

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 28 SEPTEMBER 2016

<b>Chair:</b>	* Councillor Keith Ferry	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* June Baxter	* Pritesh Patel
	* Stephen Greek	* Mrs Christine Robson
	* Graham Henson (2)	* Anne Whitehead
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Marilyn Ashton	Item 2/01, 2/03
	Susan Hall	Item 2/03
	Christopher Noyce	Item 1/02

- \* Denotes Member present
- (2) Denotes category of Reserve Members
- † Denotes apologies received

#### 281. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Barry Kendler

Reserve Member

Councillor Graham Henson

#### 282. 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 item indicated:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Planning Application</u>
Susan Hall	2/03
Marilyn Ashton	2/03, 2/01
Chris Noyce	1/02

### **283. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 10: Planning Applications Received - Item 1/02

Councillor Graham Henson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was formerly a member of the Tithe Farm Social Club. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

### **284. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2016 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### **285. Public Questions , Petitions and Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received.

### **286. References from Council and other Committees/Panels**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were none.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **287. Representations on Planning Applications**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of item 1/02, 2/01 and 2/03 on the list of planning applications.

### **288. 1/01 - 61 GREENHILL WAY, HARROW: REFERENCE P/5545/15**

**PROPOSAL:** Redevelopment of the site to provide a part three, four and five storey building to create 42 flats with associated parking and landscaping; alterations to existing vehicle access; bin and cycle storage.

Following a brief introduction to the report, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- the site was located in what could be described as a 'transitional area' of central Harrow. It bordered a commercial district that contained a variety of modern styles of buildings and a number of modern

residential blocks were under construction there. The modern design of the proposed development, which was on an independent site, was therefore deemed to be appropriate for the location;

- the site was in a high PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) area where most of the residences had low occupancy levels, comprising mostly young professionals and therefore parking provision at the site was considered acceptable;
- the Highways Authority did not anticipate any additional traffic or parking problems arising from the proposed development;
- refuse vehicles would gain access to the proposed development via the cul-de-sac in Greenhill Road and would be able to turn their vehicles beyond the proposed bin stalls;
- condition 18 required submission of a delivery and service plan which would ensure that the development did not harm the safety and free flow of the public highway.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

‘The proposal, by reason of inadequate design, excessive height, scale and bulk, and insufficient parking provision, would fail to contribute positively to the street scene and would harm the amenities of neighbouring residents, contrary to policies DM1 and DM42 of the Local Plan, AAP1 and AAP4 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.’

The motion was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

## **DECISION:**

### **Recommendation A**

**Granted** permission subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of the Section 106 legal agreement and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement, and as amended by the addendum.

### **Recommendation B**

That if, by 30<sup>th</sup> January 2017 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Divisional Director of Planning, the section 106 Planning Obligation is not completed, then delegate the decision to the Divisional Director of Planning to **REFUSE** planning permission for the appropriate reason.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.*

**289. 1/02 - TITHE FARM SOCIAL CLUB, RAYNERS LANE, HARROW:  
REFERENCE P/4602/15**

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of 30 units in the north east corner of the application site, all of which would be available for the private market. The proposed dwellings would be located on land that is designated as Open Space. The erection and sale of the dwellings would enable the existing sports and community centre to be demolished and rebuilt on the site, whereby providing a modern and much more functionable and efficient facility. The proposed dwellings would also provide for associated sports facilities such as a 3G pitch for the sports club, and a Multi-Use Game Area (MUGA) which would be available for community use.

Following a brief introduction to the report, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- the previous application, which had been refused, had proposed a higher level of vehicle parking provision than the current application which had been one of the grounds for refusal. The parking ratio for both the social club and the residential units was deemed to be appropriate;
- a response from Sport England regarding its objection was imminent.

Two Members stated that they were in favour of the application as it would yield significant benefits to the immediate and wider community in Rayners Lane.

A Member stated that he was concerned about the loss of a designated open space and insufficient parking for both residents and users of the social club. He proposed refusal on the following grounds:

- ‘1. The proposed development, by reason of the loss of Open Space, would exacerbate existing deficiencies in Open Space in the Borough for the amenity of residents of the Borough, contrary to policy 7.18.B of The London Plan 2016, policy CS1.F of the Core Strategy 2012, policy DM18 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013.
2. The proposed development, by reason of excessive scale and insufficient parking provision, would harm local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM42 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.’

The motion was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

The Committee received representations from Councillor Chris Noyce.

**DECISION: GRANTED**

- (1) Subject to the withdrawal of the Sport England Objection; and
- (2) planning permission subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the continued negotiation and completion of the Section 106 legal agreement and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions (set out in Appendix 1 of this report) or the legal agreement, and as amended by the addendum.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.*

**290. 1-03 - CHICHESTER COURT, STANMORE: REFERENCE P/2957/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Construction of two & three storey buildings to provide 20 additional dwellinghouses & 6 flats; amendments to parking layout and access; landscaping; refuse & cycle storage

Following a brief introduction to the report, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- it was not possible at this stage to estimate the cost of relocating the road which led to Chichester Court;
- the Highways Authority, which was the landowner in this case, would have final say over the development. The applicant, which in this case was the Council, would be obliged to adhere to all the conditions of planning permission;
- the application had been assessed from the crime and safety perspective. The design of the homes would allow passive surveillance of all alleyways and secluded outdoor spaces by the occupiers which should discourage any crime or anti-social behaviour;
- vehicle parking provision at the site had been deemed appropriate and adequate by the Highways Authority.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposal, by reason of insufficient parking provision and proximity to neighbouring properties in Holly Avenue and Woodstock Close, will harm the amenity and safety of neighbouring properties, contrary to policies DM1, DM2 and DM42 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.3 of the London Plan.'

The motion was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

**DECISION: GRANTED**, planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, as amended by the addendum and the following additional condition agreed at Planning Committee:

Permitted Development Rights: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no development which would otherwise fall within classes A, B, D, E, F and H in Part 1 of Schedule 2 to that Order shall be carried out on the dwelling houses without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.*

**291. 2-01 - COWMANS COTTAGE, OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE: REFERENCE P/2866/16 & 2-02 - COWMANS COTTAGE, OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE: REFERENCE P/3122/16**

**2/01: COWMANS COTTAGE, OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE: REFERENCE P/2866/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey side extension; replacement windows to side elevation; installation of 1.8M high railings and fence to side and rear boundary; lowering courtyard and new retaining walls; external alterations (demolition of cowshed)

**2/02: COWMANS COTTAGE, OLD CHURCH LANE, STANMORE: REFERENCE P/3122/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Internal and external alterations including: removal of existing cowsheds and replacement single storey side extension including an increase in height; extension and alteration to the scullery to become the link; alteration to north lobby of the cottage to remove windows and door to be set aside for

reuse and removal of brick and plaster infill; installation of 1.8m high railings and fence to side and rear boundary; lowering courtyard and new retaining walls; repairs to the existing garden wall.

Following a brief introduction to both reports, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- the architects had opted for glazing to the elevation following guidance and advice from the Local Planning Authority. The design of the glazing would help to preserve the character of the cowsheds as well as the open design beneath the gable ends. The glazing was deemed to be necessary in order to achieve a sufficient amount of habitable space. Tinted glazing could be used to allay objectors' concerns about overlooking.

A Member proposed refusal of both applications on the following grounds:

1. 'The proposed demolition of the existing cowsheds and the construction of a single storey side extension would not preserve the special interest of the listed Cowmans Cottage or its settings. In the absence of clear and convincing justification or public benefits to outweigh the harm, the proposal would have detrimental impact on the Heritage assets and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Policies 7.4,B, 7.6B, 7.8C/D of the London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS1 B/D of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Development Management Local Plan (2013)
2. The proposed single storey side extension would fail to contribute positively to the setting and quality of the Designated Open Space, contrary to Policies DM1, DM7 and DM18 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).'

The motion was seconded, put to the vote and won.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Lesley De Meza and from the applicant, Lara Oyesanya and Councillor Marilyn Ashton.

**2/01 - DECISION: REFUSED**

**2/02 - DECISION: REFUSED**

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse both applications was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek, Pritesh Patel, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted to refuse the applications.*

*Councillor Keith Ferry voted against refusal.*

*Councillor Graham Henson abstained from voting.*

**292. 2-04 - HASLAM HOUSE, 304 HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE:  
REFERENCE P/3896/16**

**PROPOSAL:**

- Demolition of former children's home and redevelopment to provide 9 residential units with car parking, landscaping and refuse & cycle storage
- Construction of 9 dwelling houses

The accommodation would provide:

- A terrace of 4 two bedroom 4 person dwelling houses on the boundary with Chichester Court
- A terrace of 3 two bedroom 4 person dwelling houses to the rear of the site
- Two 2 bedroom 4 person dwelling houses in a semi-detached pair on the site to the rear of nos. 55a-d Everton Drive
- The proposed dwelling houses would have a ridge height of 8.3m and an eaves height of 6m
- Car Parking would be provided in broadly the same location as the existing surface car park and would comprise 9 spaces including 1 for 'blue badge' holders
- Communal refuse storage and 10 secure cycle storage would be provided at the entrance to the site.

**DECISION: GRANTED**, planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report and as amended by the addendum.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.*

**293. 2-05 - 47 HIGH STREET - REFERENCE P/4593/15**

**PROPOSAL:** Approve and extension to the deadline for the completion of the s.106 Planning Obligation to 28<sup>th</sup> December 2016, or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning.

Following a brief introduction to the report, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- Local residents' concerns regarding excessive noise from the development had been noted and would be dealt with via an Event Management Strategy.

**DECISION: APPROVED**, extension to the deadline for the completion of the s.106 Planning Obligation to 28<sup>th</sup> December 2016, or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning.



*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous.*

**294. 3-01 - 35-69 IMPERIAL DRIVE, HARROW: REFERENCE P/3288/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Addition Of Two Floors To Each Building To Provide Three Flats With Balconies (Additional 9 Flats In Total); Five Storey Lift Shaft Extension To Each Building; Enlargement Of Existing Balconies And Ground Floor Patio Areas; Additional Bin Store Cycle Storage and Parking; External Alterations.

**DECISION: REFUSED**

**REASON:**

1. The proposed development, due to its excessive height and inappropriate design, including the proposed front porches, would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original buildings and would fail to respect the character of the surrounding neighbouring properties and pattern of development in the surrounding area, contrary to policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan (2016), policy CS 1 B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010).
2. The proposal, by reason of its size and siting in close proximity to neighbouring houses would result in an overbearing development which would appear excessively dominant, resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook and visual amenity to the rear habitable rooms and rear gardens of neighbouring occupiers and would also result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policy 7.6B of the London Plan (2016), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010).
3. The proposed residential units, by reason of inadequate floor to ceiling height, inadequate size, lack of storage space and inadequate outdoor amenity space, would result in substandard, cramped and poor quality accommodation to the detriment of the residential amenities of future occupiers of the residential units, contrary to policy 7.6B of The London Plan (2016), the Mayor of London Housing Guide (2016), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), and adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010).
4. The proposed one way system with cars exiting the site exclusively on to The Ridgeway, in conjunction with increased traffic flow on the site would be likely to increase traffic and parking stress on the surrounding network to the detriment of highway safety and convenience, contrary to Policies DM42 and DM43 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse the application was unanimous.*

**295. 3-02 - 28 KENTON ROAD, HARROW: REFERENCE P/2577/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Demolition of detached dwelling and construction of a two-storey flatted development comprising four 2 bedroom flats with new vehicle access, associated amenity space, refuse / cycle storage and parking.

**DECISION: REFUSED**

**REASON:** The proposed development, by reason of its incongruous height, scale and massing in comparison to the existing building and the neighbouring properties, would fail to respect the prevailing pattern of development in this part of Kenton Road, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would therefore fail to accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse the application was unanimous.*

**296. 2-03 - 77 HILLVIEW ROAD, PINNER: REFERENCE P/3331/16**

**PROPOSAL:** Re-development to provide a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings with habitable roofspace; new vehicular access, parking, bin / cycle storage, landscaping and boundary treatments

Following a brief introduction to the report, officers responded to Members questions and comments as follows:

- the replacement dwelling would replicate the gables but not the mock Tudor panelling of the current property. The latter was not a protected feature in terms of planning policy and therefore it would not be possible to add a condition requiring the inclusion of mock Tudor panelling;
- the applicant would require planning permission to increase the rear footprint;
- condition 5 dealt with landscaping. A small area of the rear garden would be given over to the extension.

A Member stated that the proposed design was contemporary and though diminutive in relation to other properties on the street, would blend in with surrounding properties.

The Chair advised that under permitted development rules, the applicant could extend the current property at the rear to create two dwellings.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

‘The proposal is an overdevelopment, with inadequate design and excessive scale, that would harm local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.’

The motion was seconded, put to the vote and won.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Sanjay Sheth and from a representative of the applicant, Vas Manga and Councillors Susan Hall and Marilyn Ashton.

**DECISION: REFUSED**

**REASON:** The proposal is an overdevelopment, with inadequate design and excessive scale, that would harm local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Keith Ferry, Stephen Greek, Graham Henson and Pritesh Patel voted to refuse the application.*

*Councillor Anne Whitehead voted against refusal.*

*Councillor Mrs Christine Robson abstained from voting.*

**297. Member Site Visits**

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 9.00 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair