

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 3rd 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).

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).

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

LIST NO:	2/08	APPLICATION NO:	P/2468/03/DFU
LOCATION:	81 Elmsleigh Avenue, Kenton		
APPLICANT:	Mr R Sodha		
PROPOSAL:	Two Storey Side to Rear and Single Storey Front/Side and Rear Extension; Conversion of Extended Dwelling to Three Self-Contained Flats; Forecourt Parking.		
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, 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).

LIST NO:	2/09	APPLICATION NO:	P/2515/03/CFU
LOCATION:	71 Alicia Gardens, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Mr R Sodha		
PROPOSAL:	Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension and Conversion to Three Self-Contained flats, Parking at Front.		
DECISION:	<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"> 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. <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>		

LIST NO:	2/10	APPLICATION NO:	P/2517/03/CFU
LOCATION:	103 Elmsleigh Avenue, Kenton		
APPLICANT:	Mr R Sodha		
PROPOSAL:	Two Storey Side to Rear, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension, and Conversion to 3 Self-Contained Flats, Parking and Widened Access.		
DECISION:	<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"> 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 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].

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

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

LIST NO:	2/13	APPLICATION NO:	P/2081/03/CCA
LOCATION:	Harrow School Pole Shed, Off 18 Football Lane, Harrow, Woodland R/O Spinney Cottages		
APPLICANT:	Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Keepers & Governors of Harrow School		
PROPOSAL:	Conservation Area Consent: Demolition of Single Storey Timber Pole Shed.		
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.		

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

LIST NO: 2/15 **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].

LIST NO:	2/24	APPLICATION NO:	P/894/03/CFU
LOCATION:	Hillmorton, 11 Orley Farm Road, Harrow		
APPLICANT:	Sureplan (South Bucks) Ltd for Mr and Mrs Soni		
PROPOSAL:	Single Storey Side Extension Conversion of Outbuilding to Provide Granny Annexe, 2 Rear Dormers		
DECISION:	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.