

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 25 OCTOBER 2017

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Ghazanfar Ali \* Nitin Parekh (1)  
\* June Baxter \* Pritesh Patel  
\* Stephen Greek \* Anne Whitehead

**In attendance:** Norman Stevenson Minute 474  
**(Councillors)**

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) Denotes category of Reserve Members

#### 462. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Christine Robson

Reserve Member

Councillor Nitin Parekh

#### 463. 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:

Councillor

Norman Stevenson

Planning Application

3/02 & 3/03

#### **464. Declarations of Interest**

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

Agenda Item 12 C - Other Applications Recommended for Refusal: 6 Crest View, Pinner

Councillor June Baxter declared a pecuniary interest in that the applicants were colleagues and members of the Conservative Group. She would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a pecuniary interest in that the applicants were colleagues and members of the Conservative Group. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Pritesh Patel declared a pecuniary interest in that the applicants were colleagues and members of the Conservative Group. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 12 b - Other Applications Recommended for Refusal: Queens Head Public House

Councillor Norman Stevenson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was Ward Councillor for Pinner, was a member of the Pinner Association and the Pinner Local History Society and a patron of the Queens Head Public House. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

#### **465. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2017 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **466. Public Questions & Deputations**

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

#### **467. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petition which was considered by the Committee and was forwarded to the Corporate Director of Community for information:

A Petition containing 47 signatures from residents of Springfield Road, with the following terms of reference:

Objections to Planning Permissions Ref P/2958/17, 15-19 Springfield Road, on the grounds of noise, lack of light, insufficient parking spaces, overcrowding and pollution.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 468. 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 2/03 on the list of planning applications.

### 469. 2-01 - The Grove, Church Hill: P-3249-17 & 2-02 - The Grove, Church Hill: P/3377/17

#### PROPOSAL:

**P/3249/17:** *Four Storey Side Extension; Single Storey Side Extension; External Alterations Including a Lightwell; Bin Store; Additional Parking Spaces (Demolition of detached garage) to Existing Boarding House Building*

**P/3377/17:** *Listed Building Consent relating to the above proposal*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- the building had been extended on a number of occasions, which was the reason for the different roof lines;
- an additional condition requiring that materials used for the new extension should match those used in the existing buildings could be added.

**DECISION: P/3249/17: GRANTED**, planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and an additional condition that materials used for the new extension should match those used in the existing buildings, and as amended by the addendum.

**DECISION: P/3377/17: GRANTED**, Listed Building Consent subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

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

### 470. 2-03 - 15 – 19 Springfield Road, Harrow- P-2958-17

**PROPOSAL:** *Demolition of existing building and redevelopment to erect a three storey building containing nine flats, amenity space; refuse and cycle storage.*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- it was important to note that the height, scale and massing of the proposed development was less in comparison to the previous

application. The previous application had been for a 4 storey development. The overall height and scale of the current application was less and therefore, the design principles and building lines of the current application were deemed acceptable;

- conditions of the section 106 agreement would alert prospective buyers to the fact that there would be a restriction on parking permits;
- it would not be possible to impose a condition requiring the applicant to use the council's refuse collection services rather than a private provider;
- a further condition was requested by the case officer regarding details of servicing the waste and recycling for the development. This was agreed by members.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposed building, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk and massing would give rise to a form of development which would be disproportionate, incongruous and overly dominant, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene, and the visual amenities of the area, contrary to policies 7.4 B and 7.6.B of The London Plan 2016, policies CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010.'

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

The Committee received representations from an objector, Ms Patel and from a representative of the applicant, Mr Stent.

Members agreed that an additional condition requiring that refuse be serviced from the Greenhill Way side be added.

The Committee voted on the officer recommendation to grant the application.

**DECISION: GRANTED**

### **RECOMMENDATION A**

Granted 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 other enabling legislation and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report or the legal agreement, and the additional condition regarding details of servicing the waste and recycling for the development, agreed at Committee.

## **RECOMMENDATION B**

That if, by 25th January 2018 or as such extended period as may be agreed by the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, then it is recommended to delegate the decision to **REFUSE** planning permission to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning.

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Nitin Parekh and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

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

### **471. 2-04 - Burnell House, 8 Stanmore Hill - P-3314-17**

**PROPOSAL:** *Alterations to the roof to raise the ridge height; external alterations*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that officers had provided advice to the applicant during the pre-application process. Officers had indicated that 26 rooflights would be unacceptable as they had concerns regarding their design and potential overlooking of neighbouring properties. This advice could not be the subject of an appeal. However, officers had subsequently assessed the application and were of the view that refusing the application for these reasons could not be sustained if the decision was appealed.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

‘The proposal, by reason of excessive bulk, mass and proliferation of roof lights, would harm local character and amenity and would harm the setting of the Stanmore Hill Conservation Area, contrary to policies DM1 and DM7 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy, and 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan.’

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

The Committee voted on the officer recommendation to grant the application.

**DECISION: GRANTED**, planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Nitin Parekh & Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

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

**472. 3-01 - Pavillion, Raghuvanshi Charitable Trust - P-3527-17**

**PROPOSAL:** *The proposal seeks to form 48 car parking spaces on the existing playing field. 24 of the parking spaces would be located to the south of the site, close to the entrance, and 24 spaces would be positioned on the north east boundary of the site, adjacent to the existing parking area.*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- an application for hard surfaced car parking submitted in 2016 had been refused and the applicant was aware that Green Belt policy did not permit the use of hard surfacing on green belt land;
- it was unlikely that the parking spaces could be located elsewhere on the site.

A Member proposed deferring the item in order to grant permission at the next meeting. The motion to defer was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

The Committee voted on the officer recommendation to Refuse the application.

**DECISION: REFUSED**

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Nitin Parekh & Anne Whitehead voted to refuse the application.*

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

**473. 3-02 & 3-03 - Queens Head Public House - P-2218-17 & P-2420-17**

**PROPOSALS:**

**P/2218/17:** *Change of use of the first floor from ancillary accommodation for the public house (use class A4) to five en-suite guest rooms (use class C1) involving the installation of external steel staircase with balustrade at rear; enlargement of existing window to form new entrance at first floor rear and installation of painted timber door; installation of painted timber framed sash window to first floor side elevation; new extract routes and three new extract grills on the front elevation.*

**P/2420/17:** *Internal and external alterations including alterations to the first floor to enable conversion to five en-suite guest bedrooms (including new walls and doors); secondary glazing; new external staircase; replacement of a first floor rear window with a door including cutting through a timber;*

*demolition of existing timber structure on the rear elevation; removal of existing signage board; ventilation to new boiler; new drainage routes; new extract routes and three new extract grills on the front elevation*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- paragraph 1.34 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) required that any harm caused by modifications to a listed building should be outweighed by its future use and potential benefit. However, paragraph 1.32 of the NPPF stated that there should be clear and convincing justification for any harm. The Council's Conservation Officer was of the view that the applicant could have opted for a different design and other alternatives, which did not cause harm could have been better explored. The applicant had failed to demonstrate that these other options were not viable, for example, the staircase could be sited in the Edwardian part of the building;
- the window surrounds on the front elevation were likely to be historic timber surrounds;
- the applicant had not provided a fire safety assessment of the building.

A Member proposed a motion to defer the application in order for the applicant to satisfactorily address concerns about the en-suite bathrooms, air vents and fire doors, and to provide further details to justify their proposals regarding the stair tower.

The Chair pointed out that the applicant had received advice from the Planning Department during the pre-application process but had chosen to ignore this.

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

The Committee received representations from Councillor Norman Stevenson.

#### **DECISION: REFUSED**

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, June Baxter, Keith Ferry, Nitin Parekh and Anne Whitehead voted to refuse the application.*

*Councillor Pritesh Patel voted against refusal.*

*Councillor Stephen Greek abstained from voting.*

**474. 3-04 - 6 Crest View Pinner - P-3774 -17**

**PROPOSAL:** *Single storey front conservatory extension; external alterations.*

Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel left the room during consideration of this item.

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that there was scope for the applicant to submit an amended application which was of a higher standard, style and design.

**DECISION: REFUSED**

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

**475. Member Site Visits**

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

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

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.32 pm, closed at 7.45 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair