

# Planning Committee

## Minutes

### 28 July 2021

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Pamela Fitzpatrick

**Councillors:** Marilyn Ashton  
Christopher Baxter  
Maxine Henson  
Ajay Maru  
Nitin Parekh  
Bharat Thakker

**In attendance (Councillors):** Philip Benjamin For Minute 355  
Stephen Greek For Minute 355 and 356  
Ameet Jogia For Minute 355  
Kairul Kareema Marikar For Minute 356  
Sasi Suresh For Minute 356  
Adam Swersky For Minute 356

**Apologies received:** Simon Brown  
Anjana Patel

**344. Minute of Silence - James King**

The Committee observed a minute of silence in honour of the late James King, Head of Building Control, who had passed away suddenly during the past week. He had worked for Harrow Council for over 20 years (between 2001 and 2021).

**345. Attendance by Reserve Members**

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Simon Brown  
Councillor Anjana Patel

Reserve Member

Councillor Ajay Maru  
Councillor Bharat Thakker

**346. 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

Planning Application

Philip Benjamin

1/01, Stanmore Station Car Park, London Road, Stanmore, P/1221/20

Stephen Greek

1/01, Stanmore Station Car Park, London Road, Stanmore, P/1221/20; and 1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20

Ameet Jogia

1/01, Stanmore Station Car Park, London Road, Stanmore, P/1221/20

Kairul Kareema Marikar

1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20

Christine Robson

1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20

Sasikala Suresh

1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20

Adam Swersky

1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20

**347. 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 in addition the following interests were also declared:

Agenda Item 1/01, Stanmore Station Car Park, London Road, P/1220/20

Councillor Nitin Parekh declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he lived in the area in which the proposed development was located.

Agenda Item 2/04, Hive Farm Bushey, P/3741/21

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she lived off Common Road, but not near enough to have been notified.

Agenda Item 2/04, Hive Farm Bushey, P/3741/21

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a member of the Harrow Weald Common Conservators.

**348. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2021 be taken as read, subject to the amendments in the Addendum, and signed as a correct record.

**349. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that four public questions were received, and responded to. Three of the four public questions had supplemental questions, which would be responded to in writing.

**350. Petitions**

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

**351. Deputations**

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

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

**RESOLVED:** To note that the petition on 265 The Ridgeway be received, after being referred to the Planning Committee from the Council meeting on 16 July 2020. The petition would be referred to the Corporate Director (Community) and the Portfolio Holder for Portfolio Holder for Strategy, Regeneration Partnerships and Devolution for response.

The contents of the petition were noted in the discussion that ensued on the application.

**353. Addendum**

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

**354. 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, 1/02 and 2/02 on the list of planning applications.

**Resolved Items**

**355. 1/01, Stanmore Station Car Park, London Road, Stanmore, P/1221/20**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment of existing public car park to provide new residential accommodation (Use Class C3), commercial floorspace at ground

floor and flexible ground floor space. Development of a public car park along with associated works (as amended by the Addendum).

The Committee received representation from the following back bench Councillors - Councillor Philip Benjamin, Councillor Stephen Greek and Councillor Ameet Jogia. They all urged the Committee to accept officer recommendations, and refuse the application.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed to replace Reason 1, and add a new Reason 2, with the other existing reasons to follow, as:

1. the proposed development represents an over development of the site and is out of keeping with its surroundings to the detriment of the character of the area and residential amenities within the locality, by reason of its poor design, scale and mass and excessively high buildings, in particular building A and buildings C and D, contrary to policy CS1, CS1B Harrow Core Strategy (2012), DM1 Harrow Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and D1, D4, D9 London Plan (2021); and
2. the proposal would do significant harm to the open setting and character of Kerry Avenue Conservation Area and adjacent Locally Listed Station Building, contrary to Policy CS1, CS1D Harrow Core Strategy (2012), DM1, DM7 of Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), D1, HC1 London Plan (2021) and the Kerry Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2013).

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

Councillors Fitzpatrick, Henson, Maru and Parekh voted against the amendment to the reasons for refusal.

Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Thakker voted for the amendment to the reason for refusal.

Therefore, the motion to amend the reasons for refusal was not carried.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations, and retain the reasons for refusal.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee was asked to REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:

1. the proposed building A, by reason of its siting and scale, bulk, design and height would give rise to significant harm to the open setting and character of Kerry Park Avenue Conservation Area and adjacent Locally Listed Station building. The overall public benefits of the scheme, including an insufficient level of genuinely affordable housing

in line with affordability levels of local borough residents and an excessive level of shared ownership product, contrary to the boroughs housing needs, does not on balance outweigh the harm identified. In the absence of clear and convincing justification in terms of overall public the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies D3 D (1),(11), D9 C (d) and HC1 C of the London Plan (2021), policy CS 1 B and D of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM 7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the Kerry Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2013);

2. the proposed development, by reason of direct loss to SINC land and insufficient mitigation measures would cause harm to the biodiversity value of the site and surrounding area. The harm identified, in the absence of any biodiversity compensation, fails to demonstrate that biodiversity value of the site and surrounding area would not be harmed, protected or enhanced, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies G5 and G6 C and D of the London Plan (2021) policy CS 1 E of the Harrow Core Strategy and policies DM 20 and DM 21 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013); and
3. the proposed development, by reason of the siting of buildings C and D together with their height bulk and scale and their relationship with the residential dwellings No's 12-30 of Westbere Drive, would give rise to an unneighbourly, overly dominant and overbearing form of development, to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy D3 D (1), (7) of the London Plan (2021), policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), the Mayoral Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (2016) and Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

## **DECISION: REFUSE**

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

### **356. 1/02, 265 The Ridgeway, Harrow, HA2 7DA, P/1492/20**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed-use scheme comprising buildings ranging from 3-7 storeys for the provision of residential units (C3); D1 floorspace and associated open space, landscaping, access, car parking, refuse stores and cycle parking and other associated works (as amended by the Addendum and Supplemental Addendum).

The Committee received representations from the following back bench Councillors - Councillor Stephen Greek, Councillor Kairul Kareema Marikar, Councillor Christine Robson, Councillor Sasikala Suresh and Councillor Adam Swersky. They all urged the Committee to accept officer recommendations, and refuse the application.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed to add a new Reason 1, with the existing reasons to follow, as:

1. the proposed development represents an over-intensive use of the site and is out of character with its surroundings in an area comprising typically semi-detached, two-storey, suburban dwelling houses and a much cherished and well frequented allotment, to the detriment of the visual and residential amenities within the locality, by reason of its excessive scale, mass and height, contrary to policy CS1, CS1B and CS1D Harrow Core Strategy (2012), DM1 Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), and D1, D4, D9 London Plan (2021).

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

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations, and add a new Reason 1 (above).

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee was asked to:

1. agree the reasons for refusal as set out in the report; and
2. refuse planning permission:
  - I. notwithstanding the viability appraisal toolkit submitted with this application and the applicant's 'without prejudice' offer of affordable housing on this site, the proposal fails to demonstrate that the maximum reasonable level of affordable housing can be achieved on this site as required by policy H5 of The London Plan (2021) and core policy CS1 (J) of the Harrow Core strategy (2012) and the proposal would fail to deliver an appropriate tenure mix that would meet the Borough's housing priority need, contrary to core policy CS1 (I) of the Harrow Core Strategy and the guidance contained in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations (2013). The proposed development therefore fails to address strategic housing objectives including the provision of mixed, balanced and sustainable communities, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies H4, H5 and H6 of the London Plan (2021) and core policies CS1(I) and CS1(J) of The Harrow Core Strategy (2012);
  - II. the proposed development, in the absence of sufficient information within the provided Ecological Impact Assessment to quantify the ongoing impacts on the adjacent Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) or provision of opportunities for local biodiversity mitigation or enhancement within the vicinity of the site, thereby 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 G6 C and D of the London Plan (2021), policy CS 1 E of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM20 and DM21 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);

- III. the proposal fails to provide sufficient information to determine the cumulative impact of the proposed siting of the buildings within close proximity of the Root Protection Area (RPA) incursions and long-term post-development physical, environmental and social pressure on existing trees adjacent to the development site, namely within the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and along the south-eastern boundary / embankment; as well as the development impact on the availability of light to ensure their long-term survival due to their close proximity to the proposed development and therefore the proposal would fail to accord with National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy G7 of The London Plan (2021) and policy DM22 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013); and
- IV. the submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report, in the absence of accurately assessing the existing site constraints pertaining to the surrounding Site of Importance of Nature Conservation (SINC), trees and site levels, fails to provide sufficient information to assess whether the proposal would result in acceptable quality of accommodation for future residents with regard to natural light, daylight and overshadowing particularly for Blocks A, B, C, D and E. Furthermore, the close proximity and elevated siting of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) adjacent to Block A, would result in poor outlook to the rear-facing habitable rooms within units A00-A06 of this block, to the detriment of the amenities of the future occupiers of this block. The proposed development is therefore contrary to the high quality design aspirations of The National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy D3(7) and D6(D) of the London Plan (2021), Core Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and policy DM1 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 unanimous.

#### **357. 2/01, Mamado House, 8 Parr Road, Stanmore, HA7 1NL, P/1315/21**

**PROPOSAL:** steel framed building to provide new warehouse (Use Class B8) to north side of existing warehouse building.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations, as amended by the Addendum.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee was asked to:

1. agree the reason for approval as set out in the report; and
2. grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report, and the Addendum.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**358. 2/02, 110 Howberry Road Edgware HA8 6SY, P/1374/21**

**PROPOSAL:** single storey front extension incorporating front porch; single and two storey side to rear extension; single storey rear extension; alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; three rooflights - one each in front, side and rear roofslopes; external alterations.

The Committee received representation from Emily Benedek (agent on behalf of Mrs Renee Gilbert - objector), and from Hiten Chauhan (applicant), who urged the Committee to refuse and approve the application, respectively.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The 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 Fitzpatrick, Henson, Maru and Parekh voted to grant the application.

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

**359. 2/03, Honeypot Business Centre, Parr Road, HA7 1NL, P/1500/21**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment to provide two storey building comprising of four industrial units (Use class B1(c)).

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations, as amended by the Addendum.



## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee was asked to:

1. agree the reason for approval as set out in the report; and
2. grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report, and the Addendum.

## **DECISION: GRANT**

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

### **360. 2/04, Hive Farm, Bushey, P/3741/20**

**PROPOSAL:** proposed vehicle access.

The Committee expressed disquiet at some of the observations in the Inspector's Report. However, they would abide by them.

The Committee resolved to accept officer recommendations, as amended by the Addendum.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The 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, and the Addendum.

## **DECISION: GRANT**

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application 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 9.37 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Pamela Fitzpatrick  
Chair