

---

**REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**


---

**MEETING HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2004**


---

Chair: \* Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: \* Marilyn Ashton \* Kara  
 \* Mrs Bath \* Knowles  
 \* Bluston \* Miles  
 \* Choudhury \* Mrs Joyce Nickolay  
 \* Idaikkadar \* Thornton

\* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillors Burchell, Dighé, Vina Mithani, John Nickolay and N Shah also attended this meeting in a participating role. See Minute 469].

**PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS -NIL**
**PART II - MINUTES**
**468. Attendance by Reserve Members:**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

**469. Right of Members to Speak:**

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillors, who are not members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda items indicated:

Councillor Burchell	Applications 3/02 and 4/01
Councillor Dighé	Application 2/08
Councillor John Nickolay	Application 3/02 and Main Agenda Item 22 – 18a Gilbert Road
Councillor Vina Mithani	Application 2/08
Councillor N Shah	Application 2/08
Councillor Williams	Main Agenda Item 22 – 18a Gilbert Road

**470. Declarations of Interest:**

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

- (i) Agenda Item 21 – First Floor, 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill  
 A note on the agenda advised that Councillor Harriss, who was not present at the meeting, had stated on his 'Notification by a Member of Financial and Other Interests' Form that he had a licence to occupy 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill for 28 days or longer.

Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Kara, Knowles and Joyce Nickolay declared an interest in the above agenda item arising from the fact that a Member of the Conservative Group had an interest in the property concerned. They left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.

- (ii) Planning Application 1/01 – Rayners Lane Estate, Rayners Lane (P/2209/03/CFU)  
 Councillor Bluston declared an interest in the above item arising from the fact that he was a proposed Member of the ALMO (Arms Length Management Organisation). He remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

471. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances/ Reasons for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's dispatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.  It also contained an application for Telecommunications Development which required urgent determination.
Agenda Item 22 – Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – 18a Gilbert Road	The Inspector's decision in respect of this property had only recently been issued and it was requested that the item now be admitted to the agenda to allow urgent discussion of the issue.

and;

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present, with the exception of the following items which be considered with the press and public excluded for the reason indicated:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
Agenda Item 20 – 48 Grimsdyke Road, Hatch End – Breach of Planning Control	The report relating to this item contained exempt information under paragraph 12(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) in that it referred to legal advice received in connection with legal proceedings by the Authority.
Agenda Item 21 – First Floor, 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill	As above
Agenda Item 22 - Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – 18a Gilbert Road	As above

472. **Minutes:**

**RESOLVED:** That, having been circulated, the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2003 be signed as a correct record.

473. **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 (Part 4B of the Constitution).

474. **Petitions:**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petitions which were considered with the relevant planning applications on the agenda:

- Petition objecting to the proposed development at 154-156 Eastcote Road, Pinner (application 1/04 on the list of planning applications)  
Councillor John Nickolay presented the above petition which had been signed by approximately 774 local residents.

- Petition objecting to the proposed development at 99 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore (application 2/06 on the list of planning applications)

A local resident presented the above petition, signed by 36 local residents, in the following terms:

“We the undersigned object to the redevelopment of 99 Stanmore Hill into an office block with 6 offices generating 14 cars. This is an overdevelopment and has no parking. Stanmore Hill cannot sustain a development of this size. We are a conservation area with a rural parade of small, unobtrusive sole owner businesses which we would like to retain”.

475. **Deputations - Suspension of Committee Procedure Rule 16.2:**

The Committee considered whether to hear a deputation request which had been received but which did not comply with all of the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution) in that it was not supported by the signatures of 10 local residents/representatives of local businesses or organisations. Following discussion it was:

**RESOLVED:** That, under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 26.1, Rule 16.2 be suspended for the duration of the meeting and the following request be heard:

Deputation re 46a Harrow View, Harrow – Breach of Planning Control: From Mrs Patel, a neighbouring resident.

(See also Minute 481).

476. **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.

477. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

**RESOLVED:** That (1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution) and the list of requests received, notified on the Addendum, representations be received in respect of items 2/04, 2/06, 2/08, 2/09, 2/10 and 2/23 on the list of planning applications; and

(2) under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 26.1, Rule 17.6 be suspended for the duration of the meeting and three minutes in total be allowed for objectors to speak, on each planning application, including on those items for which more than one request to speak had been received.

478. **Planning Applications Received:**

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

479. **Planning Applications Received - Supplemental Report:**

(See planning application 2/24 on the schedule of decisions re planning applications received attached to these minutes).

480. **Matters Arising from the Consideration of Planning Applications:**

Arising out of the consideration of planning applications received, the following issues were raised and discussed:

- (i) Planning Application 2/04 – 34 & 36 Shooters Avenue, Harrow  
Having agreed to defer consideration of this application, the Chair enquired as to whether the two objectors who had submitted requests to speak in relation to this item wished to defer speaking to a subsequent meeting when the matter returned to the Committee for determination. The speakers indicated that they would. Following a request from a Member, the Chief Planning Officer agreed that officers would ensure that the two objectors were advised of the date of the meeting to which the application would return.
- (ii) Planning Application 2/08 - 81 Elmsleigh Avenue, Kenton  
Following a request from a Member, it was agreed that any subsequent applications received in relation to this site would be referred to the Committee for determination rather than being dealt with under officer delegated authority.

- (iii) Planning Application 3/02 - 51 Abercorn Crescent, South Harrow  
Following discussion, it was agreed that the Member site visit to the above property would take place on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> February 2004 and Members would meet at the property at 10.00 am.
- (iv) Planning Application 4/01 - Edgware Community Hospital, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware  
During discussion on this application, which was to be determined by the London Borough of Barnet but on which Harrow, as a neighbouring authority, was being consulted, the Committee noted that it was understood that, as a consequence of the works planned, a nearby bus stop was to be relocated to a point opposite a parade of shops. A number of Members expressed concern that this could interfere with the loading/unloading arrangements for the shops and requested that the Committee's concerns regarding the implications of the relocation of the bus stop be conveyed to Barnet and that Barnet also be advised that the Committee felt strongly that the matter should be the subject of further consultation with the bus companies and transport users. It was also agreed that the matter would be referred to the Harrow's Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel for consideration.

**RESOLVED:** That the action outlined above be agreed.

481. **46A Harrow View, Harrow - Breach of Planning Control:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which advised of a breach of planning control at the above address.

The report outlined the nature of the breach, which was the material change in use of a first and second floor maisonette to bed-sits, and advised that it was now considered expedient to issue an enforcement notice to rectify the breach for the reasons stated in the officer report.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to his being satisfied to the evidence, the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

(1) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the permanent cessation of use of the property as bed-sits;
- (ii) the permanent removal of all locks from internal doors, with the exception of the bathroom.

(i) and (ii) to be complied with within a period of 6 months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) Issue Notices under section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control; and

(3) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to;

- (i) supply the information required by the Borough Solicitor to the Council through the issue of Notice(s) under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].

[Note: The Committee also received a deputation request in relation to this item but the depute gave no indication that they were present when called to speak].

482. **53 Arundel Drive, Harrow - Breach of Planning Control:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which advised of a breach of planning control at the above address.

The report outlined the nature of the breach, which was the erection of a single storey rear conservatory extension without planning permission, and advised that it was now considered expedient to issue an enforcement notice to rectify the breach for the reasons stated in the officer report.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to his being satisfied as to the evidence, the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

(1) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the Conservatory;
- (ii) the permanent removal of its constituent elements from the land.

(i) and (ii) to be complied with within a period of 3 months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) Issue Notices under section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control; and

(3) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to;

- (i) supply the information required by the Borough Solicitor to the Council through the issue of Notice(s) under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].

483. **73 Elm Park, Stanmore - Breach of Planning Control:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which advised of a breach of planning control at the above address.

The report outlined the nature of the breach, which was the erection of a detached building, without planning permission, in the rear garden of the property, and advised that it was now considered expedient to issue an enforcement notice to rectify the breach for the reasons stated in the officer report.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to his being satisfied as to the evidence, the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

(1) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the detached building;
- (ii) the permanent removal of its constituent elements from the land.

(i) and (ii) to be complied with within a period of 3 months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) Issue Notices under section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control; and

(3) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to;

- (i) supply the information required by the Borough Solicitor to the Council through the issue of Notice(s) under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].

484. **93 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore - Breach of Planning Control:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which advised of a breach of planning control at the above address.

It advised that a report had been submitted to the Committee at its 11 December 2002 meeting relating to the unauthorised construction of a shop front at the above property and the Committee had resolved that an Enforcement Notice be issued requiring the removal of the shop front and its replacement with a shop front as specified in the

notice. However, it was explained that the Local Planning Authority may only do this where it has accurate records of the shop front removed and on this occasion such records did not exist. Therefore, it was reported, it would be necessary to allow adequate time for the owners of the property to apply for planning permission for a replacement shop front. As such, a compliance period of 6 months was recommended.

**RESOLVED:** That, subject to his being satisfied as to the evidence, the Borough Solicitor be authorised to:

(1) Issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the demolition of the shop front;
- (ii) the permanent removal of its constituent elements from the land.

(i) and (ii) to be complied with within a period of 6 months from the date on which the Notice takes effect;

(2) Issue Notices under section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as necessary in relation to the above alleged breach of planning control; and

(3) Institute legal proceedings in the event of failure to;

- (i) supply the information required by the Borough Solicitor to the Council through the issue of Notice(s) under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice

[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].

485. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

486. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.

A Member queried whether enforcement action was to be taken in respect of 4 Elm Park. It was agreed that officers would report back on this matter.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted and officers report back on the issue of enforcement action in respect of 4 Elm Park.

487. **Telecommunications Developments:**

- Outside Homebase, 364 High Road, Harrow Weald, P/2902/03/CDT

Proposals: Provisions of 12m high ultra-slim monopole telecommunications mast; colour to be agreed, sited towards back edge of footway; 3 ancillary cabinets, the largest being 1260mm wide x 600mm deep x 1490mm high, within 4m of the proposed mast; colour of mast and cabinets to be agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That (1) Prior approval of siting and appearance be required; and

(2) details of siting and appearance be refused for the following reason, subject to standard informatives indicated:

The proposed development, by reason of its proximity to existing similar telecommunications equipment and street furniture, would give rise to proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of the visual amenities and appearance of the area.

Standard Informatives

Measurements from Submitted Plans

Relevant UDP Policies & Proposals(E6, E46, E52) (SD1, D4, D26)

488. **Determination of Demolition Applications:**  
**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no demolition applications which required consideration.
489. **48 Grimsdyke Road, Hatch End - Breach of Planning Control:**  
The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer under Part II of the agenda regarding a Breach of Planning Control at the above address.  
Following discussion it was  
**RESOLVED:** That no further action be taken with regard to this matter.  
[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].
490. **First Floor, 49 High Street, Harrow on the Hill:**  
The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer under Part II of the agenda regarding a Breach of Planning Control at the above address.  
Following discussion it was  
**RESOLVED:** That no further action be taken with regard to this matter.  
[REASON: As outlined in the officer report].  
[Note: Councillor Thornton wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached and outlined above].  
(See also Minute 470 –Declaration of Interests).
491. **Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee - 18a Gilbert Road:**  
The Committee considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer under Part II of the agenda regarding the appeal against the issue of a Planning Enforcement Notice in relation to the above property.  
Following discussion it was  
**RESOLVED:** That (1) officers be requested to seek the opinion of Counsel on the above matter;  
(2) the advice of Counsel be circulated to all Members of the Committee; and  
(3) the matter then be referred to Nominated Members for decision under the urgency procedure.  
[REASON: To obtain further advice prior to reaching a decision on this issue].  
[Note: Councillors Thornton and Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached and outlined above].  
(See also Minute 469 – Right of Members to Speak).
492. **Any Other Business:**  
**24 Uxbridge Road, Stanmore – Nomination of a Member to assist officers with an appeal**  
It was advised that an appeal had been lodged against the decision to refuse permission for a recent planning application in respect of the above site and a hearing date was to be arranged. It was explained that a Nominated Member was required to assist officers with the appeal as the Chief planning officer had recommended that the application be granted. It was agreed that Councillor Marilyn Ashton would be nominated.  
**RESOLVED:** That the action outlined above be agreed.
493. **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 10.45 pm;
  - (3) 10.45 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;
  - (4) 11.00 pm to continue until 11.15 pm;
  - (5) 11.15 pm to continue until 11.25 pm;
  - (6) 11.25 pm to continue until 11.30 pm; and
  - (7) 11.30 pm to continue until 11.35 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.40 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD  
Chair



**SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

**LIST NO:** 1/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2209/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** Rayners Lane Estate, Rayners Lane

**APPLICANT:** MEPK Architects for Warden Housing Association Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** Rayners Lane Regeneration Phase B: Provision of 106 Houses and Flats with Associated Access and Parking Space.

**DECISION:** APPROVED details of siting, access, design and external appearance, subject to the informative(s) reported.

(See also Minute 470 – Declaration of Interests).

**LIST NO:** 1/02                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2284/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** Parkville House, Red Lion Parade, Bridge Street, Pinner

**APPLICANT:** Sanderson Associates for Auger Investments PLC

**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Office to Residential (Class B1 to C3) on First and Second Floors and Provision of Additional Floor to Provide 21 Resident Permit Restricted Flats with External Stairs.

**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason reported on the addendum:

The proposal development lies within an area of land at risk from flooding. The developer has not provided a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in line with the requirements of Planning Policy Guidance 25 – Development and Flood Risk (PPG25), which may enable the Environment Agency to accept the proposal. The development may be at risk of flooding from elsewhere.

**LIST NO:** 1/03                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2516/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** 29-31 Brooke Avenue, Harrow

**APPLICANT:** Home Plans for Berma Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** Redevelopment to Provide 3 Storey Block of 12 Flats with Basement Parking.

**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason(s) reported and subject to the informative(s) reported.

**LIST NO:** 1/04                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2392/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** 154-156 Eastcote Lane, Pinner

**APPLICANT:** Johnson & Partners for Wistdale Developments Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** Detached 3 Storey Building to Provide 15 Flats with Basement and Forecourt Parking.

**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason(s) reported and the following additional reason reported on the addendum, and subject to the informative(s) reported:

3. The proposed hard-surfaced car parking area in the front garden would be unduly obtrusive and detract from the appearance of the building and street-scene.

(See also Minute 474 – Petitions).

**SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT**

**LIST NO:** 2/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2629/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 4-10 College Road, Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** David R Yeaman & Associates for Mr N Shah & Mr R Soni  
**PROPOSAL:** Provision of 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor comprising 6 Self-Contained Flats (Resident Permit Restricted).  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

**LIST NO:** 2/02                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2182/03/COU  
**LOCATION:** 7 Charlton Road, Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** Geoffrey T Dunnell for Messrs JD & P J Flannery  
**PROPOSAL:** Outline: Redevelopment to Provide Four Two Storey Terraced Houses with Parking at Front.  
**DECISION:** DEFERRED at officer's request in order for further discussions with applicant with a view to resolving access issues.

**LIST NO:** 2/03                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2677/03/CVA  
**LOCATION:** Site of Timbers, 41 Brookshill, Harrow Weald  
**APPLICANT:** Derek & Alan Nash for Mahavir Foundation Ltd  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Replacement Building for Use as Place of Worship and Religious Instruction (Revised).  
**DECISION:** DEFERRED at officer's request to await response to additional notification of purchaser/developer of Whyteways.  
  
[Note: The addendum also advised that an appeal had been lodged against the previous refusal of an application relating to this site and requested that the Committee nominate a Member to assist officers with the appeal. This matter was not discussed or agreed].

**LIST NO:** 2/04                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2550/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 34 & 36 Shooters Avenue, Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** Mr J Benaim for QFCC  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Class C3-C2 (Residential to Care Home) with S/S Rear Extension to No. 36 and Games Room at Rear.  
**DECISION:** DEFERRED in order to clarify the issue of the validity of the application.  
  
[Note: The Committee were advised of the above officer request to defer the item orally].  
  
(See also Minute 480 - Matters Arising from the Consideration of Planning Applications).

**LIST NO:** 2/05                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2442/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** 6 Alexandra Parade, Northolt Road, South Harrow

**APPLICANT:** G M Simister for Anil Mavadia

**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Shop to Restaurant (Class A1 to A3) on Ground Floor.

**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported and the following additional condition reported on the addendum:

9. Standard Condition – Disabled access use.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/06                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2786/03/CFU

**LOCATION:** 99 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore

**APPLICANT:** Geoff Beardsley & Partners Ltd for Rose Hill Pension Scheme

**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Motor Vehicle Workshop (Class B2) to Offices (Class B1) with New Hipped Roof, Windows and Elevational Cladding.

**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported and the following additional condition reported on the addendum:

4. Standard Condition - Restrict House of Use  
a) 08.00 hours to 19.00 hours Monday to Saturday and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received a representation from an objector.

The objector, who addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents, drew the Committee's attention to the petition which she had presented earlier in the meeting and began by expressing concern at the effectiveness of the notification procedure. She then referred to concerns that the proposed development would constitute overdevelopment, would not respect the height and bulk of the surrounding buildings and would overshadow adjacent properties, therefore having an adverse impact on the amenity of local residents. She pointed out that the proposed pitched roof would be only two and a half feet from the bedroom window of her property. The objector also raised concerns regarding the loss of parking spaces, which she believed would result in increased on-street parking to the detriment of the Conservation Area. She advised that a previous application for the site had been refused on the basis of reasons relating to parking and overdevelopment. She considered that these reasons remained valid.

At the conclusion of the above representation it was noted that the time allotted to hear objectors' representations on this item had expired. The second request to speak in objection to this item was therefore not heard.

No indication was given that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;

(2) During the debate which followed it was moved and seconded that consideration of the above application be deferred to allow a Member site visit. Upon a vote this was not carried.

It was further moved and second that the application be refused on the grounds that it was out of character in the Conservation Area, did not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, and the possible impact of the proposed development on the secondary window of the adjacent property was not clear without a site visit. This was also not carried.

It was then moved and seconded that the substantive motion to grant the application be amended to be subject to a condition restricting the hours of use to 9am-6pm Monday to Saturday. Upon being put to a vote, this was

not carried;

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Kara, Knowles and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the proposals to refuse the application and to restrict the hours of use outlined above and as having voted against the decision reached].

(See also Minute 474 – Petitions).

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/07	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2242/03/CVA
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Cousins Garage, 10 Greenhill Road, Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr Mellers		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Continued Use as Car Repair Workshop and M.O.T. Testing Station without Compliance with Condition 6 of Planning Permission. WEST/547/93/FUL.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED variation(s) in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/08	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2468/03/DFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	81 Elmsleigh Avenue, Kenton		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr R Sodha		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two Storey Side to Rear and Single Storey Front/Side and Rear Extension; Conversion of Extended Dwelling to Three Self-Contained Flats; Forecourt Parking.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s) and subject to standard informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13):		

1. The development would result in an over-intensive use and unacceptable level of activity within the building, to the detriment of the character of the area and the amenities of adjoining residents;
2. The development would fail to provide adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the first floor flat which would have no access to the rear garden
3. The forecourt parking provision would result in an unsatisfactory visual appearance and loss of forecourt greenery, to the detriment of the streetscene.

[Notes: (1) Prior to considering the above application, the Committee received a representation from an objector who addressed the Committee on behalf of a number of local residents. The objector outlined concerns that the proposed development was too deep, too bulky and would intrude on neighbouring residents and also pointed out the lack of provision for disabled access and refuse collection.

He further referred to concerns relating to inadequate parking provision which he advised was well below the Council standard of 1.4 car spaces per dwelling. He felt that the proposed development would therefore result in an increase in on-street parking and would exacerbate existing parking problems and would compromise highway safety. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

No indication was given that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;

(2) The Committee wished it to be recorded that they were unanimous in agreeing to refuse the above application;

(3) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted].

(See also Minute 469 – Right of Members to Speak - and Minute 480 – Matters Arising from the Consideration of Planning Applications).

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/09	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2515/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	71 Alicia Gardens, Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr R Sodha		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension and Conversion to Three Self-Contained flats, Parking at Front.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s) and subject to standard informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T130):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development would result in an over-intensive use and unacceptable level of activity within the building, to the detriment of the character of the area and the amenities of adjoining residents;</li> <li>2. The development would fail to provide adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the first floor flat which would have no access to the rear garden</li> <li>3. The forecourt parking provision would result in an unsatisfactory visual appearance and loss of forecourt greenery, to the detriment of the streetscene.</li> </ol> <p>[Notes: (1) Prior to considering the above application, the Committee received a representation from an objector who addressed the Committee on behalf of a number of local residents. The objector urged the Committee to refuse the application for the same reasons which they had refused application 2/08.</p> <p>No indication was given that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;</p> <p>(2) The Committee wished it to be recorded that they were unanimous in agreeing to refuse the above application;</p> <p>(3) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted].</p>		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/10	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2517/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	103 Elmsleigh Avenue, Kenton		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr R Sodha		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension, and Conversion to 3 Self-Contained Flats, Parking and Widened Access.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s) and subject to standard informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals (E6, E45, E51, H10, T13), (S1, SD1, EP25, D4, D5, H10, T13):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development would result in an over-intensive use and unacceptable level of activity within the building, to the detriment of the character of the area and the amenities of adjoining residents;</li> <li>2. The development would fail to provide adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the first floor flat which would have no access to the rear garden</li> </ol>		

3. The forecourt parking provision would result in an unsatisfactory visual appearance and loss of forecourt greenery, to the detriment of the streetscene.

[Notes: (1) Prior to considering the above application, the Committee received a representation from an objector who addressed the Committee on behalf of a number of local residents. The objector urged the Committee to refuse the application for the same reasons which they had refused applications 2/08 and 2/09.

No indication was given that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;

(2) The Committee wished it to be recorded that they were unanimous in agreeing to refuse the above application;

(3) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted].

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/11	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/1829/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Stanmore College, Elm Park, Stanmore		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Tony Welch Associates for Stanmore College		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two Storey Front Extensions in the Form of Three Linked Pavilions.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/12	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2079/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Harrow School Pole Shed, Off 18 Football Lane, Harrow, Woodland R/O Spinney Cottages		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Keepers & Governors of Harrow School		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Provision of Detached Single Storey Temporary Classroom.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/13	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2081/03/CCA
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Harrow School Pole Shed, Off 18 Football Lane, Harrow, Woodland R/O Spinney Cottages		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Keepers & Governors of Harrow School		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of Single Storey Timber Pole Shed.		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED Conservation Area Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/14	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/2328/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	10 College Avenue, Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Mr K D'Austin for Mr Ashraf Ali		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Two Storey Side to Rear and Single Storey Rear Extensions and Rear Dormer		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

---

---

**LIST NO:** 2/15                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1471/03/CCO  
**LOCATION:** 18 Latimer Gardens, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** Roman Professional Services for Methodist Minister Housing Society  
**PROPOSAL:** Retention of Access Ramp with Hand Rails at Front of Property  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the informative reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/16                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/20095/03/CCA  
**LOCATION:** 18 Latimer Gardens, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** Roman Professional Services for Methodist Minister Housing Society  
**PROPOSAL:** Retention of Single Storey Rear Extension with Raised Patio and Steps  
**DECISION:** GRANTED Conservation Area Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported and the following amended condition and additional condition reported on the addendum:

Amend condition 1 to read:  
"within 3 months of the date of this permission, the windows in the western facing elevation of the extension shall be obscurely glazed and shall thereafter be retained in that form".

2. Standard condition – Restrict use of roof as a balcony

---

**LIST NO:** 2/17                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2271/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 16 Old South Close, Hatch End  
**APPLICANT:** Michael Scar for Miss Marilyn Miller  
**PROPOSAL:** Replacement Detached Garage in Rear Garden  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/18                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1482/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 853 Honeygot Lane, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** A Oloyede for Radiation Ltd  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: Retail to Office (Class A1 to A2) and Rear Extension to Provide 2 Floors of Offices/Stores  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/19                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2377/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Tremar, Green Lane, Stanmore  
**APPLICANT:** G E Pottle & Co for Mr & Mrs Chowdhary  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Side Extension and Use of Garage as Habitable Room  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

---

**LIST NO:** 2/20                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2294/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Angora, 4 Brookshill, Harrow Weald  
**APPLICANT:** Aitchison Raffety for Dr Osayi  
**PROPOSAL:** Part Single, Part Two Storey Rear and Single Storey Front and Side Extensions  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

**LIST NO:** 2/21                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1700/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 1 Hallam Gardens, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** G M Simister for Mr and Mrs D Rees  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Side and Rear Extensions  
**DECISION:** GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported and the following additional condition agreed by the Committee:  
3. Standard Condition – Restrict use of roof as balcony

**LIST NO:** 2/22                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2028/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 21 Albury Drive, Pinner  
**APPLICANT:** E B Harrison for Mr Ammond  
**PROPOSAL:** Rear Dormer  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s) and subject to standard informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals (E4, E5, E6, E38, E39, E45), (SD1, SD2, D4, D5, D16, D17):  
The proposed development would be visually obtrusive in the streetscene on this prominent corner site, does not comply with the Pinner Wood Park Estate Conservation Area Policy Statement and would be detrimental to the character of the Conservation Area.  
[Notes: (1) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted;  
(2) Councillor Bluston wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached. Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Kara, Knowles and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the decision reached].

