

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 25 OCTOBER 2012

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Mrinal Choudhury \* Joyce Nickolay  
\* Stephen Greek \* William Stoodley  
\* Jerry Miles (4) \* Stephen Wright

\* Denotes Member present  
(4) Denotes category of Reserve Member

#### 319. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Bill Phillips

Councillor Jerry Miles

#### 320. Right of Members to Speak

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

Councillor

Planning Application

Barry Macleod-Cullinane

2/03 Stanburn First and Junior Schools,  
Abercorn Road, Stanmore, HA7 2PJ

### **321. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interest was declared:

Agenda Item 10 – Planning application 2/02 – Glebe Primary School, D’Arcy Gardens, Harrow

Councillor Mrinal Choudhury declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he had previously been a Governor of the school. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

### **322. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### **323. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations**

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

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

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

### **325. 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 2/04 on the list of planning applications.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

### **326. Planning Applications Received**

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Addendum was admitted late to the agenda as it contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the despatch of the agenda. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

**RESOLVED:** That authority be given to the Head of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered.

#### **(APPLICATION 1/01) WOOD FARM, WOOD LANE, STANMORE**

Reference: P/2277/12 (Mr Gaurang Velani). Variation of Condition 17 attached to Planning Permission P/2203/06/CFU dated 5<sup>th</sup> November 2009 from: “No Demolition Or Works In Connection With The Development Hereby Permitted Shall Commence Before a Regulation 44 (of the Habitat Regulations) Licence for the Relevant Protected Species has been Obtained,

and a Copy Submitted to the Local Planning Authority”, To: “No Demolition or Works in Connection With the Development Permitted (Other Than Those Works Illustrated and Referenced on Drawing Number 5272\_220\_A Relating Specifically to the Private Housing Entrance) Shall Commence Before a Regulation 44 (Habitat Regs) Licence for the Relevant Protected Species Has Been Obtained and a Copy Sent to the LPA”.

**DECISION:** It was noted that the application had been withdrawn.

**(APPLICATION 2/01) 11-15 ST ANNS ROAD, HARROW**

Reference: P/2348/12 (Mr Umar Farooq). Change of Use from Retail (Class A1) to Restaurant/Café (Class A3); Use of Front Public Forecourt for Siting of 8 Tables and 24 Chairs; Screens Around the Perimeter of the Seating area (Retrospective Application).

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to conditions and informatives reported, with an additional informative that the applicant required a highways licence in order to place tables and chairs on the highway.

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

**(APPLICATION 2/02) GLEBE PRIMARY SCHOOL, D'ARCY GARDENS, HARROW**

Reference: P/2342/12 (Harrow Council). Erection of Single Storey Building (Up to 8.1m High) With Link-to Existing School Building; External Alterations including Boundary Treatment Along Glebe Lane; Provision of Five Additional Car Parking Spaces.

The Committee was informed that the officers were mindful of the elevation of the present school and had requested the Applicant to submit a revised elevation with windows. Subject to this condition being satisfied, the officers recommended that the application be granted.

In response to questions it was noted that the internal reorganisation of classrooms did not require planning permission.

Councillor Jerry Miles indicated that he had an open mind and had not predetermined the outcome.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission, under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition that the School Travel Plan be submitted to the Planning Committee prior to occupation.

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

**(APPLICATION 2/03) STANBURN FIRST AND JUNIOR SCHOOLS,  
ABERCORN ROAD, STANMORE**

Reference: P/2020/12 (Harrow Council). Two Storey Extension with First Floor Link to Main Building; Alterations to School Pedestrian Entrance and Car Park; Provision of Four Additional Car Parking Spaces (Demolition of Existing Two Storey Annex Building).

In response to questions, it was noted that:

- planning guidance had been provided as to the suitability for expansion of each of the nine schools contained within the programme put forward by the education service. Each subsequent planning application had to be considered on its merits;
- the education and planning services had undertaken separate consultation. It was noted that consultation on the application had included 23, 24, 25 Abercorn Road. The distance travelled to school was not a planning consideration;
- the plans proposed 4 additional onsite car parking spaces which was in excess of the requirements of the London Plan. Due to congestion, particularly with regard to the collection of children from school, an attempt had been made for some increase in parking but there would be a reliance on the School Travel Plan. A 6% increase in walking was envisaged with a slightly smaller decrease in car use so a robust travel plan would be required. The lack of convenient parking could be a deterrent due to having to walk longer to school. It was commented that car sharing could be increased;
- the plans indicated 169 sq metres additional space;
- flood risk would be advised by the Environment Agency.

Councillor Jerry Miles indicated that he had an open mind and had not predetermined the outcome.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission, under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to conditions and informatives reported and an additional condition that a School Travel Plan, which took account of the number of students when the development was completed, be submitted to the Planning Committee prior to occupation.

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

## **(APPLICATION 2/04) 24 WOODWAY CRESCENT, HARROW**

Reference: P/1899/12 (Mr S Hussain). Retrospective Application for Single Storey Side to Rear Extension; Proposed Modifications to Reduce Depth and Alterations to Roof.

The officers introduced the application, with reference to a further objection which was attached to the addendum which responded to those points that had not already been addressed. The enforcement appeal decision was circulated. A site visit had been undertaken.

It was noted that the 2003 planning permission had been implemented but was not in accordance with the plans. An enforcement notice was upheld because the appeal inspector considered retention impinged on the occupiers of 26 Woodway Crescent outlook.

In order to comply with the enforcement notice, the extension would have to be completely demolished. However the extension to the rear wall, without the wrap around, could then be implemented as permitted development. The adjoining neighbour had requested the revocation of permitted development rights but officers advised that this was not an area of such special character that would justify an Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights.

In response to questions it was noted that:

- the monopitched roof on the rear extension would be retained and was considered to meet the requirements of the adopted Supplementary Planning Document. The side element would have a flat roof;
- in the view of the officers, it would be unreasonable to require the extension to be refused when it could be immediately rebuilt under permitted development rights;
- the measurement of the drop in heights for permitted development was from the highest adjacent land level;
- the impact on the window at no 26 Woodway Crescent had been a material consideration in the enforcement report.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the grounds that:

The side to rear extension adjacent to the boundary shared with no. 26 Woodway Crescent, by reason of its depth, would result in a visually dominant form of development from the neighbouring property, no. 26 Woodway Crescent, to the detriment of the visual amenities and outlook of the occupiers of no. 26 Woodway Crescent, contrary to policy 7.6.B of the London Plan 2011, saved policy D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan 2004 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010.

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

The Committee received representations from one objector, Mrs Sheila Kingsley, and the applicant, Mr S Hussain.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to conditions and informatives reported.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was as follows:*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Mrinal Choudhury, Jerry Miles and William Stoodley voted to approve.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Stephen Wright voted against.*

**(APPLICATION 2/05) 19, 21 & REAR OF 11-29 ALEXANDRA AVENUE, HARROW**

Reference: P/0376/12 (Mr Steve Murphy). Retrospective Application for Revised Access Road and Associated Landscaping and Demolition of no. 19 and External Alterations to no. 21 Alexandra Avenue in Connection With Redevelopment to the Rear of 11-29 Alexandra Avenue (Variation of Scheme APP/M5450/A/1186950 Allowed on Appeal Dated 29/07/2006 for the Provision of 12 Two Storey Houses).

In response to questions it was noted that:

- it was not illegal to demolish one half of a pair of semi-detached houses provided planning permission or prior approval was received.
- the GLA CIL contribution goes to the GLA but from the following year an additional CIL levy would be due to Harrow Council.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions and informatives reported.

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

**(APPLICATION 3/01) 24 WOODWAY CRESCENT, HARROW**

Reference: P/1898/12 (Mr S Hussain). Retrospective Application for Single Storey Side to Rear Extension; Proposed Modifications to Reduce Depth and Alterations to Roof.

It was noted that, unlike application 2/04 above, the extension was not within permitted development rights.

**DECISION: REFUSED** planning permission for the development described in the submitted plans and application for the reasons set out in the report.

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

**(APPLICATION 3/02) 24 WOODWAY CRESCENT, HARROW**

Reference: P/1900/12 (Mr S Hussain). Retrospective Application for Single Storey Side to Rear Extension; Proposed Modifications to Reduce Depth and Alterations to Roof.

It was noted that, unlike application 2/04 above, the extension was not within permitted development rights.

**DECISION: REFUSED** planning permission for the development described in the submitted plans and application for the reasons set out in the report.

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

**327. Member Site Visits**

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.20 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chairman