
REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 8 DECEMBER 2004

Chair: * Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Choudhury
 * Mrs Bath * Janet Cowan
 * Billson * Idaikkadar
 * Bluston * Miles
 * Branch (1) * Mrs Joyce Nickolay

* Denotes Member present
 (1) Denotes category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillor Mrs Kinnear also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minutes 813 and 814 below].

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

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

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Thornton	Councillor Branch

795. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: (1) To note the following declarations of interest made by Members present relating to the business to be transacted at this meeting:

- (i) Planning Application 2/01 – 15 Holland Walk, Stanmore
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the above application.

Councillors Mrs Bath and Janet Cowan also declared a prejudicial interest.

Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath and Janet Cowan left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.

At the point of the meeting at which this item was discussed, Councillors Billson and Joyce Nickolay clarified that they had only a personal interest in this item. Accordingly, they remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

- (ii) Planning Application 2/09 – Hamstede, 4 Priory Drive, Stanmore
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in the above application on the basis that a Member of the Conservative Group lived nearby. Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that she had taken legal advice regarding her interest, and that accordingly, she would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

It was noted that the personal interest also applied to the Members of the Conservative Group on the Committee except for Councillor Mrs Bath who stated that her interest was a prejudicial one.

Councillor Mrs Bath left the room and took no part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

- (iii) Main Agenda Item 12 – Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance
Councillor Mrs Bath declared an interest in respect of 1 Nelson Road because she knew the person who lived in this property.
- (iv) Main Agenda Item 16 – Prince Edward Playing Fields – Environment Agency Flood Alleviation Works
Councillors Bluston and Miles declared a non-prejudicial interest in the above item because they were Council appointed Members of Harrow Sports Council.
- Accordingly, they remained in the room and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (v) Main Agenda Item 20 – Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill
The Chair, on behalf of the Labour Group, declared an interest in the above item because of a connection through the Labour Party.

At the point of the meeting at which this item was about to be discussed, the Chair further clarified the declaration of interest by stating that the owner of the above-mentioned property had contacted Members of the Labour Group on the Committee and therefore the interest was prejudicial. Accordingly, all Members of the Labour Group on this Committee left the room and did not take part in the discussions and decision-making on this item.

[Note: Councillor Marilyn Ashton, the Vice-Chair, chaired the meeting during the discussion and decision-making on this item].

(2) to note that a discussion took place among the Members of the Committee regarding the requirement or otherwise for particular Members to declare an interest in relation to item 1/01, "19 & 21 & R/O 11-29 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow", by virtue of information circulated in advance of the meeting indicating a prior view taken on the merits of the application: this was debated in the context of practices adopted by Members generally in preparing written reasons for proposed decisions and the legal advice that Members should not make up their minds on an application until they had heard all the evidence put before them at the meeting.

[Note: Following this discussion, no declarations of interest were made in respect of this item].

796. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

- (i) Item 2/02 – Land R/O 123-135 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware (P/2723/04/COU)
The Development Control Manager requested that the above-mentioned planning application be deferred. He added that it would be re-submitted to the next meeting of the Committee as the 'notice' served on the leaseholders living in the flat adjacent to the proposal had not yet expired.
- An objector who was present at the meeting stated that she would speak at the next meeting rather than that evening.
- An observer at the meeting pointed out that the plans in respect of the above-mentioned application were wrong and that the boundaries shown were incorrect. He added that he had informed the Planning Section accordingly. The Development Control Manager stated that he would look into this matter.
- (ii) Main Agenda Item 9 – Representations on Planning Applications
Councillor Marilyn Ashton referred to agenda item 9, details of which had been set out in the Addendum Report.

Members agreed with her that it was not best practice to state the applicant's desire to address the Committee should the Committee allow an objector to speak at the meeting. Councillor Marilyn Ashton stated that the applicant would have a right of response in any case.

(iii) Late Items

The Chair reported that the Committee's consent to admit the following late items to the agenda was required:

- Item 13 – Telecommunications Development – Responses set out in the Addendum Report
- Item 19 – Any Other Business – 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (Application No. P/504/04/CFU)
- Item 21 – Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – Enforcement.

(iv) Requests to Backbench

The Chair reported that Councillor Mrs Kinnear wished to backbench in respect of the following items on the agenda:

- Main Agenda Item 20 - Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill
Main Agenda Item 21 - Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee – Enforcement.

She reported that Councillor John Nickolay would not now be backbenching on item 1/01.

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 contains information relating to various items on the agenda and is based on information received after the agenda's dispatch. It is admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.
13. Telecommunications Development	Reports under this item, as set out in the Addendum Report, are admitted to the agenda as decisions were required in order to comply with the 56 day deadline.
19. Any Other Business – 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (P/504/04/CFU)	In order to allow a Nominated Member to be elected as an appeal had been lodged against the refusal of this planning application. The recommendation of the Interim Chief Planning Officer was for approval of the scheme.
21. Item placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee - Enforcement	In order to allow the Committee to discuss the number of outstanding enforcement matters which are causing great anxiety to members of the public, and to discuss any action that may need to be taken to deal with the backlog of unresolved cases.

and;

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

<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>
20. Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill	The report relating to this item contains exempt information under paragraph 12 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 in that the report contains legal advice.

(3) the application recommended for deferral, as set out in the Addendum Report, be noted.

[Note: The Chair re-ordered the agenda at the meeting in order to allow early consideration of the items that the public were present for. However, business is recorded in the order of the items set out in the agenda for reasons of clarity].

797. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That it be agreed that, having been considered, the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2004 as a correct record once they have been printed in the Council Bound Volume, subject to the following amendments:

- (i) Item 2/08 – 75 Athelstone Road, Harrow (P/2172/04/CFU):
Under 'Notes': To record that the reasons for refusal set out in Note (1) (iii) and (iv) were withdrawn prior to the motion for refusal being put to a vote.
- (ii) Item 2/14 – 44 Dennis Lane, Stanmore (P/2058/04/DFU):
Under 'Notes': To record that Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached to grant the application for the reasons set out under paragraphs (i) to (iv).
- (iii) Item 2/20 – 15 Gordon Avenue, Stanmore (P/584/04/CFU):
Under 'Notes': To record that Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to refuse the application.
- (iv) Minute 789(i) – Broomhill, Mount Park Road:
To record in the preamble to Minute 789(i) that Councillor Mrs Kinnear provided another copy of her letter dated 30 August sent to the then Chief Planning Officer which still remained unanswered.

798. **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).

799. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petition which was referred to the Interim Chief Planning Officer for consideration:-

Petition relating to the development of flats in Manor Road – Planning Application P/2889/04/CFU: A petition signed by 70 residents living in and in the vicinity of Manor Road was presented by Councillor Bluston.

800. **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).

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

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

802. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of item 1/01 on the list of planning applications and Agenda Item 13(D) set out in the Addendum Report.

803. **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.

804. **Planning Appeals Update:**
The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

805. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**
The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.

Members raised a number of queries, details of which are set out below:

- (i) 8 Hindes Road, Harrow - Councillor Bluston expressed concern that almost two years had elapsed since this matter had been reported to Committee.
- (ii) 1 Nelson Road, Harrow - Councillor Mrs Bath enquired about the window in the flank wall. The Development Control Manager undertook to report back on this matter.
- (iii) 4 Elm Park, Stanmore - Councillor Mrs Bath enquired if the retrospective planning application had now been received. The Development Control Manager undertook to report on this matter.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

(See also Minute 795(1)(iii)).

806. **Telecommunications Developments:**
The following applications were reported in the Addendum Report:

- (i) Location: Eastcote Road, opposite junction of Lyncroft Avenue (P/2895/04/CDT)
- Proposal:
- 12m high pole with 1.5m antenna sited at the near edge of the footway
 - 2 ancillary cabinets

RESOLVED: That prior approval of siting and appearance be NOT required.

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (ii) Location: Land adjacent to 2 Woodhall Drive, Pinner (B/2915/04/CDT)
- Proposal:
- 10m high simulated telegraph pole with inoyek dual polar omni antenna and equipment cabinet
 - The dimensions of the equipment cabinet would be 1.45m x 0.65m x 1.25m high
 - The facilities would be sited on the 2.2 – 2.5m wide pedestrian pavement to the south east side of Uxbridge Road

RESOLVED: That (1) prior approval of details of siting and appearance IS required;

(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and the streetscene in general.
- (ii) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would reduce the footway width to an unacceptable degree which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (iii) Location: Junction of Elms Road and Uxbridge Road (P/2861/04/CDT)

- Proposal:
- Provision of 10.3m lamp post style Microcell telecommunications column sited towards the rear of the footway.
 - Ancillary cabinet located 4.4m south of the column to the rear of the footpath. Cabinet dimensions to include 1.45m (L), 0.65m (W) and 1.25m (H).
 - Column colour to be galvanised steel/grey and cabinet to be midnight green.

RESOLVED: That (1) prior approval of siting and appearance IS required; and
(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reason and informative:

Reason: The proposed development, by reason of its size, appearance and proximity to existing street furniture, would give rise to a proliferation of such apparatus to the detriment of the visual amenity and appearance of the streetscene and the area in general.

Informative: INFORM41_M (SD1, D4, D24)

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

- (iv) Location: Outside North Harrow Methodist Church Hall, Pinner Road (P/2888/04/CDT)

- Proposal:
- Provision of 10m lamppost style Microcell telecommunications column sited towards the front edge of the boundary.
 - Ancillary cabinet located 8m north of the column to the rear of the grass verge. Cabinet dimensions to include 1.45m (L), 0.65m (W) and 1.25 (H).
 - Column colour to be galvanised steel – anthracite grey and cabinet to be midnight green.

RESOLVED: That (1) prior approval of siting and appearance is required;
(2) approval of details of siting and appearance be REFUSED for the following reasons:

- (i) The proposal, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting, would be visually obtrusive and unduly prominent to the detriment of the amenity of local residents and the streetscene in general.
- (ii) The proposed development would give rise, by the neighbouring residents, to a perception and fear of health risk to the detriment of residential amenity.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from objectors which were noted. Following the receipt of representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objectors. One of the objectors also tabled a petition objecting to the application.

There was no indication that a representative of the applicant was present and wished to respond;

(2) during consideration of the above application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of visual amenity and health rather than on visual amenity only.

Following a vote, this was carried and the application was refused on the grounds set out above;

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

(See also Minute 812(ii)).

807. **Determination of Demolition Applications:**

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

808. **Tree Preservation Orders:**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer regarding new detailed Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) proposed for a number of sites.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Legal Services be authorised to (1) make new TPOs, to be known as follows:

TPO 783 Herga Court (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 785 Penketh Drive (No. 3) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 786 Mount Park Road (No. 8) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 787 Brookshill (No. 8) Harrow Weald
 TPO 788 Georgian Way (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 789 Water Gardens (No. 1) Stanmore Park
 TPO 790 September Way (No. 1) Stanmore Park
 TPO 791 Pine Close (No. 2) Stanmore Park
 TPO 792 Kynaston Wood (No. 1) Harrow Weald
 TPO 793 Westfield Park (No. 4) Hatch End
 TPO 794 Westfield Park (No. 5) Hatch End
 TPO 795 Julian Hill (No. 1) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 796 Julian Hill (No. 2) Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 797 Highbanks Road (No. 1) Hatch End

to be made pursuant to sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to protect those trees identified on the maps and schedules attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke the following TPOs on confirmation of the above:

TPO 41 Charnwood & Penketh, Mount Park Road, Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 5 Valleyfield, Mount Park Road, South Harrow
 TPO 43 Belmont & Thornlea, Mount Park Road, Harrow on the Hill
 TPO 262 Gordon Avenue (No. 6) Stanmore
 TPO 79 Old Church Lane (No. 1) Stanmore
 TPO 98 Stanmore Hill (No. 1) Stanmore
 TPO 72 Boxtree Road (No. 1) Harrow Weald
 TPO 80 Westfield Park (No. 1) Hatch End
 TPO 256 Westfield Park (No. 2) Hatch End
 TPO 108 Oxhey Lane (No. 1) Hatch End

Reason: To accord with current policy.

[Note: Councillor Billson undertook to raise his concerns directly with the Arboricultural Officer regarding the lack of trees on the northern part of Westfield Park, Hatch End, where the Council had recently given approval to a large development].

809. **Prince Edward Playing Fields - Environment Agency Flood Alleviation Works:**

The Committee received a report of the Interim Chief Planning Officer seeking consent to landscaping proposals submitted pursuant to Condition 4 of the planning permission P/1784/03/CFU. Two Members stated that they were satisfied with the proposals. One of these Members asked that the residents be kept informed.

RESOLVED: That (1) the landscaping proposals shown on Drawing WNSLKS/D/502 Rev. E pursuant to Condition 4 of planning permission P/1784/03/CFU be agreed;

(2) officers advise local residents adjacent to the site of the decision of the Committee.

