
REPORT OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 28 JULY 2004

Chair: Councillor Whitehead

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Councillors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Marilyn Ashton * Billson (1) * Blann (2) * Bluston (Vice-Chair in the Chair) * Janet Cowan * Idaikkadar | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Knowles * Miles * Mrs Joyce Nickolay * Thammaiah (3) * Thornton |
|--|---|

* Denotes Member present
 (1), (2), (3) Denote category of Reserve Member

[Note: Councillors Ann Groves, Seymour, N Shah, Silver and Stephenson also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 681 below].

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

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Mrs Bath

Councillor Choudhury

Councillor Anne Whitehead

Reserve Member

Councillor Billson

Councillor Thammaiah

Councillor Blann

681. Right of Members to Speak:

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

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Councillor Ann Groves | Planning application 2/04 |
| Councillor Mrs Kinnear | Planning Application 2/05 |
| Councillor Seymour | Planning application 1/01 |
| Councillor N Shah | Planning application 2/06 |
| Councillor Silver | Planning applications 1/01 and 2/09 |
| Councillor Stephenson | Planning applications 1/01 and 2/17 |

682. Declarations of Interest:

RESOLVED: To note the following declarations of Interest by Members present relating to the business to be transacted at this meeting: -

- (i) Planning Application 1/06 – The Princess Alexandra Home, 40 Common Road, Stanmore
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a prejudicial interest in the above application and accordingly left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item.
- Councillor Bluston also declared a personal interest and Councillor Blann declared a personal interest arising from his membership of the Management Committee of Bentley Priory. Accordingly, both Members remained and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.
- (ii) Planning Applications 2/02 & 2/03 – 91 High Street, Edgware
 Councillor Janet Cowan declared a prejudicial interest in the above applications and accordingly left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-

making on these items.

- (iii) Planning Application 4/02 – 26 & 28 Eastbury Avenue, Northwood
Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a prejudicial interest in the above application on the basis that she was related to the applicants. Accordingly she left the room and took no part in the discussion or decision-making on this item
- (iv) Main Agenda Item 26 – Heathfield School, Beaulieu Drive, Pinner
Councillor Knowles declared a personal interest in the above item arising from the fact that his late sister had attended the school. Accordingly, he remained and took part in the discussion and decision-making on this item.

683. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

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. |
| Agenda Item 26 – Heathfield School, Beaulieu Drive, Pinner. | This item is admitted to the agenda to allow consideration of extension and variation to the terms of the one year time-limited Deed of Variation to the original legal agreement in respect of this site. |
| Agenda Item 27 - Youth Centre, Library, Car Parks, Grant Road/George Gange Way, Wealdstone - Request for variation to the heads of term of the proposed legal agreement | This item is admitted to the agenda to allow consideration of variation to the heads of term of a legal agreement which would facilitate the earliest possible delivery of the affordable housing. |

(2) main agenda item 18 (102, 104, 106 High Street, Harrow on the Hill) be withdrawn from the agenda at the request of officers to allow further consideration of legal issues;

(3) planning applications 1/03 and 2/15 be withdrawn from the agenda; and

(4) all items be considered with the press and public present.

684. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That it be agreed that, having been circulated, the Chair be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 7 July 2004 as a correct record of that meeting once they have been printed in the Council Bound Minute Volume.

685. **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).

686. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of the following petition, which was considered with planning application 1/01:

- Petition objecting to the Closure of Harrow Bowl
Prior to addressing the Committee in relation to planning application 1/01 under the provisions of the representations procedure, a local resident presented a petition signed by approximately 1000 local residents which objected to the closure of Harrow Bowl.

687. **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).

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

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

689. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/01, 1/07, 2/05, 2/09 and 2/17 on the list of planning applications;

(2) it be noted that two requests to make representations on item 1/01 on the list of planning applications had originally been received, but the first request had now been withdrawn; and

(3) it be agreed to hear late representation requests in respect of items 1/04 and 2/17 on the list of planning applications.

690. **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.

691. **29-33 Pinner Road, Harrow (P/1558/04/CFU):**

The Committee received an application for the redevelopment of the above site to provide 34 flats in a three and four storey building with basement car parking.

It was

RESOLVED: That the applicant be informed that (1) the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:

- a) the submission and approval by the Local Planning Authority of an affordable housing scheme to provide 12 units spread throughout the building as shared ownership/key worker housing. The scheme shall include a nomination agreement with the Council
- b) ensures that the affordable housing units are available for occupation in accordance with a building and occupation programme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work on the site.

All affordable housing units shall be provided in accordance with the definition of affordable housing set out in the deposit version of the replacement Harrow UDP.

(2) a Formal Decision Notice granting permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informatives reported, will be issued only upon the completion by the developer of the aforementioned legal agreement.

692. **14-20 High Street, Wealdstone (P/1578/04/CFU):**

The Committee received an application for the redevelopment of the above site to provide 61 flats, two live/work units, and one retail unit in two five storey buildings, with parking and access from Palmerston Road.

Prior to discussing this application the Committee heard representations from an objector who spoke on behalf of a local community organisation, Wealdstone Active Community. The objector considered that the proposed colour scheme was not sympathetic to the surrounding Victorian architecture and that a brick façade would be preferable, that the proposed development was out of character with the area as it would be higher than the surrounding buildings, would not provide enough parking, and would increase the strain on the Borough's facilities, such as doctors and dentists. She also expressed concern that the retail unit should remain in A1 usage and indicated that she would prefer the live/work units to face onto Palmerston Rd.

In response, a representative of the applicant stressed that the site had now been vacant for five years and that this proposal would regenerate the area and meet the demand for housing. He pointed out that the materials for the development could be made subject to condition, and confirmed that the retail unit would be for A1 use. He

indicated that the live/work units could be accommodated as suggested. He considered that the proposed development complied with all relevant local policies.

During the discussion which followed, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the following grounds:

- 1) The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site by reason of scale, unattractive design, mass and excessively high density giving rise to an overintensification of the site to the detriment of the area.
- 2) The proposal conflicts with the UDP retail and employment policy EM7 and gives rise to a net loss of retail floor space and rear warehousing.
- 3) The proposed development is severely under provisioned for parking giving rise to overspill parking to the detriment of the surrounding area.

Upon being put to a vote, this was not carried and, following a further vote, it was

RESOLVED: That the applicant be informed that (1) the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within 6 months (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:

- (a) submission and approval by the Local Planning Authority of an affordable housing scheme to provide 19 units as shared ownership/key worker housing. The scheme shall include a nomination agreement with the Council.
- (b) ensures that the affordable housing units are available for occupation in accordance with a building and occupation programme to be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of work on the site.

All affordable housing units shall be provided in accordance with the definition of affordable housing set out in the deposit version of the replacement Harrow UDP.

(2) a formal decision notice, granting permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon completion of the aforementioned legal agreement.

[Note: Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Billson, Janet Cowan, Knowles and Mrs Joyce Nickolay wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision reached, set out above].

693. **The Princess Alexandra Home, 40 Common Road, Stanmore (P/2979/03/COU):**

The Committee received an outline application which sought to redevelop the above site to provide a replacement nursing and care home with a day care centre.

It was

RESOLVED: That the applicant be informed that (1) the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within one year (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to:

- (i) the offer to the Council of a lease to enable the provision of public access over that part of the site which is bounded by Bentley Priory Open Space, to include a timescale and specification of works to be carried out to the land and a sum to be donated to the Council for subsequent maintenance.
- (ii) the provision of an Action Plan in respect of the transfer during the construction period of residents to alternative facilities of their choice consistent with the wishes and needs of their family carers. The Plan shall include timescales for the transfer of residents and shall be approved by the Council prior to its implementation and commencement of the development hereby permitted; and

(2) a formal Decision Notice, granting permission in accordance with the application and submitted plans subject to the conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon the completion by the developer of the aforementioned legal agreement.

[Note: The Committee wished it to be recorded that they were unanimous in supporting the decision set out above, with the exception of Councillor Marilyn Ashton who, as set out Minute 682: Declarations of Interest, did not take part in the decision-making on this item]

694. **4 Elm Park, Stanmore - Breach of Planning Control:**

Having refused permission for the retention of, alterations to, and use of an outbuilding located at the above address as a separate dwelling, and for the provision of associated parking spaces, the Committee now gave consideration to the report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding enforcement action to address the above breach of planning control.

It was agreed that it was now expedient for enforcement action to be taken for the reasons set out in the officer report and the Committee

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to (1) issue an Enforcement Notice pursuant to Section 172 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 requiring:

- (i) the cessation of use of the detached garden building as a single-family dwellinghouse;
- (ii) the demolition of the front and internal ground floor walls, the removal of all internal fixtures and fittings, and the return of the use of the building to car parking as shown on plan 2572/10 of planning permission EAST/1213/01/FUL.

(i) and (ii) should be complied with within a period of 3 months 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 event of failure to:

- (i) supply the information required by the Borough Solicitor 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.

695. **Copse Farm, 2 Brookshill Cottages, Dairy Cottage, Brookshill Drive, Harrow - Enforcement Action:**

Having refused permission for the retention of galvanised security fencing at the above site, the Committee requested that officers submit a report to the next meeting regarding enforcement action in respect of the fencing.

RESOLVED: That officers be requested to submit a report to the next meeting regarding enforcement action in respect of the galvanised security fencing located at the above site.

(See also Minute 711: Any Other Business).

696. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO)738 Temple Mead Close (No. 4), Stanmore Park:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for the area comprising 38 Gordon Avenue and 7-44 Temple Mead Close, Stanmore Park.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 738 Temple Mead Close (No. 4), Stanmore Park, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 84, Gordon Avenue (No. 2), Stanmore on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

697. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO)739 Gayton Road (No. 3) Greenhill:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for 9 Gayton Road.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 739 Gayton Road (No. 3), Greenhill, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 94 Gayton Road (no. 1) Harrow on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

698. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) TPO 740 Gayton Road (No. 4), Greenhill:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for the area comprising Cymbeline Court, Knowles Court, Charville Court, Lime Court and Petherton Court, Gayton Road, Greenhill.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 740 Gayton Road (No. 4), Greenhill, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 153 Gayton Road (No. 2) Harrow on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

699. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 741 Ben Hale Close (No. 2) Stanmore Park:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for the area comprising 2-9 Ben Hale Close and 31 and 33 Green Lane, Stanmore Park.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 741 Ben Hale Close (No. 2), Stanmore Park, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 4 Ben Hale, Green Lane, Stanmore on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

700. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 742 Cannon Lane (No. 4) Pinner South:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for the area comprising 20, 22, 22a and 22b Cannon Lane, Pinner South.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 742 Cannon Lane (No. 4), Pinner South, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 135, Cannon Lane (No. 1), Pinner on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

701. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 743 Elms Road (No. 13) Harrow Weald:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for 40 Elms Road, Harrow Weald.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 743 Elms Road (No. 13), Harrow Weald, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 129 Elms Road (No.5), Harrow Weald on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

702. **Tree Preservation Order (TPO)744 The Chase (No. 3) Stanmore Park:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding a new, detailed Tree Preservation Order (TPO) proposed for the area comprising 1-19 Caroline Court, Stanmore Park.

RESOLVED: That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to

(1) make a new Tree Preservation Order (TPO) to be known as TPO 744 The Chase (No. 3), Stanmore Park, pursuant to Sections 198 and 201 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to protect those trees identified on the map and schedule attached to the officer report; and

(2) revoke TPO 136 The Chase (No. 1), Stanmore on confirmation of the above.

[REASON: To accord with current policy (see paragraph 6.2 of the officer report)].

703. **102, 104, 106 High Street, Harrow on the Hill:**

This item was withdrawn from the agenda (see Minute 683: Arrangement of the Agenda).

704. **Locally Listed Buildings:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which outlined actions taken further to the Council's resolution on 29 April 2004 to promote changes in legislation to strengthen the rules governing Locally Listed Buildings.

RESOLVED: That the Council continue to lobby to promote changes in legislation to strengthen the rules governing Locally Listed buildings.

705. **Heathfield School, Beaulieu Drive, Pinner:**

The Committee received a joint report of the Borough Solicitor and of the Chief Planning Officer which considered a request by the Girls Day School Trust to extend and vary the heads of terms of the one year time-limited Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 agreement relating to the use of the School.

The report outlined the details of the request and recommended that the request be agreed in part. A Member suggested that, if a request was submitted the following year to extend the use for a further period of time, Members might conduct a site visit to corroborate the information gathered during the year regarding the impact of the request.

During the discussion of this item, the Committee requested that officers write to the School strongly urging that visitors and users of the School pool park their vehicles within the school site in the identified parking areas and not on the public highway in Beaulieu Drive and adjacent roads.

RESOLVED: That (1) the continued use of the school facilities by third parties outside school hours between the hours of 16.30 and 21.00 on weekdays during term time, 09.00 and 21.00 weekdays during school holidays, and between 09.00 and 18.00 on Saturdays be agreed for a further one year period;

(2) the request to continue the use (set out in (1) above) for a period of three years be refused;

(3) the request for use of the facilities by third parties on Sundays be refused;

(4) the request to vary the maximum number of users from 40 to 60 be refused; and

(5) officers be requested to write to the school, as set out above.

(See also Minute 682: Declarations of Interest).

706. **Youth Centre, Library, Car Parks, Grant Road/George Gange Way, Wealdstone - Request for Variation to the Heads of Term of the Proposed Legal Agreement:**

The Committee received a report regarding the request for a variation to the heads of terms of the legal agreement in respect of the above site.

During the discussion on this item which followed, Members requested that further

information regarding the reasoning behind this request be provided following the meeting, and the action proposed be agreed by Nominated Members via the Urgent Non-Executive Action procedure.

RESOLVED: That Nominated Members be provided with further information regarding the reasoning behind the request for a variation to the heads of terms of the legal agreement in respect of the above site, and the action proposed be agreed via the Urgent Non-Executive Action procedure.

707. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

708. **Enforcement Notices Awaiting Compliance:**

The Committee received a report of the Chief Planning Officer which listed those enforcement notices awaiting compliance.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

709. **Telecommunications Developments:**

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

710. **Determination of Demolition Applications:**

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

711. **Any Other Business:**

• **Arrangements for Member Site Visits**

Following discussion, it was agreed that the Member site visits to 11 Brickfields, Harrow (item 2/05 on the schedule of decisions attached to these minutes), 25 Hawthorn Drive, Harrow (item 2/09 on the schedule of decisions) and 5 Georgian Way, Harrow (item 2/14 on the schedule of decisions) would take place on Saturday 4th September 2004. It was also agreed that the Committee would conduct a visit to Copse Farm, Harrow on this date as it was anticipated that a number of planning applications in respect of this site would be submitted in the near future.

It was agreed that a mini-bus to transport Members to the sites would depart from the Civic Centre at 10.00 am, but that the exact timing of the visits would be confirmed to Members in writing following the meeting.

712. **Extensions to and Termination of the Meeting:**

In accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 14 (Part 4B of the Constitution) it was

RESOLVED: At (1) 10.00 pm to continue until 11.00 pm; and

(2) 11.00 pm to continue until 11.30 pm.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 11.30 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR HOWARD BLUSTON
Vice-Chair (in the Chair)

SECTION 1 – MAJOR APPLICATIONS

LIST NO: 1/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/504/04/CFU
LOCATION: 354 –366 Pinner Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Moren Greenhalgh Architects for Genesis
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment for 3-6 Storey Building to Provide Supermarket, 119 Flats, Community Facility, Parking, Accesses
DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reasons and subject to Standard Informative 41 – UDP Policies and Proposals:

1. The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site by reason of excessively high density, resulting in overintensification of the site to the detriment of the amenities of the local area.
2. The proposed development affords a severe shortage of amenity space with most of the occupiers not having access to it. This will give rise to a loss of residential amenity for future occupiers to the detriment of the area.
3. The proposal represents a shortfall of parking provision for the residential element giving rise to unacceptable levels of on-street parking. The lack of parking, together with the low level of retail parking provision, will be detrimental to the amenities of the local area resulting in overspill parking, giving rise to the potential need for unnecessary parking restrictions in neighbouring roads.
4. The loss of the indoor recreational leisure facility And replacement with community facility is not equivalent or better and is therefore contrary to policy R12 of the UDP. This will give rise to a loss of amenity to the wider community.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and two representatives of the applicant.

The objector, who spoke on behalf of a number of local residents and users of Harrow Bowl, explained that the bowling facility currently housed on the above site was very popular with all age groups and a number of community groups such as the Scouts, Guides and Mencap, and its closure would therefore be a great loss. She also referred to the facility's role in deterring anti-social behaviour and providing diversionary activities, and the Authority's duty to deter crime and maintain a leisure facility. With this in mind, she requested that a small bowling centre be incorporated in the scheme before the Committee.

The objector further advised that she considered that the scheme before the Committee proposed inadequate parking provision and expressed concern that the Borough's resources, such as schools and hospitals, would not be able to cope with the demands of an increasing population which such high density developments would give rise to.

In response, the representatives of the applicant stressed that the applicants had worked with officers to ensure that the application met all local and strategic planning policies. They argued that the proposed parking provision was appropriate given the situation of the site and its good local transport links. They considered that many local residents would walk to the proposed supermarket. They confirmed that they would also draw up a travel plan.

The representatives considered that the proposed development would assist in regenerating and reinvigorating the area and would provide retail facilities which local people were much in need of.

Following the receipt of the above representations, Members asked a number of questions of the representatives of the applicant.

(2) The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that the above application be granted.

(3) Councillors Blann, Bluston, Idaikkadar, Miles and Thammaiah wished to be recorded as having voted against the decision to refuse the above application].

(See also Minute 681: Right of Members to Speak and Minute 686: Petitions).

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 1/02 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1558/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | 29 – 33 Pinner Road, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Window Homes Ltd | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment: 34 Flats in 3/4 Storey Building with Basement Car Parking (Resident Permit Restricted) | | |
| DECISION: | See Minute 691. | | |
| LIST NO: | 1/03 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1423/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | Land R/O 2-24 Walton Road, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Warren Smith Architects Ltd for Masterson Holdings | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment to Provide 12 Flats in Detached Two Storey Terrace with Access and Parking | | |
| DECISION: | Withdrawn by Applicant. | | |
| LIST NO: | 1/04 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1578/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | 14-20 High Street, Wealdstone | | |
| APPLICANT: | Adrian Salt & Pang Ltd for Prindles Investments Ltd | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment: 61 Flats, 2 Live/Work Units, 1 Retail Unit in 5 Storey Buildings, Parking and Access Off Palmerston Road (Resident Permit Restricted) | | |
| DECISION: | See Minute 692. | | |
| LIST NO: | 1/05 | APPLICATION NO: | P/939/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | Chandos Parade, Buckingham Road, Edgware | | |
| APPLICANT: | Glen Robinson Associates | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment for a Part 2, Part 3 Storey Building to Provide 10 Flats With Access and Parking | | |
| DECISION: | REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the reason(s) reported and the following additional reasons reported on the addendum and agreed by the Committee, and subject to the informative(s) reported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The proposed parking area, by reason of size and siting would give rise to levels of activity which would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours. 3. Notwithstanding the details indicated on the submitted drawings, the proposal could give rise to problems of the overlooking of the rear gardens of nos.80 and 82 Buckingham Road particularly at such times as the proposed planting areas are being maintained. | | |
| LIST NO: | 1/06 | APPLICATION NO: | P/2979/03/COU |
| LOCATION: | The Princess Alexandra Home, 40 Common Road, Stanmore | | |
| APPLICANT: | Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Jewish Care | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Outline: Redevelopment to Provide Replacement Nursing and Care Home with Day Care Centre | | |

DECISION: See Minute 693.

LIST NO: 1/07

APPLICATION NO: P/1357/04/CFU

LOCATION: 9 – 17 Manor Road, Harrow

APPLICANT: Gillett Macleod Partnership for Preston Bennet Developments

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment: Two Part 2/Part 3 Storey Blocks of Flats to Provide 22 Flats, Access and Parking

DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reason and subject to Standard Informative 41 – UDP Policies and Proposals:

The proposal would represent an overdevelopment of the site and one which would, as a consequence, be out of character with the area.

[Notes: (1) Prior to considering the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and a representative of the applicant.

The objector, who was the Chair of the Greenhill Manor Residents' Association, expressed concern that the proposed development would be out of character with the area, was too high in density, would give rise to overlooking of adjoining residents and to additional noise, activity and pollution. She also voiced concern that there would be inadequate parking provision and this would give rise to overspill on-street parking and traffic congestion. For all these reasons she considered that the proposed development would have a negative impact on the amenity of nearby residents.

In response, the representative of the applicant argued that the proposed development was consistent with all relevant planning policies and would reflect the character of road, which, he pointed out, was characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached house and flats. He explained that the development would be set back from the road and would therefore maintain the harmony of the streetscene, and would comply with the Council's normal standards in relation to the 45 degree code. He further pointed out that the proposal would consolidate the existing three accesses to the site into one and this would bring associated benefits in highways terms. He considered that the scheme was in accordance with PPG13 in that it would encourage sustainable forms of transport such as walking and cycling.

Following the receipt of the above representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objector and the representative of the applicant.

(2)The Chief Planning Officer had recommended that this application be granted].

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO: 2/01

APPLICATION NO: P/1191/04/DFU

LOCATION: 79 Hindes Road, Harrow

APPLICANT: A P Laight for Mr S Bignell

PROPOSAL: Conversion of Dwellinghouse to Five Self Contained Flats (Resident Permit Restricted)

DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

[Notes: (1) Having temporarily left the room during the discussion on this item, Councillor Miles did not take part on the vote in respect of this item;

(2) During the voting on the above decision, the Chair exercised his extra and casting vote].

LIST NO: 2/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/141/04/CFU
LOCATION: 91 High Street, Edgware
APPLICANT: MSK Design Associates for H Wyatt
PROPOSAL: First Floor Rear Extension to Provide Offices (B1) (Revised)
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.
(See also Minute 682: Declarations of Interest).

LIST NO: 2/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/941/04/CLB
LOCATION: 91 High Street Edgware
APPLICANT: MSK Design Associates for Triumph Press – H Wyatt
PROPOSAL: Listed Building Consent: First Floor Extension/Alteration to Rear
DECISION: GRANTED Listed Building Consent in accordance with the works described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.
(See also Minute 682: Declarations of Interest).

LIST NO: 2/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/824/04/DFU
LOCATION: 27 Nibthwaite Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Iftikhar Hussain
PROPOSAL: Rear Dormer
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

LIST NO: 2/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1606/04/CFU
LOCATION: Land at 11 Brickfields, R/O Byron House, Harrow
APPLICANT: Robin Bretherick Associates for C Foster
PROPOSAL: Construction of Two Storey Detached House and Garage
DECISION: DEFERRED for a Member Site Visit.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector and a representative of the applicant.

The objector drew the Committee's attention to the additional replies to the notification in respect of this application which were outlined on the addendum, and pointed out that this brought the total responses to 94. She explained that this was a complex application for a very sensitive site. She noted that the principle of a detached house being located on the lower part of the site had been accepted by the inspector at a previous appeal but felt that this was not an appropriate form for the site. She argued that it did not accord with English Heritage's criteria for such locations in that it's size, bulk and inappropriate design would detract from the Conservation Area and the adjacent listed building, it was not clearly residential in nature, and vehicles accessing the site would represent a safety hazard to children walking to

and from the nearby school. She also referred to the loss of trees which the scheme would give rise to. She urged the Committee to undertake a site visit to assess the impact for themselves.

The representative of the Applicant argued that, following the overturning of refusals on appeal, the only significant issue left to explore was the submission of a modern design which would address the previous reasons for refusal and would respect the location. He pointed out that the CAAC and the Council's transport engineers and conservation officer supported the scheme and highway engineers had raised no concerns regarding access.

(2) Councillor Mrs Kinnear, who was not a Member of the Committee, had sought the Committee's permission to speak on this item. However, as consideration of it was subsequently deferred pending a site visit, it was agreed that her comments would be heard when the application returned to the Committee at its next meeting].

(See also Minute 711: Any Other Business).

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| LIST NO: | 2/06 | APPLICATION NO: | P/494/03/CFU |
| LOCATION: | Swaminarayan Temple, 107 Westfield Lane, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Draper Neal Associates for SKSS Temple | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Provision of Additional Floor to Accommodate Community Activity Area with Stair/lift Access | | |
| DECISION: | GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported. | | |
| | (Note: The Committee wished it to be recorded that it was unanimous in agreeing to grant the above application). | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 2/07 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1555/04/CCO |
| LOCATION: | Copse Farm, 2 Brookshill Cottages, Dairy Cottage, Brookshill Drive, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Copse Farm Ltd | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Retention of 2m High Galvanised Security Fencing | | |
| DECISION: | REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reasons and subject to Standard Informative 41 – UDP Policies and Proposals: | | |
| | The retention of the security fencing, by reason of size, siting and appearance, would be inappropriate, obtrusive and give rise to a loss of outlook, to the detriment of the visual amenities, appearance and character of the Green Belt, Brookshill Drive Conservation Area, the Harrow Weald Ridge Area of Special Character, the setting of the listed and locally listed buildings and neighbouring residential amenities. | | |
| | (Note: The Committee wished it to be recorded that it was unanimous in agreeing to refuse the above application) | | |
| | (See also Minute 695: Enforcement Action and Minute 711: Any Other Business) | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| LIST NO: | 2/08 | APPLICATION NO: | P/871/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | Green Trees, 21 Briants Close, Pinner | | |
| APPLICANT: | Kenneth W Reed & Associates for Mr & Mrs T Gallagher | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment to Provide 3 x 2 Storey Detached Houses With Garages | | |
| DECISION: | GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the | | |

application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

LIST NO: 2/09 **APPLICATION NO:** P/921/04/DFU
LOCATION: 25 Hawthorn Drive, Harrow
APPLICANT: Mel-Pindi for Bison Ltd
PROPOSAL: Two Storey Side, Single Storey Front and Rear Extension and Conversion of Dwelling into Two Flats
DECISION: DEFERRED for Member Site Visit.

[Notes: (1) Prior to discussing the above application, the Committee received representations from an objector.

The objector, who lived in an adjoining property but who spoke on behalf of a number of residents of Hawthorn Drive, referred to a petition which had already been submitted by residents. He pointed out that the above property was subject to a restrictive covenant which prohibited the conversion of the house into flats, and he also expressed concern regarding party wall issues, noise insulation, that conversion would be out of character with the road, that it would exacerbate existing parking problems, would be intrusive and overbearing, would dwarf and overshadow the neighbouring bungalow, and would set a precedent. He urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Following the receipt of the above representations, the Committee asked a number of questions of the objector.

There was no indication given that the applicant was present and wished to respond.

(2) During the discussion which followed, it was moved and seconded that the application be refused, however, a number of Members were in favour of conducting a site visit prior to making a decision on this item and the motion was withdrawn on this basis.

(3) Councillor Silver, who was not a Member of the Committee, had sought the Committee's permission to speak on this item. However, as consideration of the item was subsequently deferred pending a site visit, it was agreed that his comments would be heard when the application returned to the Committee at its next meeting].

(See also minute 711: Any Other Business).

LIST NO: 2/10 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1201/04/CFU
LOCATION: Haslem House, 304 Honeygot Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: The Wilson Partnership for London Borough of Harrow
PROPOSAL: Redevelopment to Provide Part Single, Part Two Storey Care Home With Parking and Refuse Store
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

