

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

3 SEPTEMBER 2013

Chairman: * Councillor William Stoodley

Councillors: * Mrinal Choudhury * Joyce Nickolay (3)
* Stephen Greek * Bill Phillips
* Ajay Maru (2) * Simon Williams

* Denotes Member present
(2) and (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

438. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Keith Ferry
Councillor Stephen Wright

Reserve Member

Councillor Ajay Maru
Councillor Joyce Nickolay

439. Right of Members to Speak

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillors, who were not Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda item indicated:

Councillor

Marilyn Ashton
Sachin Shah

Planning Application

1/01 The Hive Football Centre (Formerly Prince Edward Playing Fields), Camrose Avenue, Edgware

Marilyn Ashton
Manji Kara
Sachin Shah

3/02 Park High School, Thistlecroft
Gardens, Stanmore

(Councillor Manji Kara did not speak).

440. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 10 – Planning Application 2/04 – 6 Sites Around Bushey

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in that she lived within the area encompassed by the ERUV. She would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in that he was a member of the United Synagogue and his late grandmother lived within the area encompassed by the ERUV. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 10 – Planning Application 3/02 – Park High School, Thistlecroft Gardens, Stanmore

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a non pecuniary interest in that she was a Local Authority appointed Governor of Park High School. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Mrinal Choudhury declared a non pecuniary interest in that his son had been a student at the school. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Sachin Shah declared a non pecuniary interest in that he was a Local Authority appointed Governor of Rooks Heath School. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

441. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2013 and of the Special meeting held on 1 August 2013 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

442. Public Questions and Deputations

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or deputations received.

443. Petitions

RESOLVED: That a petition presented by Shahab Ahmed containing 224 signatures in support of the application regarding Harrow Magistrates Court, Rosslyn Crescent, Harrow was noted.

444. References from Council and other Committees/Panels

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

445. Representations on Planning Applications

RESOLVED: That

- (1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30, representations be received in respect of items 1/02, 2/01 and 2/11 on the list of planning applications;
- (2) in accordance with Committee Procedural Rule 30.5 it was agreed that two objectors be able to address the Committee in relation to item 2/01;
- (3) in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 25.1, that Procedure Rule 30.3 be suspended to allow an objector who had not met the deadline to speak in connection with planning application 2/06.

RESOLVED ITEMS

446. Planning Applications Received

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Addendum was admitted late to the agenda as it contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the despatch of the agenda. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Divisional Director of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered.

THE HIVE FOOTBALL CENTRE (FORMERLY PRINCE EDWARD PLAYING FIELDS), CAMROSE AVENUE, EDGWARE

Reference: P/0665/13 (The Hive Developments Ltd). Variation Of Condition 29 (Approved Plans - Added Through Application P/2807/12) Attached To P/0002/07 Dated 08/04/2008 For 'Redevelopment For Enlarged Football Stadium And Clubhouse, Floodlights, Games Pitches, Banqueting Facilities, Health And Fitness Facility, Internal Roads And Parking' To Allow Minor Amendments To The Stadium Comprising: Phase 1: Internal And External Alterations To East Stand Including Additional Row Of Seats; Increase In Height, Depth And Capacity Of West Stand Including Camera Position; Reduction In Capacity Of Standing Areas; Increase In Height Of Floodlights And Re-Siting Of Southern Floodlights; Additional Turnstiles, Spectator Circulation, Fencing, Food Kiosks And Toilets; Alterations To Parking Areas. Phase 2: Replace North Stand With Seated Stand; Reduction In Capacity Of Standing Area In Southern Stand; Extension To Rear Of West Stand To Provide Indoor Spectator Space (Total Stadium Capacity Not To Exceed 5176 As Previously Approved).

The Divisional Director of Planning introduced the report with reference to the addendum which included a summary of additional responses received and further information submitted by the applicant. A site visit had been made, therefore the Members of the Committee were familiar with the circumstances of the existing and proposed schemes.

The application had been submitted as a material minor amendment to an earlier planning permission that had been implemented. Concerns raised in connection with the principle of the use of the site by the first team of Barnet Football Club were not matters before the Committee as the use was permitted by the earlier planning permission.

He drew attention to the approved plans for the stadium complex that were approved in 2008 and partly implemented. The phase 1 works detailed in the application had been substantially completed on the site. The proposed changes were in 2 phases and related to the north and west stands to the stadium and the re-assignment of spectator seating in the stadium (principally from the omission of the approved upper tier on the East Stand). Other material changes were to the height of the four stadium floodlights which had also been installed.

With regard to the amenity aspects of the floodlights and stands under Phase 1 of the scheme, the view of the officers was that whilst the changes to the West Stand were acceptable, the applicant's argument that the additional height of the floodlights enabled a reduction in glare/light spill had not been demonstrated in the submissions made to the Council. Tests had been undertaken and witnessed by Environmental Health and the Institute of Lighting Engineers guidance had been referred to. The Local Plan policy test required the LPA to be satisfied with the amenity impact of the lighting.

Officers were satisfied with the Phase 2 proposals, subject to management of the stadium capacity in a manner that reflected the permitted capacity. The impact of appearance and amenity was considered acceptable with an appropriate scale and form. The other elements were acceptable. The second key component was the infilling of space beyond the west stand which enclosed the space for fans to circulate. Members were taken to this area on the site visit and would form their own view. Officers considered that the impact upon amenity and the character of the area would be acceptable.

The community view was that light from the floodlights would increase disturbance. The applicants had been asked to submit material to demonstrate that the higher lights were satisfactory. The failure of the applicants to submit satisfactory material to demonstrate that these impacts had been minimized, and the assessment of the Environmental Protection Team formed following their site visit during the use of the floodlights meant that officers could not conclude that the changes to the floodlights satisfied the Local Plan policy.

Following questions and comments from Members, the Divisional Director advised that:

- in considering any future enforcement outcome, the LPA needed to consider the effect of the breach of the planning approval and the expediency of formal enforcement action. Should the application for the stand be refused then the expediency of enforcement action would certainly need to be considered;
- there was not a detailed noise report. The Environmental Health advice was that there was not likely to be a lot of difference compared with the present scheme. The applicant had said that it was difficult to provide an assessment. The Environmental Protection officer advised that in his opinion there would be little difference, in noise levels as a result of the changes and a noise assessment was not warranted;
- the Environmental Protection officer had considered a report from lighting consultants and considered that the content was inadequate to support the assertion that light spill from the approved 15 metres floodlights was greater than 28 metres. It was noted that the light plot submitted by the applicant did not include the impact/levels on all of the surrounding residential properties;
- it was acknowledged that the rear elevation windows in Phase 2 works to the west stand could cause perceived overlooking. Had the application been before the Committee for approval, a condition addressing this concern would have been appropriate. Views from passengers on the Jubilee Line embankment, which were closer to the properties on Aldrige Avenue, was likely to create a greater sense of overlooking than from the West Stand. The separation of the stand from the homes on Aldrige Avenue would not, in officers opinion, justify refusal of the proposals on ground of a loss of privacy, particularly where there was scope for the introduction/ conditioning of obscure glazing to the windows in the stand giving rise to this concern;

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the following grounds:

1. The revised proposals would be detrimental to the character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring residential properties, by reason of the increased height, scale and bulk of the spectator stands and floodlights, contrary to policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan, policy CS 1(B) of the Core Strategy and policy 7.4 of the London Plan.
2. In the absence of sufficient details and calculations in relation to the potential impacts of the revised capacities and layouts of the various spectator stands within the site, the local planning authority is unable to conclude that the proposals would not result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbours by virtue of unacceptable noise levels within and adjacent to residential properties surrounding or near to the site. The proposals are therefore contrary to policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan and policy 7.15 of the London Plan.

3. The proposed rear extensions to spectator stands, given the additional height, would result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties, contrary to policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan and policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

The motion for refusal was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

A further motion for refusal was proposed, seconded and put to the vote. The motion was carried.

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

- (1) the application has failed to demonstrate that the impact of the floodlights would not result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbours by virtue of unacceptable lighting levels within and adjacent to residential properties surrounding or near to the site. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies DM 1C and DM 48C of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- (2) the height of the west stand would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, Policies CS1(B) and policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan;
- (3) the west stand by reason of excessive height, scale, bulk and proximity to the site boundary, would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties also contrary to, CS1B of Harrow's Core Strategy, and 7.4 of the London Plan.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse was unanimous.