**LIST NO:** 2/23                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1900/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** Land Adjacent to 128 Somervell Road  
**APPLICANT:** Mahmut Hilmi Architect for Mr S Budhdeo  
**PROPOSAL:** Single and Two Storey Detached House with Parking at Front (Revised).  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason(s) and subject to standard informative 41 – UDP and Deposit Draft UDP Policies and Proposals (E6, E17, E45, T13) (D4, D5, SD1, EP42, T13):  
The proposed house, by reason of its location, would result in a cramped form of development, obtrusive and overbearing in the streetscene, exacerbating the incongruity of the present building that is known as 126a and 126s Somervell Road.



[Notes: (1) Prior to considering the above application the Committee received a representation from a neighbouring resident who objected to the application and from a representative of the applicant.

The objector indicated that he felt the application was very similar to an application for the same site which had been refused the previous summer, and expressed concern that the proposed development would neither complement nor be clearly separate from his own, adjacent property. He pointed out that it would be only 3 inches from his property and this would raise maintenance problems and would impinge on his privacy. He further added that the development would also fail to reflect the character of the surrounding properties and would not be in accordance with the Council's Unitary Development Plan.

In response, the representative of the applicant argued that the application before the Committee differed significantly from the previous application and would reflect well the style of the surrounding properties. He felt that the development would constitute an excellent use of the site and listed its merits, and also disputed that the proximity of the development to the neighbouring property would cause any difficulties;

(2) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted;

(3) It was agreed that members would raise their concerns regarding the current condition of the above site with Environmental Health;

(4) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Kara, Knowles and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the above decision to refuse the application.

Councillors Bluston and Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted against the above decision to refuse the application].

---

<b>LIST NO:</b>	2/24	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/894/03/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Hillmorton, 11 Orley Farm Road, Harrow		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Sureplan (South Bucks) Ltd for Mr and Mrs Soni		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Single Storey Side Extension Conversion of Outbuilding to Provide Granny Annexe, 2 Rear Dormers		
<b>DECISION:</b>	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.		

[Notes: (1) During the debate on the above application it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds that the proposed development would be detrimental to the character of the Conservation area by reason of the terracing effect the granny annex would give by filling in the gap between the above property and the adjacent property, would be visually obtrusive in the streetscene and would be harmful to the character of the surrounding road. Upon being put to the vote and with the Chair exercising her extra, casting vote this was not carried;

(2) The vote on the substantive motion to grant the above application was carried upon the Chair exercising her extra, casting vote;

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs bath, Kara and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the above motion to refuse the application and as having voted against the decision reached to grant the application].

---

**SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL**

**LIST NO:** 3/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/1913/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 455 Uxbridge Road, Hatch End  
**APPLICANT:** Anthony J Blyth and Co for Ms F Surace  
**PROPOSAL:** Change of Use: A1 to A3 (Retail to Food & Drink) on Part of Ground Floor, with Parking at Rear.  
**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason(s) reported and subject to the informative(s) reported.

**LIST NO:** 3/02                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2400/03/CFU  
**LOCATION:** 51 Abercorn Crescent, South Harrow  
**APPLICANT:** ARP Associates for Miss Philomena D'Souza  
**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Rear Extension  
**DECISION:** DEFERRED for Member Site Visit  
  
(See also Minute 469 – Right of Members to Speak - and Minute 480 – Matters Arising from the Consideration of Planning Applications).

**SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES**

**LIST NO:** 4/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2260/03/CAN  
**LOCATION:** Edgware Community Hospital, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware, Middx  
**APPLICANT:** London Borough of Barnet  
**PROPOSAL:** Consultation: Construction of New Site Entrance onto Burnt Oak Broadway.  
**DECISION:** RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development set out in the application, subject to regard being had to the following matters:  
  
Planning permission being subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 legal agreement involving this Council to secure the sum of £10,000 to facilitate any remedial traffic management measures that may be necessary as a result of the proposal, within 3 years of occupation of the development.  
  
(See also Minute 469 – Right of Members to Speak - and Minute 480 – Matters Arising from the Consideration of Planning Applications).

**LIST NO:** 4/02                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2204/03/CNA  
**LOCATION:** BACS, 3 De Havilland Road, Edgware, Middlesex, HA8 5PA  
**APPLICANT:** Brent Council  
**PROPOSAL:** Consultation: Redevelopment to Provide 125 x 2 Bed and 14 One Bed Flats, and 44 Town Houses in Part 3, Part 4 Storey Block with 172 Parking Spaces.  
**DECISION:** RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development set out in the application, subject to regard being had to the informative reported.