LIST NO: 2/11 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1301/04/CFU
LOCATION: 28 Lake View, Edgware
APPLICANT: R J Blyth Fias for B Misell
PROPOSAL: Part Single, Part Two Storey Rear Extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with 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/716/04/CFU
LOCATION: 60 Moss Lane, Pinner
APPLICANT: Mr Thomas O'Brien for Mr & Mrs P Arnold-Baker
PROPOSAL: First Floor Side Extension, Alterations to Roof Including Provision of Rear Dormer and Rooflights at the Front, and Single Storey Rear Extension
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with 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/1136/04/CCO
LOCATION: Chalgrove, 30 Peterborough Road, Harrow
APPLICANT: Complete Planning for Mr J McGinley
PROPOSAL: Retention and Completion of Paved Area/Steps at Front, Paved Patio & Wall at Rear, Provision of Replacement Boundary Fence & Timber Gate
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported, and the following additional informative agreed by the Committee:

4. The applicant is advised that the Committee wish to see the sensitive repair of existing cracks, but no other alterations, to the retained brick wall on the site boundary with Peterborough Road and Tyburn Lane.

LIST NO: 2/14 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1249/04/DFU
LOCATION: 5 Georgian Way, Harrow
APPLICANT: Wastell & Porter Architects for Casio Holdings
PROPOSAL: Replacement Detached House of Two and Three Storeys
DECISION: DEFERRED for Member Site Visit.
(See also Minute 711: Any Other Business).

LIST NO: 2/15 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1649/04/CFU
LOCATION: 166 Stanmore Hill, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Wyndham & Clarke for Mr Hoddy
PROPOSAL: Single Storey Side Extension
DECISION: DEFERRED at Officers' Request – still awaiting revised drawings.

LIST NO: 2/16 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1620/04/CFU
LOCATION: The Barn, 27 Warren Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Mr Ashok Channa
PROPOSAL: Single Storey Front and Side Extensions, Roof Extensions Including Dormer Windows to Side
DECISION: GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported.

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| LIST NO: | 2/17 | APPLICATION NO: | P/946/04/DFU |
| LOCATION: | Site of Garages Fronting, Cross Rd – R/O 40 Cunningham Park, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Kieran Maidment | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Single Storey Building for Storage of Domestic Vehicles | | |
| DECISION: | GRANTED permission in accordance with the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the condition(s) and informative(s) reported. | | |
| | [Notes: (1) Prior to debating the above application, the Committee received a representation from an objector, who spoke on behalf of a number of local residents. | | |
| | The objector explained that Cunningham Park was characterised by Edwardian family houses and expressed concern that the above garages might be used not just for storage purposes but to also carry out work on cars, and would therefore give rise to noise and disturbance which would impact on neighbouring residents. The objector was also concerned that the applicant might require access from other properties' gardens. | | |
| | There was no indication given that the applicant was present and wished to respond. | | |
| | (2) The Committee wished it to be recorded that they were unanimous in agreeing to grant the above application]. | | |

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 3/01 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1288/04/CCO |
| LOCATION: | 4 Elm Park, Stanmore | | |
| APPLICANT: | Bryan Layman | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Retention of Alterations to and Use of Outbuilding as Separate Dwelling and Car Parking Spaces | | |
| 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. | | |
| | (See also Minute 694: Breach of Planning Control) | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 3/02 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1295/04/CFU |
| LOCATION: | 86 Headstone Lane, Harrow Weald | | |
| APPLICANT: | R Perin for Dr Ravikumar | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Change of Use: Residential to Doctor's Surgery (Class C3 to D1) & Single Storey Side/Rear Infill Extension With Parking at Front and 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. | | |

SECTION 4 – CONSULTATIONS FROM NEIGHBOURING AUTHORITIES

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 4/01 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1456/04/CNA |
| LOCATION: | Halls of Residence, University of Westminster, Watford Road, Harrow | | |
| APPLICANT: | Brent Council | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Consultation: 5 Storey Linked Buildings to Provide Student Accommodation in Form of 102 Single and 48 Double Rooms | | |
| DECISION: | RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development set out in the application. | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 4/02 | APPLICATION NO: | P/1557/04/CNA |
| LOCATION: | 26 & 28 Eastbury Avenue, Northwood, Herts | | |
| APPLICANT: | Three Rivers District Council | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Consultation: Redevelopment to Provide 2 Blocks, Each of 12 Flats and Parking | | |
| DECISION: | RAISED NO OBJECTIONS to the development set out in the application, subject to the informative reported. (See also Minute 682: Declarations of Interest) | | |
