
REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 11 FEBRUARY 2004

Chair: * Councillor Anne Whitehead

Councillors: * Marilyn Ashton * Knowles
 * Mrs Bath * Miles
 * Choudhury * Mrs Joyce Nickolay
 * Idaikkadar * Ray (5)
 * Kara * Thornton

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

[Note: Councillors Anjana Patel and Navin Shah also attended this meeting in a participating role. See Minute 494].

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL**PART II - MINUTES**493. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Bluston

Reserve Member

Councillor Ray

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

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, Councillors Anjana Patel and Navin Shah, who are not Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on Item 2/01.

495. **Declarations of Interest:**

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

(i) Item 2/01 – Site of Timbers, 41 Brookshill, Harrow Weald (P/2677/03/CVA/GM)

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in the above application arising from the fact that she knew a resident who lived near the above property. Accordingly she remained and took part in the voting and discussion on this item.

(ii) Item 2/06 - 73 Imperial Drive, North Harrow (P/9/04/CFU/GM)

Councillor Idaikkadar declared an interest in the above application arising from the fact that his GP would be practising from the above premises should the Committee be minded to grant planning permission. Accordingly, he left the room and took no part in the discussion or voting on this item.

(iii) Item 2/19 – White Cottage, 2 Whitehall Road, Harrow (P/246/03/CFU/GM)

Councillor Knowles declared a personal interest in the above application arising from the fact that the above property was situated in a Neighbourhood Watch area which was run/co-ordinated by his partner. Accordingly, he remained and took part in the voting and discussion on this item.

(iv) Item 3/02 – 7 Rickmansworth Road, Pinner (P/2582/03/CFU/TEM)

The Chair, Councillor Anne Whitehead, stated that she would have declared an interest in the above application had it not been withdrawn by the applicant.

(3) Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Mrs Bath, Knowles, Mrs Joyce Nickolay and Thornton wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached];

(4) Following consideration and determination of the above planning application, Members nominated Councillor Marilyn Ashton as the 'Nominated Member' who was required to agree the Statement for the Council for the appeal that had been lodged against the decision to refuse the previous application for the above site (minute 518(ii) also refers).

LIST NO:	2/02	APPLICATION NO:	P/2918/03/COU
LOCATION:	131-133 Whitchurch Lane, Edgware		
APPLICANT:	Gillett Macleod Partnership for London & District Housing Ltd		
PROPOSAL:	Outline: Redevelopment to Provide 8 Flats in Two 2 Storey Blocks with Access and Parking		
DECISION:	REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reasons:		

Reason 1 - This proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenities of Nos. 129 and 135 Whitchurch Lane by reason of noise and disturbance from traffic and activity generated by the use of the access road.

Reason 2 - The character and the building line of the row of semi-detached houses would be abruptly interrupted by the gap caused in the street scene by the demolition of two semi-detached houses to the detriment of the character of this section of Whitchurch Lane.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from two objectors and the applicant's agent.

The first objector stated that the siting of the rubbish bins was inappropriate and would be only 30m from the rear of her property and only 1m for other properties in the area. She added that there was a dispute regarding the boundary and she read out the communication received from the land registry. She felt that the proposal would devalue her property.

The second objector who had not previously registered his right to speak at the meeting was allowed to address the meeting with the Committee's approval. He objected to the proposal on the grounds that

- it would lead to an increase in noise and traffic pollution;
- it would overlook onto adjoining properties and that, as a result, he would not be able to build a swimming pool in his own garden because there would be no privacy;
- that the proposal would devalue the properties in the area;
- that the use of heavy machinery would lead to disruption.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting and stated that the report before the Committee addressed all planning matters and that the objections were not based on planning grounds.

Members did not ask any questions of the objector or the applicant's agent.

(2) During the debate which followed, it was moved and seconded that consideration of the above application be deferred to allow Members to visit the site on the grounds that the proposal was essentially a backland development and that a site visit would allow Members to see the distances between properties and assess the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Upon a vote this was not carried.

It was further moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds that

- (1) This proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenities of Nos 129 and 135 Whitchurch Lane by reason of noise and disturbance from traffic and activity generated by the use of the access road.