 2 accidents on Whitchurch Lane and that the proposed access from Whitchurch Lane was therefore a cause for concern.

She stated that the statement in the officer's report that the residents of Whitchurch Lane would be disadvantaged for some 6 or 7 months only was a fallacy and stated that diggers were working there from 8am, including on Sundays.

She went on to argue against some of the points set out in the officer's report and concluded by saying that access from Whitchurch Lane was not feasible, that it was impractical and that it would lead to traffic and road safety problems.

(2) During discussion on this application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reason:

- (i) that the size and number of construction vehicles would be detrimental to the safety of the highway and the free flow of traffic on Whitchurch Lane giving rise to loss of amenity to the surrounding area.

Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried.

- (3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for a refusal.

- (4) Following this vote, it was moved and seconded that Condition 7 be amended and that the hours of work should be restricted to Monday-Friday 10.00 – 15.00 in order to avoid works taking place during the school run.

Upon being put to a vote, this was carried. It was noted and agreed that Reason 7 should also be amended to include reference to the free flow of traffic].

LIST NO:	2/02	APPLICATION NO:	P/2112/03/CFU
LOCATION:	Biro House, 110 Stanley Road, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Roxstan Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Continued use of part of Industrial Building (Class B1) for Exhibition Purposes (Class D1) in relation to Redevelopment Proposals		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		
	[Note: Prior to the consideration and determination of this application, Members' attention was drawn to the addendum report which sets out the amendment to the description. This amendment has been incorporated in the 'proposal' above].		

LIST NO:	2/03	APPLICATION NO:	P/2160/03/CON
LOCATION:	Bentley House, 15-21 Headstone Drive, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Pearson Associates for Value Times Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Continued Use as Hostel		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		
	(Note: (1) During the course of the discussions on the above application, it was moved and seconded that the application be granted for a period of 6 months only and not 1 year as set out in Condition 1 of the report.		
	Upon being put to a vote this was not carried.		
	(2) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached, only in that the use hereby permitted should be discontinued within 6 months and not within 1 year as agreed by the Committee.		
	(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay stated that they felt it appropriate to permit the use for 6 months only in the light of the expected future issuance of policy on such uses by central government].		

LIST NO: 2/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1869/03/CFU

LOCATION: Doctors' Surgery, William Drive, Stanmore

APPLICANT: Laing Homes Ltd

PROPOSAL: Detached Two Storey Building with Rooms in Roofspace to Provide Doctors' Surgery with detached Bin Store, Access and Parking.

DECISION: DEFERRED for a Member Site Visit to take place on 6 December 2003 at 10.00 am.

[Note: (1) During discussions on this item, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred in order to allow Members to visit the site in order to assess the parking situation;

(2) to note that a revised drawing had been submitted as set out in the Addendum report).

LIST NO: 2/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2106/03/CFU

LOCATION: Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, Brockley Hill, Stanmore

APPLICANT: PKL Healthcare for Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital

PROPOSAL: Single Storey Linked Extension to Provide 2 Temporary Operating Theatres, a 6 Bed Recovery Room and Ancillary Accommodation

DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/06 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1794/03/CCO

LOCATION: Peterborough & St Margaret's School, Common Road, Stanmore

APPLICANT: GVA Grimley – A Thompson for E Ivor Hughes Educ. Foundation

PROPOSAL: Retention of Revised Car Parking Provision

DECISION: DEFERRED at the request of officers in order for further discussions with the applicant regarding landscaping and boundary treatment and to obtain revised plans.

LIST NO: 2/07 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1788/03/DFU

LOCATION: Coniston Court, Stonegrove, Edgware, (Penthouse Flat)

APPLICANT: Anthony J Blyth and Co for Mr & Mrs Tenenbaum

PROPOSAL: Extension at Third Floor over Front Block (Flats 17/18) to provide additional Flat and, Two Additional Parking Spaces (Revised)

DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition set out in the addendum report.

LIST NO: 2/08 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1404/03/COU

LOCATION: 24 Uxbridge Road, Stanmore

APPLICANT: Preston Bennett

PROPOSAL: Outline: Demolition of Existing Property and Redevelopment to Provide 3 Houses (Revised)

DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason:

That the development would be an overdevelopment and overintensification of the site resulting in the loss of a unique locally listed building to the detriment of the character of this 1930s enclave. The close proximity of the development to the properties which abut the rear of the site would result in a loss of residential amenity to the neighbouring residents and would spoil the quiet tranquillity of the gardens of those properties.

(Note: (1) Prior to the debating the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and a representative of the applicant.

The objector, who spoke on behalf of neighbouring residents, urged Members to refuse permission and to uphold the previous decisions of the Committee. He added that the application, if granted, would result in the loss of a beautiful thatched cottage and that it would affect the environment of local residents. He mentioned that the owners of 17D Dearne Close were also concerned about the screening to their property and pointed out the potential legal action over the trees.

The representative of the applicant, in commending the officer's report, stated that the scale and bulk of recent developments in Uxbridge Road had resulted in a change of character of the area and therefore the officer had recommended the removal of the locally listed building. He added that the proposed design was of the highest standard.

He added that all the existing trees on the site would be retained and that the proposal made efficient use of the site. He also mentioned that the owners of the property in question were supportive of the scheme;

(2) during discussion on this item, it was formally moved and seconded that the application be refused and, upon being put to a vote, this was carried;

(3) the Committee wished it to be minuted that they were unanimous in reaching the above decision).

LIST NO:	2/09	APPLICATION NO:	P/1801/03/DFU
LOCATION:	Land adjoining 3 Royston Park Road		
APPLICANT:	URPS for Mrs W M A Hoy		
PROPOSAL:	Detached House With Garage		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.		

LIST NO:	2/10	APPLICATION NO:	P/1843/03/DCFU
LOCATION:	105 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware		
APPLICANT:	David Barnard for City & County Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Single Storey Side to Rear Extension and Conversion of Dwelling House to Three Self-Contained Flats (Revised).		
DECISION:	DEFERRED at the request of officers in order to take account of the decisions of the UDP Advisory Panel in relation to the Inspector's recommendations, in particular the policy on conversion.		

LIST NO: 2/11 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1489/03/DFU
LOCATION: 20 Royston Park Road, Pinner
APPLICANT: Mr K D'Austin for Mr F Riordan
PROPOSAL: Front Porch, First Floor Side Extension, Two Storey Rear Extension, Roof Extension and Three Rear Dormer Windows
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/12 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1208/03/CCO
LOCATION: Cornerways, 14 Orley Farm Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Mrs Neena Crinnion
PROPOSAL: Retention of Summerhouse Building in Rear Garden
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the informative reported.

LIST NO: 2/13 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2305/03/CFU
LOCATION: Grimsdyke Golf Club, Oxhey Lane, Pinner
APPLICANT: Jack Cruickshank Architects for Peter Francis
PROPOSAL: Provision of Practice Bay/Shelter within Practice Zone
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the condition and informative reported.

LIST NO: 2/14 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1700/03/CFU
LOCATION: 1 Hallam Gardens, Pinner
APPLICANT: G M Simister for Mr & Mrs D Rees
PROPOSAL: Single Storey Side and Rear Extensions
DECISION: DEFERRED to allow for negotiations for improved design and appearance.

LIST NO: 2/15 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1137/03/CFU
LOCATION: Brakelond, 65 South Hill Avenue, Harrow
APPLICANT: David R Yeaman & Associates for Mr & Mrs M Dunlop
PROPOSAL: Two Storey Rear Extension, Side and Rear Dormers and Alterations to Front Elevation.
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

(Note: During the course of the discussions on the above application, it was moved and seconded that determination of the application be deferred to allow the CAAC to be re-consulted. Following a vote, this was not carried.)

LIST NO: 2/16 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1772/03/CFU

LOCATION: 102 High Street, Harrow-on-the-Hill, Park House

APPLICANT: J R Andrews for Mr T J Harriss

PROPOSAL: Change of Use: Class B1 to D1 (Office to Complementary Therapy Clinic) on Ground and First Floor.

DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to conditions 1-3 and 5-8 and informatives reported with condition 4 being amended to read as follows:

Condition 4 (as amended): The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:

08.00 hours to 18.00 hours Monday to Saturday inclusive without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/909/03/CFU

LOCATION: 218 Shaftesbury Avenue, South Harrow

APPLICANT: A D A Architecture (A Lamboura) for Mr Azhar Aslam

PROPOSAL: Two Storey Side and Rear Extensions, Rear Dormer, Conversion to Provide 6 Self-Contained Flats, New Vehicular Access Forecourt Parking.

DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reasons and informative reported.

SECTION 4- CONSULTATIONS FOR NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

LIST NO: 4/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2032/03/CNA

LOCATION: Former Boosey & Hawkers Site, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware

APPLICANT: London Borough of Barnet

PROPOSAL: Consultation: Variation of Condition 6 of Planning Permission W00614M/02 for Residential and Commercial Redevelopment to permit receipt and despatch of commercial deliveries between 07.00 hours and 23.00 hours Monday to Sundays including Bank and Public Holidays.

DECISION: RAISED NO OBJECTIONS subject to (i) the proposed variation being amended as reported; (ii) the informative reported; and (iii) condition 4 being amended to read as follows:

Condition 4 (as amended): The use hereby permitted shall not be open to customers outside the following times:

08.00 hours to 18.00 hours Monday to Saturday inclusive without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

LIST NO: 4/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2259/03/CNA

LOCATION: 144 High Street, Edgware

APPLICANT: London Borough of Barnet

PROPOSAL: Consultation: Outline: Redevelopment 4 Storey Building to Provide Commercial Floorspace on Ground Floor and 9 Flats on Upper Floors.

DECISION: NO OBJECTION RAISED to the development set out in the application subject to regard being had of the informative reported.
