

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 19 JULY 2017

<b>Chair:</b>	* Councillor Keith Ferry	
<b>Councillors:</b>	* Ghazanfar Ali	* Graham Henson (3)
	* June Baxter	* Pritesh Patel
	* Stephen Greek	* Anne Whitehead
<b>In attendance: (Councillors)</b>	Norman Stevenson	Minute 425, 426

- \* Denotes Member present
- (3) Denotes category of Reserve Members

#### 418. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Christine Robson	Councillor Graham Henson

#### 419. 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>
Norman Stevenson	2/01 & 2/02

**420. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no declarations of interest were made.

**421. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2017 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**422. Public Questions, Petitions & Deputations**

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

**423. References from Council and other Committees/Panels**

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

**424. 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 items 2/01 & 2/02 on the list of planning applications.

**RESOLVED ITEMS**

**425. 2/01: 41 Paines Lane, Pinner - P/2013/17**

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey front extension; single and two storey rear extension; first floor side extensions; two rooflights in side and rear roof slopes; re-installation of solar panels (demolition of shed)

An officer provided a brief overview of the report. A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

‘The proposal, by reason of excessive scale and bulk, and proximity to neighbouring properties, 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 lost.

Members then voted to grant the application.

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

*Councillors Ghanzafar Ali, Keith Ferry, Graham Henson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application*

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

*The Committee received representations from an objector, Mrs Drake, the applicant, Mr Rama and Councillor Norman Stevenson.*

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

**426. 2/02: 14 Moss Close, Pinner - P/1583/17**

**PROPOSAL:** Alterations to roof to remove gables and create hip ends and extension to roof to raise ridge height; rooflights in front and rear roofslope

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

- single storey extensions with flat roofs were increasingly common in the borough and all applications for flat roofs included conditions prohibiting their use as balconies. These areas could only be accessed for reasons of maintenance and could not be used as amenity spaces. Officers would normally rely on neighbours to report any breaches of planning conditions by applicants;
- a pitched roof was not necessary for the application to be recommended for grant;
- under Permitted Development rights, homeowners were at liberty to paint and render their dwellings as they wished. The Enforcement Notice issued against the applicant required him to either demolish the those aspects of the recent renovations considered unacceptable in planning terms. Any conditions imposed on the latest application should be necessary and reasonable;
- officers had been obliged to consider the most recent application, despite the Enforcement Notice issued against the applicant, and the subsequent appeal lodged by him, otherwise the Council would be liable for costs for Non-Determination. If the current application were to be granted, then this would supersede the appeal and works on the property would have to be completed within a year;
- section 70 (c) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 stated that Local Planning Authorities were not obliged to consider a retrospective application for any development subject to an enforcement notice. However, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) made an assumption that Planning Authorities would work collaboratively with applicants. Officers were of the view that the current application, which was materially different from the previous one, would ameliorate the harm caused by the unauthorised changes made to the property in contravention of the planning permission granted in 2015. In her view, this was the best solution to the current situation. Had the application

been identical to the previous one, then article 70 (c) could have been invoked;

- officers had also assessed the harm created by the changed front aspect of the property. Because this related to Permitted Development rights, officers were obliged to take a balanced view. It was reasonable to ask the applicant to reduce the bulk of the roof and mute the appearance of the property at the front. The applicant would need to reinstate the hipped roof (which would reduce the overall bulk of the roof), the original red roof tiles and hanging bay.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposal, by reason of design, height, scale, bulk, and rear flat roof, 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 wished it to be recorded that the decision to refuse the application was unanimous*

*The Committee received representations from an objector, Mrs Bridges, the applicant, Mr Sisodia and from Councillor Norman Stevenson.*

**DECISION: REFUSED**

**427. 2/03: 28 Coledale Drive, Stanmore - P/2016/17**

**PROPOSAL:** Single Storey Front Extension; Single Storey Side To Rear Extension; Front Porch.

Members voted to grant the application.

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

**DECISION:** Granted, planning permission, subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.22 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair