

# Planning Committee

## Minutes

### 9 December 2020

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Keith Ferry

<b>Councillors:</b>	Ghazanfar Ali	Simon Brown
	Marilyn Ashton	Ajay Maru
	Christopher Baxter	Anjana Patel

<b>In attendance (Councillors):</b>	Richard Almond	For Minute 472
	Ameet Jogia	For Minute 469
	James Lee	For Minute 469
	Amir Moshenson	For Minute 469

**Apologies received:** Sachin Shah

**459. Attendance by Reserve Members**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Sachin Shah

Reserve Member

Councillor Ajay Maru

**460. 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:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Planning Application</u>
Ameet Jogia	1/01, Canons Park Station Car Park, (P/0858/20)
James Lee	1/01, Canons Park Station Car Park, (P/0858/20)
Amir Moshenson	1/01, Canons Park Station Car Park, (P/0858/20); and 3/01, Prince Edward Playing Fields (P/1564/20)
Richard Almond	2/03, 3 Lyncroft Avenue (P/2173/20)

#### **461. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the Declarations of Interests published in advance of the meeting on the Council's website were taken as read.

#### **462. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 November 2020 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

#### **463. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that one public question (with a supplemental question) was received and responded to, and the recording had been placed on the website.

(The video recording of this meeting can be found at the following link: <https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting> )

#### **464. Petitions**

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

#### **465. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no deputations notified.

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

**RESOLVED:** To note that two petitions (published in the Supplemental Agenda on 2 December 2020) were received from the Council Meeting held on 26 November 2020. These pertained to:

- 1) Canons Park Station Car Park Development; and
- 2) Stanmore Station Car Park Development.

**467. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept the Addendum and Supplemental Addendum.

**Resolved Items**

**468. Representations on Planning Applications**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 29 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/01, 2/01, 2/03, and 3/01 on the list of planning applications.

[Note: Planning applications 1/01 and 2/01 were subsequently deferred, and so the representations were not received].

**469. 1/01 Canons Park Station Car Park (P/0858/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment of existing car park to provide new residential accommodation (Use Class C3) and Sui Generis unit at ground floor and public car park along with associated works.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed that the item be deferred to allow for a site visit to see the views from the Grade II park and fully understand the impact of the development. The motion was seconded, put to the vote, and agreed.

**DECISION: DEFER**

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

Councillors Ali, Ashton, Baxter, Brown, Maru and Patel voted for the application to be deferred.

Councillor Ferry voted against deferral.

**470. 2/01 Land South of Anmer Lodge (P/3109/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment to provide a six storey building comprising of office floor space on the first floor (use class E) and 9 flats (2 x 3 bed, 5 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed) on second, third, fourth and fifth floors; parking; bin and cycle stores.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed that the item be deferred to allow for a site visit to understand the proximity of the surrounding buildings and the access arrangement in respect of the development. The motion was seconded, put to the vote, and agreed.

**DECISION: DEFER**

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

#### **471. 2/02 5 Wellington Avenue (P/2515/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment to provide one pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings with habitable roof spaces (2 x 5 bed); landscaping; parking; refuse and cycle storage.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal for the following reasons:

- 1) the development would be detrimental to the character of the area by reason of its siting and scale, contrary to CS1 Core Strategy (2012), 7.4 London Plan (2016), DM1 Harrow Management Policy, D1 Draft London Plan (2019) and to the Harrow Residential design Guide SPD in relation to Garden Development (2013).

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Anjana Patel, put to the vote and lost.

Councillors Ali, Brown, Ferry and Maru voted against the proposal.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel voted for the proposal.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

#### **DECISION: GRANT**

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

Councillors Ali, Brown, Ferry and Maru voted for the application.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel against the application.

#### **472. 2/03 3 Lyncroft Avenue (P/2173/20)**

- **PROPOSAL:** conversion of dwelling (use class C3) to House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) for up to 8 people (Use class sui generis).

The Committee received representations from Robert Bruce (objector) and Sammy Chan (agent for the applicant). Both objector and agent outlined their reasons for seeking refusal, and approval, of the application, respectively.

The Committee also received representation from Councillor Richard Almond (Ward Councillor) who spoke against granting the application.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal for the following reasons:

- 1) the development, by reason of the excessive number of occupiers, represents an overly intensive use of the site to the detriment of future occupiers and residential amenity within the locality, contrary to CS1 Harrow Core Strategy (2012), DM1, DM30 Development Management Policy, London Plan Policy 3.5 (2016), Draft London Plan Policy D1 (2019).

The proposal was seconded, put to the vote and agreed. The decision to refuse the application was unanimous.

The Committee resolved to refuse officer recommendations.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Had this application been not appealed for non-determination, the Local Planning Authority would have recommended that this application be granted.

The Committee was also asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report.

### **DECISION: REFUSE**

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

#### **473. 2/04 25 Abercorn Road (P/2947/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** re-development to provide two storey dwelling (demolition of existing dwelling).

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) Grant planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

### **DECISION: GRANT**

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

Councillors Ali, Brown, Ferry and Maru voted for the application.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel abstained from voting.

**474. 2/05 15 Elms Road (P/3177/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** conversion of dwelling house into four flats (1 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 1 X 3 bed); single storey front extension; single storey side extension; single and two storey rear extension; alterations to roof to raise ridge height; rear dormer; external alterations.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**475. 3/01 Prince Edward Playing Fields (P/1564/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** outline application for access only - redevelopment to provide four storey building with basement comprising of sporting higher education facility, student accommodation, hotel, medical diagnostic centre; plant and associated works.

The Committee received representation from Sean McGrath (agent for the applicant) who urged the Committee to reject officer recommendations, and grant the application.

The Committee also received representation from Councillor Amir Moshenson, who urged the Committee to accept officer recommendations, and refuse the application.

Following questions and comments from a Member on the extent of open space that would be utilised by the community, it was advised that it was yet to be determined.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- 1) the proposed uses comprising of a hotel, sporting higher education facility including student accommodation and medical diagnostics centre would give rise to inappropriate uses on the site which would be in direct conflict with the site's allocation for community outdoor sport development and by reason of the site's low accessibility, siting outside of a Town Centre or Opportunity Area and insufficient evidence to demonstrate the need for the uses proposed, would give rise to an unsustainable development in a strategically poor and inappropriate location, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 3.16, 3.19 and 4.5 of The London Plan (2016), policies S5, E10G, SD7, S1 and S3B of The Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), core policies CS1 Z, F and L of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policies DM 34, DM 46 and DM 48B of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and Site MOS5 of the Harrow Site Allocations (2013);
- 2) the proposed development would result in a direct loss of protected designated open space and would not provide a use which is ancillary or appropriate to the existing open space, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.18 of The London Plan (2016), policy G4 of The Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), core policy CS1 F of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM18 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 3) the proposed development, in the absence of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, fails to demonstrate the impacts of the development on the surrounding highway network, and to propose measures to promote sustainable travel modes and to reduce the effects of travel by car. Insufficient information has therefore been provided to demonstrate that the proposals would not result in unacceptable harm to the surrounding highway network through increased pressure on local parking amenity and on local transport infrastructure from excessive vehicle trips, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 6.3, 6.10 and 6.13 of The London Plan (2016), policies T1, T2, T4, and T6, T6.4 of the Draft London Plan – Intend to Publish (2019), policy 1 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy, policy CS1 R of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM 42 and DM 43 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 4) the proposed development, in the absence of an acceptable Preliminary Ecological Assessment and the site's close proximity to the adjoining Borough Grade I Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and the Edgware Brook, fails to demonstrate that biodiversity value of the surrounding area would not be harmed, protected or enhanced, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.19 of The London Plan (2019), policy G6 of the Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), and policies DM 48 A b, DM 20 and DM 21 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);

- 5) the proposal, by reason of an unsatisfactory Flood Risk Assessment, fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would result in a net reduction in flood risk, be resistant and resilient to flooding, would not exacerbate the risk of flooding within the site or increase the risk and consequences of flooding elsewhere or provide a dry means of escape for the future users, to the detriment of the safety of the adjoining occupiers and the future users of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 5.12 and 5.13 of The London Plan (2016), policies SI12 and SI 13 of the Draft London Plan (2019), Core Policy CS1 U of Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM 9 and DM 10 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 6) the proposed development, by reason of the indicated heights and conflicting floor space figures proposed, would be likely to result in a harmful, bulky and unduly dominant addition to the site which would significantly detract from the open character of the site and the surroundings, and would fail to respect the existing development on the site or contribute positively to the site's setting and the quality of the open space, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of The London Plan (2017), policies D1 and D3 of the Draft London Plan (2019), core policy CS 1 B and F of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy DM 18 C/D of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 7) the proposed development, by reason of the excessive amount of development proposed and the nature of the proposed uses and their relationship with residential properties coupled with an inadequate Lighting Impact Assessment, would give rise to unacceptable harmful outlook and visual impacts, light pollution as well as potential unreasonable noise and disturbance impacts from the increased intensity of use of the site, to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the adjacent neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 7.4 B, 7.6B and 7.15 of The London Plan (2016), policies D3, D13 and D14 of the Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019) and policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013); and
- 8) the proposed development, in the absence of insufficient information relating to Air Quality Impacts, including insufficient information relating to the level of car travel or alternative sustainable travel proposals, fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would not contribute to a deterioration in air quality in the locality, to the detriment of the future users of the site and wider area and the overall environmental quality of the London Borough of Harrow, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.14 of The London Plan (2016), policy of the SI 1 of the Draft London Plan – Intend to Publish (2019) and policies DM 1 and DM 12 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).



## **DECISION: REFUSE**

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

Councillors Ali and Ferry voted to grant the application.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter, Brown, Maru, and Patel voted to refuse the application.

### **476. 3/02 Ayman Lodge (P/3181/20)**

**PROPOSAL:** installation of 1.9m high front entrance gates and brick piers (retrospective).

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

## **DECISION: REFUSE**

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

### **477. Any Other Business**

#### **Vote of Thanks**

Members and Officers expressed their profound appreciation to Councillor Keith Ferry for his services as Chair of the Planning Committee over the years. This would be his last meeting. They wished him well in his future endeavours.

**The video recording of this meeting can be found at the following link:**

<https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting>

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.30 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Keith Ferry  
Chair