Reasons for Report: To discuss the provision of landscaping to prevent public access onto the embankment pursuant to Condition 4 of planning permission P/1784/03/CFU.

(See also Minute 795(1)(iv)).

810. **Former Youth Centre, Library and Car Park - Grant Road/George Gange Way Wealdstone Site - Stopping Up of the Highway:**

The Vice-Chair stated that she could not support recommendation 1.3 as set out in the Interim Chief Planning Officer's report because the stopping-up of highways was a major action, and that the results of the consultation ought to come back to this Committee. She referred to the decision taken by the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Transport on this matter, which decision had subsequently been withdrawn following a request to call-in the decision.

She reiterated that the results of the consultation, including the Mayor of London's decision, ought to come back to this Committee.

Members were of the view that only major matters relating to stopping-up actions under Section 247 of the Highways Act 1980 ought to come before the Development Control Committee, following which, it was

RESOLVED: (1) That officers be authorised to commence the necessary process to stop up the areas of highway shown on the plan at Appendix 1 in accordance with Sections 247 and 252 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Greater London Authority Act 1999;

(2) that, in the event that objections are made and not withdrawn within the 28 days of publication of the proposed Order, the objections be referred to the Mayor for London for determination as to whether or not a public inquiry should be held in accordance with Section 252 of the Act;

(3) that the results of the consultation be submitted to the Development Control Committee; and

(4) that the Director of Legal Services be authorised to obtain adequate undertakings from the applicant prior to the commencement of the stopping up process stating that the applicant will pay all costs incurred by the Council pertaining to the Stopping Up Order, which it is authorised to recover under the London Local Authorities (Charges for Stopping Up Orders) Regulations 2000.

Reason: To enable the development to be carried out in accordance with the planning permission granted.

811. **Rayners Lane Estate, Scott Crescent - Stopping Up of the Highway:**

Members were of the view that the results of the consultation ought to be submitted to the Development Control Committee and it was

RESOLVED: (1) That officers be authorised to commence the necessary process to stop up the areas of highway shown on the plan at Appendix 1 in accordance with Sections 247 and 252 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Greater London Authority Act 1999;

(2) that, in the event that objections are made and not withdrawn within the 28 days of publication of the proposed Order, the objections be referred to the Mayor for London for determination as to whether or not a public inquiry should be held in accordance with Section 252 of the Act;

(3) that the results of the consultation be submitted to the Development Control Committee; and

(4) that the Director of Legal Services be authorised to obtain adequate undertakings from the applicant prior to the commencement of the stopping up process stating that the applicant will pay all costs incurred by the Council pertaining to the Stopping Up Order, which it is authorised to recover under the London Local Authorities (Charges for Stopping Up Orders) Regulations 2000.

Reason: To enable the development to be carried out in accordance with the planning permission granted.

812. **Any Other Business:**

(i) 354-366 Pinner Road, Harrow (P/504/04/CFU)

The Development Control Manager reported that an appeal had been lodged against the refusal of the above-mentioned application, details of which were set out in the Addendum Report. He added that a Nominated Member was required, as the recommendation of the then Chief Planning Officer had been to approve the scheme.

RESOLVED: That Councillor Marilyn Ashton be nominated.

- (ii) Health Aspects of Telecommunications Development
During discussion of applications for telecommunications development (Minute 806 refers), it was

RESOLVED: That officers be requested to report back to a future meeting of the Committee on health aspects of telecommunications developments in relation to appeal cases.

813. **Broomhill, Mount Park Manor, Harrow on the Hill:**

(Note: The Chair, Councillor Anne Whitehead, having declared an interest in this item and left the room, the Vice-Chair, Councillor Marilyn Ashton took the Chair).

The Committee received a joint report of the Director of Legal Services and the Interim Chief Planning Officer.

The Development Control Manager introduced the report and showed photographs of timber fences and gates in the vicinity of the site.

A Member who was backbenching asked question(s) of the officer(s) and made comments on the breach.

Members discussed whether or not to take enforcement action on the unauthorised fence and gates or to seek modifications to the unauthorised gates only. It was

RESOLVED: That, subject to his being satisfied as to the evidence, the Director of Legal Services be authorised to (1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) compliance with Condition 6 of Planning Consent WEST/884/00/CON; and
 - (ii) compliance with Condition 8 of Planning Consent WEST/884/00/CON should be complied with within a period of 28 days 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 Director of Legal Services to the Council through the issue of Notices under Section 330 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;

and/or

- (ii) comply with the Enforcement Notice.

Reason for Report: To seek the Committee's views on whether enforcement action is considered to be appropriate.

(Note: Following the conclusion of this item, Councillor Anne Whitehead resumed the Chair).

(See also Minute 795(1)(v)).

814. **Issue placed on the agenda further to a request from a Member of the Committee - Enforcement:**

A Member who was backbenching enquired about the position on enforcement and the lack of enforcement action being taken by officers. She cited examples of where enforcement action was outstanding and, in some cases, had been for up to four years. She provided officers with details of various sites where enforcement action was outstanding. She added that local residents were concerned about the lack of action taken by the Council.

The Vice-Chair described the frustration of residents and Members about the lack of enforcement action being taken and enquired about the reasons why it was taking so long to take any action. She also cited examples where enforcement action had yet to be taken. In addition, she enquired why there was a backlog.

The Chair asked for a report on this matter and an explanation of the rationale behind the lack of enforcement action. She added that Members had fought hard to increase the resources available in this area.

A Member agreed that a report was required and questioned whether the levels of resources available were adequate. Another Member enquired if the matter of the possibility of costs being awarded against the Council was an issue.

RESOLVED: That officers be requested to report back on Planning Enforcement to a future meeting of the Committee setting out (i) details of the workload; (ii) the staffing situation; (iii) the backlog of work and (iv) resources in general.

815. **Extension and Termination of the Meeting:**
In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4b of the Constitution) it was

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

(2) at 10.30 pm to continue until 11.00 pm;

(3) at 11.00 pm to continue until 11.20 pm;

(4) at 11.20 pm to continue until 11.30 pm;

(5) at 11.30 pm to continue until 11.45 pm;

(6) at 11.45 pm to continue until 12.00 midnight;

(7) at 12.00 midnight to continue until 12.05 am;

(8) at 12.05 am to continue until 12.10 am;

(9) at 12.10 am to continue until 12.15 am.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 12.14 am).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR ANNE WHITEHEAD
Chair

SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

LIST NO:	1/01	APPLICATION NO:	P/2684/04/CFU
LOCATION:	19 & 21 & R/O 11-29 Alexandra Avenue, South Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Gillett Macleod Partnership for Clearview Homes Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Demolition of Existing Dwellings and Redevelopment to Provide 14 Two Storey Terraced Houses with Access and Parking		
DECISION:	<p>REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) The density of the development would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the properties in the surrounding area by reason of noise and disturbance generated by the number of units on the site.</p> <p>(ii) The proposal represents backland development to the detriment of the status of similarly situated sites in the locality, which will give rise to an increase in such developments since a precedent would have been set.</p> <p>[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector, which were supported by photographic evidence, and the applicant's architect, which were noted. Following the receipt of the representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objector and the applicant's architect;</p> <p>(2) during the discussion on the above item, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused. Upon being put to a vote, this was carried;</p> <p>(3) the Committee wished to be recorded as having been unanimous in their decision to refuse permission;</p> <p>(4) it was noted that the final sentence in paragraph (3) under 'Appraisal' in the officer report ought to read: 'It is considered that not be <u>compromised</u> by the';</p> <p>(5) the Interim Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted].</p> <p>(See also Minute 795(2)).</p>		

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO:	2/01	APPLICATION NO:	P/2822/04/DFU
LOCATION:	15 Holland Walk, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Anthony J Blyth & Co for Mr & Mrs S Freeman		
PROPOSAL:	First Floor Side, Single and 2 Storey Rear Extension		
DECISION:	<p>GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum report, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.</p> <p>(See also Minute 795(1)(i)).</p>		

LIST NO:	2/02	APPLICATION NO:	P/2723/04/COU
LOCATION:	Land R/O 123-135 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware		
APPLICANT:	Gillett Macleod Partnership for London & District Housing Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Outline: Redevelopment: Two x 2 Storey Blocks to Provide 8 Flats and Chalet Bungalow with Access and Parking		

(6) Councillors Bluston, Choudhury, Idaikkadar, Miles and Anne Whitehead wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision reached to grant the application;

(7) Councillor Mrs Bath requested that the Director of Legal Services inform her whether the Section 106 money received from Sainsbury's Ltd towards the refurbishment of the multi-storey car park would be lost].

LIST NO:	2/04	APPLICATION NO:	P/2620/04/CLA
LOCATION:	R/O 56/58 Church Road, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Harrow Engineering Services		
PROPOSAL:	Renewal of Temporary Planning Permission EAST/988/02/LA3 for Surface Level Car Park with Access from Elm Park		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (i) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) Condition 1 being amended to read 2 years rather than 3 years.		
	[Note: During discussion on this application, it was moved and seconded that Condition 1 be amended to 2 years for the following reason:		
	The last temporary permission was for two years which was thought to be an acceptable length of time. However, it is unacceptable to use the site for three years because it will give rise to prolonged access difficulties which will occur with the weight of traffic coming out of the Sainsbury's Car Park.		
	Upon being put to a vote this was carried].		

LIST NO:	2/05	APPLICATION NO:	P/1845/04/CFU
LOCATION:	259/261 Northolt Road, South Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Tecon Ltd for Mr K Shah		
PROPOSAL:	Change of Use: Part Ground Floor Retail to Financial/Professional Services (A1 to A2), Use of First Floor as 2 Flats, Single/2-Storey Rear Extension, Shop Front (Resident Permit Restricted).		
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/2606/04/CFU
LOCATION:	Three Chimneys, 59 The Common, Stanmore		
APPLICANT:	Rogerson Ltd for Mr & Mrs Zimmerman		
PROPOSAL:	Alterations First Floor and Single Storey Rear Extensions and Alterations, Creation of 2 Balconies, Roof Lights at Rear		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (i) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) the following additional informative:		
	3.	The applicant is advised that any further extensions to this property are unlikely to be favourably considered.	

LIST NO: 2/07 **APPLICATION NO:** P/7883/04/DFU

LOCATION: 31 Borrowdale Avenue, Harrow

APPLICANT: M Halai for M L Vishram

PROPOSAL: Single Storey Side to Front and Rear Extension and Two Rear Dormers; Garage and Store in Rear Garden and Construction of Vehicle Crossover

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

[Note: Councillor Mrs Ashton wished to be recorded that, whilst she was not objecting to the proposal, she was concerned about the proposed size of the store in the rear garden and the use thereof; the owners had advised, however, that the store would be used as ancillary to their property for storage of such items as bicycles and children's furniture].

LIST NO: 2/08 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2710/04/DFU

LOCATION: 36-38 High Street, Harrow on the Hill

APPLICANT: Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr D O Pelaez

PROPOSAL: Change of Use of First Floor Restaurant at No.38 in order to Extend Guesthouse at No.36.

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

LIST NO: 2/09 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1824/04/CFU

LOCATION: Hamstede, 4 Priory Drive, Stanmore

APPLICANT: Brill & Owen Architects for Mr M & Mr L Reuben

PROPOSAL: First Floor Side and Rear and Single Storey Rear 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.

(See also Minute 795(1)(ii)).

LIST NO: 2/10 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2379/04/DFU

LOCATION: 37 Nelson Road, Stanmore

APPLICANT: Mr J Bhasin, JLB Design Associates for Ms U Vohra

PROPOSAL: Conversion of Dwellinghouse to 2 Self-Contained Flats

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

[Notes: (1) During consideration of this application, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused for the following reasons:

(i) The additional activity generated by the conversion of this single dwellinghouse to two units will be detrimental to residential amenities and will give rise to noise and disturbance to the neighbouring properties.

- (ii) The proposal would be out of character in a road where there are no other converted dwellinghouses, which will impact detrimentally on the local area.
- (iii) Parking is typically difficult in the road and so any additional pressure on parking will be detrimental to residential amenities and the free flow of traffic.

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

(2) the vote on the substantive motion to grant the above application was carried;

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Billson, Janet Cowan and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached to grant the application for the reasons stated in (1) above].

LIST NO: 2/11 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2547/04/DFU
LOCATION: 41 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
APPLICANT: Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr Robert Fulker
PROPOSAL: Change of Use of First and Second Floors from Office (Class B1) to Two Self-Contained Flats; Alterations to Front and Replacement Windows at Rear.
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/2548/04/DLB
LOCATION: 41 High Street, Harrow on the Hill
APPLICANT: Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr Robert Fulker
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: Internal Alterations in Connection with Change of Use to 2 Flats, External Repairs and Alterations to Windows.
DECISION: GRANTED listed building consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/13 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2660/04/CFU
LOCATION: 9 Springfield Close, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Concept Windows for Mr D Lack
PROPOSAL: Conservatory at Rear
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Note: The footprint, floorspace and volume calculations for the proposed conservatory are set out in the Addendum Report].

LIST NO: 2/14 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2357/04/DFU
LOCATION: 7 Hillview Close, Pinner
APPLICANT: Magan D Solanki for Mr & Mrs Jivraj
PROPOSAL: Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/15 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2583/04/CFU
LOCATION: Hill View, Brookshill Drive, Harrow
APPLICANT: Gillett Macleod Partnership for Mr G Orengo
PROPOSAL: Two Storey Rear Extension and Replacement Single Storey Side Extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

[Notes: (1) During discussion on this application, it was moved that the application be refused on the following grounds:

(i) The proposed extensions would result in an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the Green Belt contrary to policies of the HUDP and the provisions of PPG2.

(ii) The removal of chimneys would be detrimental to the character of the conservation area.

(2) Upon clarification from the Development Control Manager that the existing chimneys would be retained, the second reason for refusal in paragraph (1(ii)) above was withdrawn by the mover of the motion;

(3) the ground for refusal as set out in (1)(i) above was seconded and following the advice of the Development Control Manager that the extension had been reduced extensively, the reason for refusal was amended as follows:

(i) The proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions to the building to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Green Belt contrary to Policies of the HUDP and provisions of PPG2.

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

(4) the vote on the substantive motion to grant the above application was carried].

LIST NO: 2/16 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2555/04/CFU
LOCATION: 7 Stanmore Hall, Wood Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Eklus (Mauritius) Ltd
PROPOSAL: Lowering of Parapet Wall with the Provision of Railings
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, subject to the condition and informative reported.

LIST NO: 2/17 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2556/04/CLB
LOCATION: 7 Stanmore Hall, Wood Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Eklus (Mauritius) Ltd
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: Lowering of Parapet Wall with the Provision of Railings
DECISION: GRANTED Listed Building Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, as set out in the Addendum Report, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

LIST NO: 2/18 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2724/04/CFU
LOCATION: Mulberry House, Pinner Hill, Pinner
APPLICANT: Orchard Associates for Mr & Mrs R Weerasekera
PROPOSAL: Part Single, Part Two Storey Side Extension with Rear Dormers and Rooflights
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to (1) the conditions and informatives reported and (ii) the following additional informative:
4. The applicant is advised that any further extensions to this property are unlikely to be favourably considered.

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2030/04/CFU
LOCATION: 294 Uxbridge Road, Hatch End
APPLICANT: Michael Burroughs Associates for A Surace
PROPOSAL: Change of Use: Retail (Class A1) to Public House (Class A3) as Part of Ground Floor
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.

LIST NO: 3/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2653/04/DFU
LOCATION: 21 & 23 Woodhall Drive, Pinner
APPLICANT: A Davies for Mr & Mrs Fromlich/Mrs R Desai
PROPOSAL: Alterations to Roof and Rear Dormer
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.

LIST NO: 3/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1941/04/CFU
LOCATION: Former Kings Head Hotel, Harrow on the Hill
APPLICANT: VRDL for Macleod & Fairbriar Ltd
PROPOSAL: Use of Ground Floor & Basement Area Intended for A3 Use in Permission WEST/971/02/FUL, as Residential Unit
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informative reported.
(See also 'Note' under 3/04 below).

LIST NO: 3/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1942/04/CFU

LOCATION: Former Kings Head Hotel, Harrow on the Hill

APPLICANT: VRDL for Macleod & Fairbriar Ltd

PROPOSAL: Use of Ground Floor & Basement Area Intended for A3 Use in Permission WEST/971/02/FUL, as Residential Unit (Duplicate)

DECISION: That had an appeal against non-determination not been made, the application for the development described in the application and submitted plans would have been REFUSED permission for the reason and informative reported.

[Note: In respect of both item 3/03 above and item 3/04, the Interim Chief Planning Officer's representative stated, in response to a query from a local resident with regard to the notification undertaken, that the notification should read 164 and not 172 and that this figure would be adjusted].

SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

LIST NO: 4/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/2751/04/CAN

LOCATION: 131-135, Kenton Road, Kenton Timber & Builders, Harrow

APPLICANT: Brent Council

PROPOSAL: Consultation: Part 4/5/6 Storey Building to Provide 16 Flats with Retail Unit on Ground Floor and Parking.

DECISION: That Harrow Council OBJECTS to the development set out in the application and submitted plans for the reason and informatives reported.
