
REPORT OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2007

Chairman: * Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Councillors: * Don Billson * Manji Kara
 * Mrinal Choudhury * Narinder Singh Mudhar
 * Keith Ferry * Joyce Nickolay
 * Thaya Idaikkadar

* Denotes Member present

[Note: Councillors John Cowan, B E Gate, Christopher Noyce and Mrs Anjana Patel also attended this meeting to speak on the items indicated at Minute 30 below].

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

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

30. 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 items indicated:

Councillors B E Gate, Christopher Noyce Planning Application 1/02
 and Mrs Anjana Patel

Councillor John Cowan Planning Application 1/03

31. Declarations of Interest:

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

- (i) Planning application 1/02 - Strongbridge Close, Harrow
 Councillor B E Gate, who was not a member of the Committee, declared a personal interest arising from the fact that he had been a Local Authority representative on the management committee between 1999 and 2003.
- (ii) Planning applications 1/03 - Government Buildings, Honeypt Lane, Stanmore and 1/04 - Land adjoining Edgware Brook and Whitchurch Lane, Honeypt Lane, Stanmore
 Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a personal interest in the above related applications arising from the fact that she was a non-executive member of the Canons Park Residents' Association (CAPRA). Councillors Mrs Janet Cowan and John Cowan, who were not members of the Committee, declared the same personal interest.
- (iii) Planning application 3/01 – Cloisters Wood, Wood Lane, Stanmore
 Councillor Mrinal Choudhury declared a personal interest in the above application arising from the fact that he had visited the Edgware temple. Accordingly, he would remain in the room and take part in the discussion and decision-making on the item.

Councillor Manji Kara declared a prejudicial interest in the above application arising from the fact that he had started using the temple as a place of worship and had made acquaintances there. Accordingly, he would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or decision-making on the item.

32. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following agenda items be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:

| <u>Agenda item</u> | <u>Special Circumstances/Grounds for Urgency</u> |
|---|--|
| Addendum | This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the agenda's despatch. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision. |
| 11. Planning Applications Received: P/2317/06/CFU – Government Buildings, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore and P/2246/06/COU – Land adjoining Edgware Brook and Whitchurch Lane, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore | This report was unavailable at the time the agenda was printed and circulated. Members were asked to consider the item, as a matter of urgency, to meet the appeal timetable. |
| 15. Section 106 Agreement relating to White Lion Football Ground, Burnt Oak Broadway, Edgware Road | The Developer had paid all the monies due under the Agreement. The Agreement needed to be completed before the next meeting of the Committee. |

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

33. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the Chairman be given authority to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2006 as a correct record once they have been printed in the Council Bound Minute Volume.

34. **Public Questions:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 19.

35. **Petitions:**

RESOLVED: To note receipt of the following petitions which were referred to the Head of Planning for consideration:

- (i) Petition opposing the scale of the proposed redevelopment of Strongbridge Close, Harrow.
Councillor Mrs Anjana Patel presented the above petition, which had been signed by 40 people.
- (ii) Petition objecting to the proposed development on the Government Building site at Honeypot Lane by Berkeley Homes.
Councillor John Cowan presented the above petition, which had been signed by 1248 people.

36. **Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no deputations were received at the meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 17.

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

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

38. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

Having received a request for representations in respect of item 1/03 – Government Buildings, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, which was 'For Decision' by the Committee and had no recommendation for grant or approval from the Head of Planning, it was

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 27.1 (Part 4B of the Constitution), Committee Procedure Rule 18.1 be suspended to receive representations in respect of item 1/03; and

(2) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 18 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/01 and 1/02 on the list of planning applications.

39. **Planning Applications Received:**

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Head of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

40. **Planning Appeals Update:**

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

Officers reported that, since the agenda had been printed and circulated, the public enquiry relating to Comfort Inn, 2-12 Northwick Park Road had been withdrawn.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted with the amendment detailed above.

41. **Section 106 Agreement relating to White Lion Football Ground, Burnt Oak Broadway Edgware Road:**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Legal Services in this regard.

RESOLVED: To extend the time for completion of the Section 106 Agreement by two months from 10 January 2007.

42. **Member Site Visits:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Member site visits to be arranged.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.33 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARILYN ASHTON
Chairman

television reception to the pre-development standard will be agreed with Harrow Council, funded, constructed and maintained at the developer's expense, thereafter.

- (b) A formal decision notice granting permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended on the Addendum, and subject to the planning conditions and informatives reported, will be issued only upon the completion, by the applicant, of the aforementioned legal agreement.

(2) RESOLVED that officers' clarification of aerodrome safeguarding be reported to Nominated Members, for approval, via the Urgent Non-Executive Action procedure.

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

(2) the Committee wished it to be recorded that the vote to grant the application was unanimous].

(See also Minutes 31 and 35).

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------------------|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 1/03 | APPLICATION NO: | P/2317/06/CFU |
| LOCATION: | Government Buildings, Honeygot Lane, Stanmore | | |
| APPLICANT: | Turley Associates for Berkeley Urban Renaissance Ltd & Dominion Housing Group Ltd. | | |
| PROPOSAL: | Redevelopment to provide 816 residential units (including 40% affordable housing) 959 SQ M Class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1 & D2 floorspace; 7927 SQ M of B1 (a), (b), (c) floorspace including a business incubator centre; creation of a new access onto Whitchurch Lane; associated flood alleviation, landscaping, car parking and highway works (duplicate application) | | |
| DECISION: | <p>Had the applicant not appealed against the failure of Harrow Council to determine the application within the statutory period, the Committee would have REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The proposed density of development is outside the ranges set out as appropriate for suburban locations in the London Plan table 4B.1 and policy 4B.3 and, in the absence of compelling reasons to justify the deviation, is considered excessive. (ii) The proportion and mix of the affordable housing as proposed does not comply with HUDP policy H5 and London Plan policy 3A.7 and 3A.8. The requirement to provide for affordable housing arising from the development at Brockley Hill, Brockley Park (now completed) has not been taken into account satisfactorily in the overall proposal. (iii) Contrary to HUDP Policy D4, the design, appearance and layout of the proposed development is unsatisfactory in this suburban context. The elevational treatment is monotonous, and the irregularly shaped courtyard block in the 'central zone' detracts from the purpose and function of the courtyard. (iv) The housing mix as proposed is unsatisfactory in that it does not comply with HUDP policy H7 and the approved SPG and fails to provide sufficient family sized accommodation. (v) The internal layout of some of the residential units is unsatisfactory in respect of sunlight, daylight and outlook, contrary to HUDP policy D4. | | |

- (vi) The proposal, by reason of its excessive building envelope and overall density, does not provide enough amenity space to meet the needs of all ages and requirements, and would give rise to a loss of residential amenity to the future occupiers of the site, contrary to HUDP policy D5.
- (vii) In the absence of a contribution to local healthcare facilities, the development will, when complete, generate an unacceptable demand for Primary Health Care contrary to HUDP policies SC1 and C8.

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

(2) the Committee wished it to be recorded that the vote to refuse the application, had the applicant not appealed, was unanimous;

(3) the Committee wished the following statement, read by the Chairman, to be recorded:

"The Council has been put into the position of having to come to a view on these applications because the applicant has submitted appeals, as is their right. To meet the Appeal timetable the Committee must indicate clearly how it would have dealt with these applications now on the basis of the information currently available including the views of the Mayor of London.

We have set out clearly what the Committee sees as the deficiencies in Berkeley's proposals in the reasons for refusal. These will need to be addressed before the Committee could consider a revised scheme, and we encourage the Applicant to consider carefully the opportunity now presented to review their position rather than pursue an Appeal.

It will be imperative that the affordable housing provision is amended to take proper account of the requirement to fulfil the obligations from the Brockley Hill development, and to better reflect the Borough's need for larger family accommodation. At the same time, a revised scheme must take account of the excessive density as proposed and the suburban context of the site. This needs to be reflected in the detailed design and appearance of the scheme, which should also pick up the detailed concerns raised by both Harrow Council and the GLA.

There are outstanding issues which could be resolved through S106 or condition. In addition to the list, as set out in paragraph 16 of the report, should be added sustainable renewable energy, lifetime homes, wheelchair access and contributions towards local health provision"].

(See also Minutes 31, 35 and item 1/04 below).

| | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|---------------|
| LIST NO: | 1/04 | APPLICATION NO: | P/2246/06/COU |
| LOCATION: | Land adj. Edgware Brook & Whitchurch Lane, Honeypot Lane, Stanmore | | |
| APPLICANT: | Turley Associates for Berkeley Urban Renaissance Ltd & Dominion Housing Group Ltd. | | |
| PROPOSAL: | New pedestrian access route and associated landscape works (as part of the comprehensive development of the Former Government Office and DVLA site) (duplicate application | | |
| DECISION: | Had the applicant not appealed against the failure of Harrow Council to determine the application within the statutory period, the Committee would have REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, for the following reason: | | |
| | (i) | The proposed footpath and landscaping, if constructed in the absence of the adjoining site, would not connect to other pedestrian routes and give rise to conditions likely to increase the risk of crime and disorder. | |

[Note: The Committee wished it to be recorded that the vote to refuse the application, had the applicant not appealed, was unanimous].

(See also item 1/03 above).

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/1863/06/CFU

LOCATION: Cloisters Wood, Wood Lane, Stanmore

APPLICANT: Hari Design for Shree Swaminarayan Temple

PROPOSAL: Change of use of buildings 2 & 4 from use Class D1 to 3 flats and 11 studio flats

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

(2) RESOLVED that officers be requested to encourage the applicants to progress unresolved issues from previous planning applications.

[Note: The Committee wished it to be recorded that the vote to refuse the application was unanimous].

(See also Minute 31).
