

**SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS**

<b>LIST NO:</b>	1/01	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/3309/06/COU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	287, 289, 291, 293 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware, HA8 6RA		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	David Kann Associates for City & Metropolitan Developments Limited		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Redevelopment to provide two storey block (with rooms in the roof) of 14 flats with parking and basement fitness/spa centre (outline)		
<b>DECISION:</b>	REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, for the following reasons:		
	(i) The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size, scale and bulk, would be visually obtrusive and out of character with neighbouring properties, which would comprise mainly pairs of semi-detached houses in single family occupation, and would not respect the scale and massing of those properties, to the detriment of the visual amenities of the neighbouring residents and character of the area, contrary to policies D4 and D5 of the HUDP.		
	(ii) The proposed access road and rear parking area, by reason of excessive size and unsatisfactory siting in relation to neighbouring residential properties, together with the associated disturbance and general activity, would be unduly obtrusive and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties and character of the area.		

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector, and the applicant's representative, which were noted;

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

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Don Billson, Julia Merison, Narinder Singh Mudhar and Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted for the decision to refuse the application;

(4) Councillors David Gawn, Keith Ferry and Thaya Idaikkadar wished to be recorded as having abstained from voting;

(5) the Head of Planning had recommended that the above application be granted].

(See also Minutes 45 and 49).

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

<b>LIST NO:</b>	3/01	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/3169/06/CFU
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Peterborough Cottage, Garlands Lane, Harrow on the Hill		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Kenneth W Reed and Associates for The Keepers and Governors of Harrow School		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Redevelopment of Peterborough Cottage to provide new school boarding house		
<b>DECISION:</b>	WITHDRAWN by the applicant.		

<b>LIST NO:</b>	3/02	<b>APPLICATION NO:</b>	P/3170/06/CCA
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Peterborough Cottage, Garlands Lane, Harrow on the Hill		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	Kenneth W Reed and Associates for The Keepers and Governors of Harrow School		

**PROPOSAL:** Conservation Area Consent: Redevelopment of Peterborough Cottage and outbuildings

**DECISION:** WITHDRAWN by the applicant.

**LIST NO:** 3/03                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/2732/06/CFU

**LOCATION:** Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, Brockley Hill, Stanmore, HA7 4LP

**APPLICANT:** RNOH Trust for PKL Healthcare

**PROPOSAL:** Temporary single storey rear IT building

**DECISION:** (1) REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reasons reported;

(2) RESOLVED that, should the applicant wish to submit a further application, officers be urged to continue negotiations with the applicant to assist in identifying a suitable site for the temporary building.

**LIST NO:** 3/04                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/3381/06/CFU

**LOCATION:** The Old Coachworks, R/O 1-7 Whitefriars Drive, Harrow Weald, HA3 5HJ

**APPLICANT:** Knight Frank LLP for Stablewood Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** Three storey block of 10 flats with associated parking and landscaping

**DECISION:** WITHDRAWN by the applicant.

#### **SECTION 5 – PRIOR APPROVAL APPLICATIONS**

**LIST NO:** 5/01                      **APPLICATION NO:** P/58/07/CDT

**LOCATION:** Texaco Wealdstone Service Station, 16-22 Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2UF

**APPLICANT:** Spyder Facilities Ltd for T Mobile

**PROPOSAL:** Proposal: Prior approval for siting and appearance for relocation and height increase of existing monopole antenna from 13.7M to 14.7M. Relocation of equipment cabinets.

**DECISION:** (1) RESOLVED that prior approval of details of siting and appearance be required;

(2) REFUSED prior approval of details of siting and appearance for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, for the reason reported.

(See also Minute 45).