158-160 HIGH STREET, WEALDSTONE HARROW

Reference: P/0435/13 (Mr E Gadsden). Redevelopment Of The Site To Provide A Three Storey Building Containing 12 Flats With Balconies At The Front And Rear; Bin Storage; Landscaping; 1.5m High Railings Along Road Boundaries And 1.8m High Fencing Along Side And Rear Boundaries; Parking At Rear.

An officer introduced the report with reference to the addendum which included further comments from the objector and a statement from the applicant regarding the character of the area. It was noted that a site visit had taken place.

In response to questions and comments from Members, the Committee was advised that:

- affordable housing was excluded due to viability. Should the S106 Agreement be signed by the prescribed time the GLA CIL would apply.

If it was signed subsequently the Harrow Council CIL would apply provided it was in place at the time of determination;

- detailed consideration had been given to the mitigation of the flood risk and the officers were satisfied with the measures proposed;
- conditions 4, 5 and 6 dealt with concerns regarding trees and biodiversity.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Edmund Cleary, and a representative of the Applicant, Richard Henley.

DECISION:

- (1) **GRANTED** permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement with the Heads of Terms stated, conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition as follows:

The development hereby permitted, as detailed in the submitted and approved drawings, shall be built to Lifetime Home Standards, and thereafter retained to those standards.

REASON: To ensure provision of 'Lifetime Home' standard housing in accordance with policies 3.5, 3.8 and 7.2 of The London Plan 2011, policy CS1.K of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 and policy DM2 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013.

- (2) the delegation to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the Section 106 Agreement and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or legal agreement be approved;
- (3) should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed by 27 September 2013, the decision to REFUSE planning permission be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning on the grounds as set out in the report.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

XANADU HOUSE, POTTER STREET HILL, PINNER

Reference: P/0380/13 (Mr Raman Dhillon). Childrens Play House On Plinth In Rear Garden (Retrospective Application).

An officer introduced the report, noting that a site visit had taken place. It was reported that an Article 4 Direction did not remove permitted rights for outbuildings. The overall height of the building would be within the limitations for permitted development, although the eaves height slightly exceeded these limitations.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was noted that:

- the character of the conservation was defined in the Pinner Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy and included mature boundary treatments to mature gardens with a mix of evergreens, deciduous species and shrubs;
- the play house was not considered to have an adverse impact upon openness of the green belt. The noise of children playing was not inappropriate in the green belt given the acceptance within policy of sport and recreation uses as appropriate development in greenbelt locations;
- the site visit gave Members an appreciation of the screening provided to the neighbouring property by vegetation along the site boundary. It was for Members to form a view on the justification of further planting through the use of a planning condition.

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Michele Hope and Maurice Felber, and the Applicant, Raman Dhillon.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was as follows:

Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Ajay Maru, Bill Phillips and William Stoodley voted to grant the application.

Councillors Joyce Nickolay, Stephen Greek and Simon Williams abstained.

STANMORE COLLEGE, ELM PARK, STANMORE

Reference: P/1663/13 (Harrow Council). Construction Of A Three Storey Linked Building To The West Of The Site, Adjacent To Old Church Lane To Provide A Gym And Ancillary Facilities At Ground Floor Level And Four Additional Teaching Classrooms At First And Second Floor Level; New Non Illuminated Signage To Front (Western) Elevation; Hard And Soft Landscaping; Provision Of Cycle Storage Railings And Boundary Treatment; (Demolition Of Existing Single Storey Mobile Building On Western Side Of The Site (Hawthorn Mobile Buidling) And Part Demolition Of Single Storey Hall Building And External Canopies).

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

293 – 295 STATION ROAD, HARROW

Reference: P/3294/12. (Crestway Ltd). Use Of First And Second Floors As A House Of Multiple Occupancy (Use Class C4)

In response to a question, it was noted that access was by means of the front door and with the rear access becoming a fire escape.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse/waste has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The use hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details which shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties, as required by policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

6 SITES AROUND BUSHEY

Reference: P/1462/13 (United Synagogue). Construction Of Pole And Wire Gateways And Steel Posts To Form An Eruv For Bushey.

It was noted that the associated application to Hertsmere Borough had been granted on 27 August subject to conditions regarding maintenance and external appearance. These conditions were taken into account by Harrow Council by the inclusion of two further conditions included in the addendum.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

TREVOSSE, 116 ROWLANDS AVENUE, HATCH END

Reference: P/1381/13 (Mr & Mrs Atul Patel). Two Storey Side Extension.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

FLAT G, 36 HINDES ROAD, HARROW

Reference: P/0538/13 (Mr Mohammed Lalji). Certificate Of Lawful Existing Use: Use Of Detached Outbuilding In Rear Garden As Residential Unit (Class C3).

It was noted that the application had been deferred from the Planning Committee on 1 August 2013 for further consultations to be undertaken. A site visit had taken place.

The Divisional Director of Planning stated that improved methods of targeting enforcement were being examined. An officer stated that Building Control records did not indicate a change in use of the property so building regulations would need to be examined.

In response to questions, the Committee was informed that:

- the current application was a test of the evidence submitted by the application, that on the balance or probabilities the outbuilding had been used for a continuous period of four years as a residential unit. It was not an application for planning permission but an assessment of the evidence that had been demonstrated;
- the fact that the landlord paid the Council tax on behalf of the tenants was not a factor for consideration;
- there was no evidence that the outbuilding had been used for anything except residential use. A gap in tenancy did not negate the residential use;
- the building had been inspected and observed as divided and set out as residential with Council Tax being paid from then onwards with tenancy agreements being produced. There was a requirement on the Committee to grant a certificate as the evidence was robust and there was no evidence to the contrary;
- the planning and finance officers had examined the evidence from the applicant. Council tax payments had been received and recorded. It would be inappropriate for Members of the Committee to request the original paperwork and undertake their own investigations prior to making a decision.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Eileen Kinnear.

DECISION: GRANTED a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the Certificate of Lawful Use was as follows:

Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Stephen Greek, Ajay Maru and, William Stoodley voted to grant the certificate.

Councillors Joyce Nickolay , Bill Phillips and Simon Williams abstained.

1 & 1A SILVERDALE CLOSE, NORTHOLT

Reference: P/1852/13 (Melinda Property Services Ltd). Change Of Use Of Former Childrens Residential Home And Contact Centre Into Seven Residential Flats (Class C2/D1 To Class C3); External Alterations (Revised).

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

106 - 108 HINDES ROAD, HARROW

Reference: P/0932/13 (Kjdma (Harrow) Ltd). Change Of Use Of Ground Floor From Office (Class B1) To Two Flats (Class C3); Conversion Of First Floor To Four Flats (Six In Total); Alterations To Roof To Form End Gable And Two Rear Dormers; Single Storey Side Extension And Two Storey Rear Extension; Alterations To Front Elevation; Front Boundary Wall; Bin And Cycle Storage; Re-Instate Existing Crossover; Parking At Rear And Landscaping.

In response to a question, the Committee was informed that the parking was maximized with the surrounding roads being well controlled and that more sustainable travel was encouraged.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition as follows:

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a scheme for the storage and disposal of refuse/waste has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority.

The use hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the works have been completed in accordance with the approved details which shall thereafter be retained.

REASON: To ensure adequate standards of hygiene and refuse/waste collection without prejudice to the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of

their properties, as required by policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant was unanimous.

WILLOW COTTAGE, HILLSIDE ROAD, PINNER

Reference: P/0934/13 (Mr Sabri Karim). Retrospective Application For A Loft Conversion With Proposed Alterations To Reduce The Size Of The Unauthorised Side And Rear Dormers; Removal Of One Of The Flat Roofed Rear Dormers; Removal Of 18 Of The 26 Unauthorised Rooflights; Insertion Of 2 Additional Rooflights; Replacement Of Unauthorised Pantiles With Clay Tiles On Roof.

The Committee requested that the officers monitor the situation and advise Members when the works to address the requirements of the enforcement notice had been undertaken.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

THE EASTCOTE ARMS PUBLIC HOUSE, EASTCOTE LANE, SOUTH HARROW

Reference: P/0027/13 (Eastcote Investments Ltd). Change Of Use Of First Floor From Ancillary Residential Accommodation For A Public House (Use Class A4) To Multiple Occupancy For Up To 9 Persons (Use Class C4).

The officer informed the Committee that the property was currently vacant with a licence application having been submitted. In response to questions it was noted that:

- the officers were satisfied with further details submitted to mitigate the flood risk;
- it was not unusual to have residential accommodation above public houses and residents in the residential accommodation would be aware of the use. Officers had been advised that building regulations did not require soundproofing;
- the refuse facilities would be those that applied to the public house as it was a single unit.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.

57 CECIL PARK, PINNER

Reference: P/3277/12 (Geraldine Capper). Single Storey Side Extension.

An officer introduced the report, noting that a site visit had taken place to the property and the adjoining property. It was noted that the application had been reported to the Committee at the request of a Nominated Member.

In response to questions, it was noted that:

- the application had been assessed against guidance and policy and was considered to be appropriate for the area;
- the site visit had shown that there was a variety of styles in the street and therefore not a prevailing style, therefore the application preserved the varied character of the area;
- the loss of the chimney was not before the Committee for consideration. The removal of a chimney did not require Conservation Area consent nor planning permission in itself.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the following grounds:

The proposed development, by reason of excessive scale and bulk and inadequate design, would be harmful to the character and setting of the Tookes Green Conservation Area, contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.8 and 7.16 of the London Plan, Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan.

The motion for refusal was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Terence Upton, and a representative of the applicant, Mr Capper.

DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was as follows:

Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Ajay Maru, Bill Phillips and William Stoodley voted for the application.

Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against the application.

HARROW MAGISTRATES COURT, ROSSLYN CRESCENT, HARROW

Reference: P/0955/13 (The Jasper Foundation). Listed Building Consent: Internal And External Alterations Including Removal Of Walls And Interior Fixtures And Fittings And Part Reinstatement And Recreation Of Features And Replacement Of Windows (Partially Retrospective).

DECISION: DEFERRED for a site visit.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to defer the application was unanimous.

PARK HIGH SCHOOL, THISTLECROFT GARDENS, STANMORE

Reference: P/0940/13 (Mr Emlyn Lumley). Variation Of Condition 14 Of Planning Permission East/45063/92/Out Dated 03/09/1992 To Allow Public Use Of The Sports Hall For Pre Booked Sport And Fitness Purposes For Up To 40 Persons At Any One Time. Proposed Opening Hours Are 18.00 To 22.00 Monday To Friday And 09.00 To 17.00 Saturday And Sunday. Sports To Include Badminton, Five A Side Football, Cricket, Yoga And Dance.

An officer reported that the dual use of the sports hall had been discontinued due to noise and traffic concerns due to access via two cul de sacs. The Committee was required to balance the planning policy against the safeguarding of the amenities of residents. The officers did not consider that the PPG17 study had demonstrated sufficient unmet demand. Subsequent to the preparation of the report additional information had been received from the applicant and other bodies supporting demand for such facilities.

A Member of the Committee stated that a traffic scheme had introduced a one way system for entrance to the school.

A Member of the Committee moved that the application be deferred. This was seconded, put to the vote and carried.

In view of the proposal to defer, Councillor Marilyn reserved her right to speak to the application when it was further considered.

DECISION: DEFERRED to enable consideration of further information supplied by the applicant and other bodies.

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to defer was as follows:

Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Ajay Marun, Bill Phillips and William Stoodley voted for the deferment.

Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against the decision to defer.

447. Member Site Visits

RESOLVED: To note that a site visit would take place to Harrow Magistrates Court, Rosslyn Crescent, Harrow.

448. Extension of Meeting

RESOLVED: That

- (1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 a proposal to extend the length of the meeting until 11.00 pm, if necessary, be agreed;
- (2) in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 25.1, that Committee Procedure Rule 14.2.1.2(c) be suspended in order to enable the Committee to continue after 11.00 pm until the close of business.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 11.07 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR WILLIAM STOODLEY
Chairman