

# Planning Committee

## Minutes

### 30 June 2021

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Pamela Fitzpatrick

**Councillors:** Marilyn Ashton  
Christopher Baxter  
Simon Brown  
Ajay Maru  
Nitin Parekh  
Anjana Patel

**In attendance (Councillors):** Ameet Jogia  
For Minute 334 (a)

**Apologies received:** Maxine Henson

**325. Attendance by Reserve Members**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Maxine Henson

Reserve Member

Councillor Ajay Maru

**326. Right of Members to Speak**

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillor, who was not a Members of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda item indicated:

Councillor

Planning Application

Ameet Jogia

Agenda Item 1/01, Stanmore and Edgware Golf Centre, Stanmore, HA7 4LR (P/3088/20)

**327. 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, and that the following interests were also declared:

Agenda Item 1/01, Stanmore and Edgware Golf Centre, Stanmore, HA7 4LR P/3088/20

Councillor Ajay Maru declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was the Cabinet Portfolio Holder Assistant for Businesses, and in that role he had been at meetings where he had been advised that the applicant had had meetings with Council officers concerning the Council's ambition to redevelop Wealdstone, which might affect the applicant's business. Councillor Maru would leave the meeting when the item was being discussed and voted on.

Agenda Item 2/04, 2 Park Drive, Rayners Lane, Harrow HA2 7LT, P/0903/21

Councillor Ajay Maru declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was acquainted with the applicant, when he served as Mayor of the London Borough of Harrow.

**328. Minutes**

Councillors Marilyn Ashton and Ajay Maru advised an amendment to the minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2021 on declarations of interest. They were not Ward Councillors in the area in which Agenda Item 2/09, 328 High Road, P/4459/20 was located, as stated in the minutes. Councillor Ashton had spoken to the proprietor of the business on some occasions, while Councillor Maru had been a customer there.

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2021 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the amendment above.

**329. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that two public questions were received. The first question would be responded to in writing as the questioner was not present to pose the question.

The second question was responded to, and the supplemental question would be responded to in writing.

**330. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received.

**331. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received.

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

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

**333. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept the Addendum.

**334. 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 Agenda Items 1/01, 2/01, 2/02 and 2/05 on the list of planning applications.

**Resolved Items**

**335. 1/01, Stanmore and Edgware Golf Centre, P/3088/20**

**PROPOSAL:** demolition of former golf club buildings and construction of a single and two storey building for a banqueting facility; widening of existing vehicular access from Brockley Hill, car and cycle parking, waste/recycling storage, landscape enhancement and associated works (as amended by the Addendum).

Councillor Ajay Maru left the room whilst the item was being discussed and voted on.

The Committee received representation from Councillor Ameet Jogia (Back Bench) who urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Nitin Parekh proposed deferral to allow the applicant submit additional information as requested by officers. The motion was seconded by Councillor Simon Brown, put to the vote and agreed.

The Committee resolved to defer the application, and that the applicant should submit the additional information by early August 2021, in order for the application to be considered at the early September 2021 Planning Committee meeting.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee had been asked to REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:

1. the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development on the application site. The proposed

development would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, to the detriment of the character, appearance and openness of the Green Belt, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy G2 of The London Plan (2021), Core policy CS 1 F of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and policy DM 16 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), and no very special circumstances had been demonstrated by the applicant whereby the harm by reason of inappropriateness is outweighed by other considerations;

2. the proposed development, by reason of failure to provide adequate on-site or off-site car / coach parking and lack of integrated drop off facilities to serve the proposed banqueting facility, would significantly intensify site usage and generated trips. The associated likely on site congestion and parking overspill into the London Borough of Harrow and the London Borough of Barnet, with particular reference to the residential streets to the south-east of the site, was therefore considered to be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety, and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy T4 of The London Plan (2021), and policies DM 42 E and F, DM 1 B (f) (C) and D (h), policy DM 42 E and F and DM 43 B and C of the Harrow Development Management polices Local Plan (2013);
3. the proposed development by reason of inadequate archaeological evaluation of the application site, had failed to demonstrate that potential archaeological assets of significant importance would not be harmed, and impacts minimised through appropriate design and construction. The proposal would therefore fail to comply the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy HC1 C and D of The London Plan (2021), policy CS1 D of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy DM 7 A, B and H of the Harrow Development Management Polices Local Plan (2013); and
4. the proposed development, in the absence of adequate Ecological Assessment which failed to address the sites strategic Green Belt location and the sites boundaries including its close proximity to the adjoining Pear Wood and Stanmore Country Park Site of Importance for Nature Conservation, failed 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 G6 of The London Plan (2021), policy CS 1 E of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM 20 and DM 21 of the Harrow Development Management Polices Local Plan (2013).

#### **DECISION: DEFER**

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

**336. 2/01, 56 Lorne Road, P/1559/21**

**PROPOSAL:** conversion of dwelling into two flats (1 x 3 bed and 1 x 2 bed); installation of access ramp to front entrance; and bin and cycle stores.

The Committee received representation from Bekim Haziri (objector) and Muneer Ahmed (agent for applicant) who urged the Committee to refuse and approve the application, respectively.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal for the following reason:

- 1) the proposal represented an over-intensive use of the site and would result in a loss of residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers, by reason of the proposed conversion of this single family dwelling house into two flats for eight occupiers, contrary to policies CS1 Harrow Core Strategy (2012), D1 London Plan (2021), DM1 Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

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

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 by majority of votes.

Councillors Brown, Fitzpatrick, Maru and Parekh voted to grant the application.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel voted against the application.

**337. 2/02, 44 Blythwood Road, P/0410/21**

**PROPOSAL:** alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; rooflight in front roof slope; two storey side extension; single storey front extension, incorporating front porch; external alterations (demolition of attached garage and front porch).

The Committee received representation from Alexandra Osborn (objector), and Dipesh Shah (agent for applicant) who urged the Committee to refuse and approve the application, respectively.

Following comments from Members on whether more conditions could be added to ensure the sustainable urban drainage [SuDs] was further strengthened, as the site was located within a Critical Drainage Area, the Legal Officer advised that it would not be justified to impose additional conditions, which were not necessitated by the development.

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 majority of votes.

Councillors Brown, Fitzpatrick, Maru and Parekh voted to grant the application.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel abstained from voting on the application.

### **338. 2/03, 16 Dalston Gardens, P/0480/21**

**PROPOSAL:** first floor rear extension (Use Class B2).

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 unanimous.

**339. 2/04, 2 Park Drive, P/0903/21**

**PROPOSAL:** subdivision of site and existing house to form 2 x 3 bed dwellings; single and two storey side to rear extension; single storey rear extension; external alterations; pedestrian access; bin and cycle stores.

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 unanimous.

**340. 2/05, West House Gallery Café, West End Lane, P/1292/20**

**PROPOSAL:** enlargement of terrace area to cafe and installation of perimeter timber post and railings.

The Committee received representation from Jackie Lindop (objector), who urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal for the following reason:

- 1) the proposal would failed to contribute positively to the setting and quality of the Designated Open Space and it had not been demonstrated that there are any wider benefits, which would outweigh the loss of Open Space, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM18 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

The proposal was seconded by Councillor Christopher Baxter, put to the vote, and agreed.

The Committee resolved to refuse 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: REFUSE**

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

**341. 2/06, Roger Bannister Sports Centre, P/3959/19**

**PROPOSAL:** creation of 49 additional car parking spaces (inclusive of 2 blue-badge spaces); replacement of path (as amended by the Addendum).

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 unanimous.

**342. 2/07, 6 New Road, P/4384/20**

**PROPOSAL:** re-development to provide two storey building with habitable roofspace comprising of seven flats (5 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed); parking; bin and cycle stores; landscaping.

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 unanimous.

**343. 2/08, The Old School, Church Hill, P/1907/21**

**PROPOSAL:** Listed Building Consent - internal and external alterations including new floor finish and timber skirtings; new radiators; new services;



new lighting; new doors; new partitioning, wall panelling and glazed screens; new electronic screens; new mechanical ventilation and louvres; creation of opening in wall; new WC.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval and suggested conditions as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant Listed Building Consent.

### **DECISION: GRANT - LISTED BUILDING CONSENT**

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the Listed Building Consent was unanimous.

**The audio 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 9.18 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Pamela Fitzpatrick  
Chair