

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 17 OCTOBER 2018

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Ghazanfar Ali \* Mina Parmar (2)  
\* Stephen Greek \* Christine Robson  
\* Graham Henson \* Norman Stevenson (1)

**In attendance:** Marilyn Ashton Minute 106  
**(Councillors)**

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) and (2) Denote category of Reserve Members

#### 95. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Bharat Thakker  
Councillor Anjana Patel

Reserve Member

Councillor Mina Parmar  
Councillor Norman Stevenson

#### 96. 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:

**97. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

**98. Minutes**

A Member stated that an objector who had spoken against application 2/08: Roger Bannister Sports Centre, Uxbridge Road, had sent an email requesting that the content of his speech made at the 26 September Planning Committee meeting, be recorded in the minutes.

The clerk advised that an email response had been sent to the objector in question and that the minutes were intended to be a concise summary of discussion and decision-making and were not intended to be a contemporaneous record of proceedings.

Members expressed concern that public participation at Planning Committee meetings was not being recorded sufficient detail and asked whether, going forward, Committee Services could look into the possibility of recording public speakers at Planning Committee and publishing these on the Council's website.

The Chair added that any such recordings would prove useful to the Planning Inspector when dealing with appeals. He added that it would be useful to audio record all Planning Committee deliberations and to publish these on the Council's website.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

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

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

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

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

**101. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept both addendums.

**102. Representations on Planning Applications**

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

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 103. 2/01: Vacant Land Northeast of Hailsham Drive - P-2028-18

**PROPOSAL:** Outline application for access only: redevelopment to create new building for up to nine flats; new access and associated works (with appearance, scale, layout and landscaping reserved)

A Member proposed that if granted, then the reserved matters should be submitted to a future meeting of the Planning Committee for consideration. This was agreed unanimously.

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendations.

#### **DECISION:**

**GRANT**, planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and as amended by the Addendum 1;

That the reserved matters be submitted to a future meeting of the Planning Committee, for consideration.

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

### 104. 2/02: 30 Clonard Way - P-2981-18

**PROPOSAL:** Single and two storey side to rear extensions, ground floor front and rear extensions, rear dormer and rooflights and external alterations (demolition or rear extension and bin store)

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

- due to its depth, height and siting, officers considered that the proposed extension would not have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties as it would be set back from them and would not be visible from the street;
- the side window would have obscured glazing and there would be no overlooking;
- the proposed extension would not cause any overshadowing of neighbouring properties.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

‘The proposal, by reason of excessive scale and bulk, would harm the amenities of neighbouring properties, 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.

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendations.

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

*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, Graham Henson & Christine Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Mina Parmar & Norman Stevenson voted against the application.*

#### **105. 2/03:11 Elms Road - P-2735-18**

**PROPOSAL:** Re-Development To Provide A Two Storey Building With Accommodation In Roof To Create Seven Flats; Parking; Landscaping; Separate And Communal Amenity Space; Refuse And Cycle Storage

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

- in accordance with London Plan policies, officers would encourage applicants to promote sustainable transport and modal shift by limiting parking provision at new developments. Six parking spaces (including 1 disabled space) were proposed at the site and this was within London Plan guidelines;
- the property had not been used as sheltered accommodation for 11 years and had been vacant for some time.

A Member queried the fact that the previous application which had been granted had been for a two storey building for six flats with 5 parking spaces and the current application was for seven flats with the same number of parking spaces. An officer stated that the parking provision was within London Plan guidelines and that the application had been assessed in line with relevant policies.

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 streetscene, 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 proposed development to seven flats would be an over-intensive use of the site, and would have an insufficient level of parking provision, to the detriment of local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM42 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy, and 6.13, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.

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

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendations.

**DECISION: GRANT**, planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in the officer report, and as amended by Addendum 2.

*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, Graham Henson & Christine Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Mina Parmar & Norman Stevenson voted against the application.*

**106. 2/04: 4 Elm Park - P-2003-18**

**PROPOSAL:** Re-development to provide one two storey building for four flats; landscaping; separate and communal amenity space; bin / cycle storage

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

- the report should state that the application site fell within a PTAL 2/3 area (and not a PTAL 2) and that the Old Church Conservation Area was located to the West of the site (and not to the East);
- officers had not been able to gain access to the stairwell which, was visible through the dormer window;
- Highways did not have any jurisdiction over the service road adjacent to the site as it was privately owned;
- a condition relating to Secure by Design would be included;
- the applicant did not own the adjacent building.

The Chair stated that a site visit had been carried out recently to the application site albeit some of the Members had not been present at that site visit.

The Committee received a representation from Councillor Marilyn Ashton.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposal, by reason of poor design, excessive bulk, height and scale, and lack of parking provision, would result in an overdevelopment of the site and have a detrimental impact on local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1, DM42 and DM43 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 6.13, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.'

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

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendations and replace the words 'Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning' with the words 'Interim Chief Planning Officer' in the recommendation.

**DECISION: GRANT**, planning permission subject to authority being delegated to the Interim Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the 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 (set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report), and as amended by Addendum1.

*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, Graham Henson & Christine Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Mina Parmar & Norman Stevenson voted against the application.*

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.33 pm, closed at 7.27 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair