

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 9 APRIL 2014

**Chairman:** \* Councillor William Stoodley

**Councillors:** \* Mrinal Choudhury \* Joyce Nickolay (3)  
\* Keith Ferry \* Sachin Shah (3)  
\* Stephen Greek \* Simon Williams

\* Denotes Member present  
(3), (3) Denote category of Reserve Members

#### 520. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Bill Phillips  
Councillor Stephen Wright

Reserve Member

Councillor Sachin Shah  
Councillor Joyce Nickolay

#### 521. 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:

Councillor

Marilyn Ashton

Planning Application

1/01 Anmer Lodge, Coverdale Close &  
Stanmore Carpark, Dennis Lane,

Stanmore

James Bond, Janet Mote, 3/01 Broadfields Sports and Social Club,  
Anthony Seymour Headstone Lane, Harrow

**522. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 10 – Planning Application 3/01 – Broadfields Sports and Social Club, Headstone Lane, Harrow

Councillor Keith Ferry declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in that he lived in the consultation area. He would leave the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Anthony Seymour declared a non- pecuniary interest in that he was a Governor of Pinner Park Infant and Junior School which was within the consultation area. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

**523. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2014 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**524. Public Questions, petitions and deputations**

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

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

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

**526. Representations on Planning Applications**

**RESOLVED:** That

- 1) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/02 and 2/02 on the list of planning applications;
- 2) in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30.5 two objectors be allowed to address the meeting in respect of item 2/01.

**RESOLVED ITEMS**

**527. 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 Divisional Director of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered.

**ANMER LODGE, COVERDALE CLOSE & STANMORE CARPARK, DENNIS LANE, STANMORE**

Reference: P/0412/14 (Notting Hill Home Ownership). Redevelopment of Anmer Lodge & Stanmore Car Park Site in Four Blocks of Various Heights: Block A to Provide 1,692 Sq. M (Gross) Food Retail Store (Class A1) with Ancillary Café and 3-5 Storeys of Flats over; Block B to Provide Multi Storey Car Park and 3-4 Storeys of Flats over; Block C to Comprise 3-6 Storeys of Flats with Undercroft Parking; Block D to Comprise 2-4 Storeys of Houses and Flats with Surface Car Parking. Basement Car Park Below Blocks A & B. Total 120 Dwellings (Class C3) (Resident Permit Restricted); 294 Car Parking Spaces (Comprising 151 Replacement Spaces, 50 Spaces for the Food Store and 93 Spaces for Residents), 8 Motorcycle Spaces and 144 Cycle Spaces. Access from Dennis Lane and Coverdale Close. Proposal also Includes Combined Heat & Power Plant; Landscaping & Roof Gardens; Diversion of Water Culvert; Works to Provide Temporary Replacement Town Centre Car Park (Minimum of 151 Spaces) and Demolition of Anmer Lodge.

An officer introduced the report with reference to the addendum which included a summary of additional responses received, further information provided by the applicant and amendments to the report and conditions. A site visit had taken place, therefore the Committee were familiar with the proposed scheme.

The Committee was informed that the site had been allocated as a development site in Harrow's local plan. There were two distinct areas with high density mixed use in the district centre and a more residential component in the north. The officers had maintained a dialogue with the applicant during the course of the planning application to address matters arising from the appraisal of the application process.

The officers had considered the impact of additional vehicular movements and the Committee was informed of proposed mitigation measures such as road improvements, junction alterations and traffic calming measures.

In response to questions, the Committee was informed that:

- the Harrow Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was £1,343,340 and the GLA CIL was £652,400;
- the 10% disabled parking was considered satisfactory taking into account sustainability and the availability of public transport;

- amendments to the number of internal bin stores had been secured during discussion with the applicant to ensure that Council requirements were met;
- traffic management schemes sought to improve traffic flow in the Uxbridge Road corridor by linking signal installations and the implementation of stringent controls. The quantum of commercial units with 50 car parking spaces was not considered to be a large traffic generator nor was the lower ratio residential parking control level;
- new signalized pedestrian crossings were proposed to balance the improvement of traffic flow with pedestrian movement and safety and assistance with funding would be provided by the developer. The system would be fully integrated to ensure any delays were minimised whilst providing valued facilities;
- improvements to benefit the surrounding public realm included the western alleyway focus from the Broadway. The proposed redesign of the service road, which was in Council ownership, sought to improve the entrance to the development and be pedestrian friendly. Although there was not a firm design for vehicular access for traders, improvements to lighting and surface was anticipated;
- further enhancements to include some free parking, pedestrian crossing, and improvements to help north/south integration were planned;
- a condition to prohibit home delivery services from the retail store which would generated heavy traffic was feasible;
- the introduction of an affordable rent would result in a reduction in the amount of affordable housing to 28 or, if a mixed development was implemented, to 22. The affordable housing would be brought forward to Phase 1. Should economic conditions improve, the S106 review mechanism enabled the situation to be reviewed in phase 2;
- the balustrades surrounding the flats would be coloured glazed screens to enable light to pass through. 'hit and miss' brickwork was bricks with gaps. In addition to turfs, the green roofs were examples of bioversity and were controlled by conditions.

#### **DECISION:**

- 1) **GRANTED** permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, subject to referral to the Greater London Authority, the completion of a Section 106 Agreement with the Heads of Terms stated, conditions and informatives reported, as amended by the addendum and with conditions put forward by the Metropolitan police and an informative regarding home deliveries from the retail store as follows:

8. All main entrance doorsets to individual dwellings and communal entrance doorsets shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in PAS 24:2007 or WCL 1 'Security standard for domestic doorsets.
- 9 All window sets on the ground floor of the development and those adjacent to flat roofs or large rainwater pipes (downpipes) shall be made secure to standards, independently certified, set out in BS 7950:1997 or WCL 4 'Security standard for domestic windowsets'.

REASON: To ensure that the development is safe and secure, in accordance with Secured by Design principles and Policy DM2 of the Local Plan.

- 6 No home deliveries shall be carried out from the retail store hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To enable the servicing, highways and amenity impacts of any additional vehicle movements associated with home deliveries from the store to be assessed and considered, in accordance with Policy 6.3 of the London Plan and Policies DM1, DM43 and DM44 of the Local Plan.

- 2) the delegation to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the Section 106 Agreement and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or legal agreement be approved;
- 3) should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed by 1 July 2014, the decision to REFUSE planning permission be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning on the grounds as set out in the report.

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

*Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, Sachin Shah and William Stoodley voted to grant the application*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams abstained.*

## **COLART LTD, WHITEFRIARS AVENUE, HARROW**

Reference: P/3961/13 (Barratt Homes North London). Approval of All Reserved Matters Following Outline Planning Permission for a Comprehensive Mixed Use Development of Land at Former Winsor and Newton Factory and Office Buildings; Demolition of Existing Buildings, The Retention of the Winsor and Newton Former Office Building to be Refurbished for Business and Employment Uses (Use Classes B1(A), B1(B) and B(C)) and New B1 Employment Space Equating to a Total of 2,921sqm; up to 195 New Residential Dwellings (Use Class C3); Safeguarded Area of Land for

Education Use (Use Class D1); Together With New Streets, Public Realm, Parking and Means of Access.

An officer introduced the report, advising Members that the scale perimeters, design codes, height, bulk, scale and general layout perimeters had been approved by the Committee as part of the Outline Planning Permission. Attention was drawn to the addendum. No responses had been received following renotification required due to improvements to landscaping and an increase in landscaping by 56 Whitefriars Avenue.

The Committee was advised that the Section 106 Agreement contained a mechanism to review the housing component as the scheme progressed.

In response to questions, the Committee was informed that:

- there had been an increase in the amount of car parking throughout the development subsequent to that approved under the Outline Plan. The officer indicated the distribution of the parking provision, noting that the parking in the outline application had been illustrative;
- landscaped areas included rear gardens, a public square and, communal areas for flats and blocks of flats. Officers did not consider that balconies or Juliet balconies were necessary on Block D as the site accommodated amenity space;
- new vehicular linkages with Bruce and Ladysmith Roads would be created. The road plan had been analysed at the outset and no physical changes to the highway had been deemed necessary;
- the updated play strategy identified the communal square to the east of the existing Winsor and Newton Building and the landscaped area located in the north eastern corner of the site as local areas for play. A mixture of formal and informal seating areas and soft landscaping would provide a useable space for all potential users;
- a home zone design was intended to calm the area. Textured variations in surfaces and visual elements would make the car less dominant and enhance safety for pedestrians;
- discussions were taking place with Salvatorian College with regard to the area of land set aside for educational use as required by the Section 106 Agreement. The educational use would need to be determined within five years. The security of the land for education use could be secured by an informative;
- in order to separate vehicular and pedestrian safety to the north of the site a boundary treatment was considered necessary;
- discussions with the developer had resulted in a significant enhancement of the amount of landscaping provided and had required a third round of consultation. Siting and landscaping for the

scheme were indicative and the expectation was that sufficient landscaping would enhance the common boundary with 56 Whitefriars Avenue. The representatives from the developer had undertaken to ensure that the privacy of 56 Whitefriars Avenue would be treated adequately.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Patrick Masterson, and the applicant, Rebekah Jubb.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the reserved matters for the development described in the application and submitted plans and **APPROVED** details pursuant to the conditions described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions and informatives, as amended by the addendum and with an additional condition on boundary treatment and an informative to ensure educational space is secure as follows:

Notwithstanding the approved plans, the development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until further details including specifications of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- Boundary treatments including fencing, gates, walls and railings
- Interim landscape/ management strategy including fencing and security for the land to the north of Plot A adjacent to the Salvatorian College.

The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be maintained.

**REASON:** To safeguard the appearance and character of the area and to enhance the appearance of the development in accordance with policy DM22 of The Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

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

#### **WEST END LAWN TENNIS CLUB, CUCKOO HILL ROAD, PINNER**

Reference: P/1425/13 (Roger Hill-Chairman). Installation of New 5 Metre High Floodlight Column with 2 X Luminaries to Court 6; New Luminaries to Existing 5 Metre Column Between Court 5 & 6 (Updated Lighting Information Received).

An officer introduced the report stating that the application had been deferred from the meeting of the Planning Committee on 16 October 2013 to permit the submission of further information regarding cumulative impacts of the proposed lighting, particularly with regard to 18 Cuckoo Hill Road and 2 Northfield Avenue. The report had been updated to take this into account. The Committee noted that site visits had been undertaken in October and the week prior to this meeting so that Members were fully aware of the site circumstances.

Attention was drawn to the addendum which updated consultation responses and added lighting specification. It was noted that the new information had

been assessed by the lighting engineer who was satisfied that the cumulative impact of the lighting would not result in harmful impact or intrusion. It was acknowledged that the format of the plans had been hard to transmit electronically and a hard copy had been made available for those affected.

In response to questions, the Committee was informed that:

- the maintenance of the floodlights and post installation measurements would be controlled by conditions. Environmental Health had the ability to technically measure the configuration;
- the lighting was of a higher level than the existing floodlights. The conditions contained in the appeal decision would be carried forward to the current application.

Clarification was sought as to the difference between the current application and that previously overruled by the Secretary of State.. The officer emphasised that each application had to be considered on its merits. The previous application had not been allowed due to proximity to a house and not to a garden in that it had been directly adjacent to 2 Northfield Avenue within 10 metres of the house and directly in front of the bedroom and side of the property. The appeal was refused by the Planning Inspector and subsequent application resited further south. The current application was in excess of 20 metres rear of 18 Cuckoo Hill Road and some distance from 2 Northfield Avenue.

A Member proposed refusal on the grounds of height, appearance and proximity to a neighbouring property, visually intrusive, contrary to policies DM1 and 48 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan and CS1 of the Core Strategy.

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

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Alan Thackrey and Christine Wallace, and the applicant, Laraine Beaumont.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions and informatives, as amended by the addendum, and with an informative as follows:

The applicant is reminded to ensure that the lighting is only switched on inside of the hours as per condition 3 and switched off when the courts are not in use.

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

*Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, Sachin Shah and William Stoodley voted to grant the application*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against granting the application.*



## **ABBNEYFIELD HOUSE, 32 - 34 WEST END AVENUE, PINNER**

Reference: P/0089/14 (Powerday Plc). Change of Use and Conversion of Care Home to Seven Flats (Use Class C2 to C3); First Floor Rear Extension; Single Storey Rear Extension; Two Storey, First and Second Floor Infill Rear Extensions; Two Rear Dormers; Access Ramps at Front and Rear; External Alterations.

An officer introduced the report and noted that a site visit had taken place. Attention was drawn to Condition 8 regarding the submission of a revised layout to ensure that only units 1 and 4 would be accessed from the side entrance as their principal access with use by units 2, 5 and 7 only in the event of an emergency.

The Committee was informed that only two units had access to amenity space because should all occupants go down the narrow side entrance to the amenity space it would be harmful to the neighbours. The officers were of the view that this was satisfactory given the fact that a park was within easy walking distance.

The officers considered that although the Gross Internal Areas (GIA) for flat number 6 was 4sm under that recommended by the London Plan, the shape and room sizes were acceptable and the small deficiency would not constitute a reason for refusal.

In response to questions, the Committee was informed that:

- a number of properties in West End Avenue had been converted;
- the officers were satisfied with the stacking arrangements;
- parking was normally maximized but the overdominance would leave no amenity space and the proposed arrangement would protect pedestrians.

Members expressed concern at the practicalities of transferring 14 refuse bins from the designated refuse storage area to the front and back again on collection day. The Committee was informed of the condition that the bins should be stored accordingly except on collection day but that any maintenance issues would be the responsibility of environmental health. Palladin bins were too wide for the side entrance. Following discussion, the Committee was of the view that storage to accommodate the bins should be at the front of the property.

The Committee was required to consider a balance between the extant use as a Care Home and residential use bearing in mind the servicing of the residential use.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

- 1) overdevelopment, over intensive use of site, harmful to the amenity of occupiers and neighbouring properties contrary to policies DM1 and DM26 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan and CS1 of the Core Strategy;
- 2) insufficient amenity space for all its occupiers contrary to DM27 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan;
- 3) insufficient parking which would have a detrimental impact on surrounding roads contrary to DM1 and DM26 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan

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

The Committee received representations from an objector, Gerald O'Keefe, and the applicant, John Kelly.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions and informatives, as amended by the addendum and with the deletion of condition 13, and the additional condition and informative as follows:

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall not be occupied until revised plans showing an area that can be used for the storage of bins within the front garden on bin collection days has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The bins shall be stored within this area in the front garden on collection days only and stored in the designated refuse storage areas at the rear at all other times.

**REASON:** To ensure that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway safety in accordance with Policy DM42 and to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is safeguarded in accordance with policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan.

**INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant is reminded to ensure that the designated refuse storage areas are maintained to a high standard in order to mitigate against nuisance to neighbours regarding odour and vermin. Please note that in the event of a complaint this matter would be dealt with by Environmental Health legislation.

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

*Councillors Mrinal Choudhury, Keith Ferry, Sachin Shah and William Stoodley voted to grant the application*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against granting the application.*

**BROADFIELDS SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB, HEADSTONE LANE,  
HARROW**

Reference: P/4030/13 (Harrow Community Sports Ltd). Change of Use of 2.2ha of Land (Formerly used as Playing Fields) to Touring Caravan and Camping Site (75 Pitches); Formation of Accessways; Construction of Reception Building and Waste Disposal Point; Associated Works and Landscaping.

An officer introduced the report, advising that the application was materially similar to the previously withdrawn scheme in respect of the proposed use. A summary of changes to the scheme and supporting information was contained in the report. Attention was drawn to the addendum which included further consultation and responses including a petition with 4228 signatures.

It was noted that due to the requirement for further consultation with site notices and an environment impact assessment the consultation period did not end until 25 April so it was recommended to delegate to the Divisional Director - Planning to determine the application after the end of the consultation period.

The Committee was informed that the proposal was specifically not an appropriate development in the green belt as stated in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF unless there were very special circumstances to outweigh the harm.

With regard to consultees, it was noted that:

- Sport England had maintained their objection. Aerial photographs showed the area to have been laid out as playing fields in the recent past. There had been no clear evidence that the playing fields had not been used during the previous five years;
- English Heritage had maintained its objection and recommended that the failure of the applicant to provide an adequate archaeological be cited as a reason for refusal;
- In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment, the Environmental Agency objected to the grant of planning .permission

**DECISIONS: DELEGATED** authority to the Divisional Director of Planning to **REFUSE** the planning application following the end of the consultation period on 28 April 2014.

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

#### **528. Member Site Visits**

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

#### **529. Any Other Urgent Business - Arrangement of Special Meeting**

The Interim Divisional Director of Planning referred to the decision of the Planning Committee to refuse planning permission on 3 September 2013 for the development at The Hive which had not been built in accordance with planning permission. An enforcement Notice had been served. The officers had recommended refusal on the grounds of the impact of the floodlights and the Committee had agreed two additional reasons for refusal on the grounds of amenity and unacceptable harm to neighbouring properties.

Advice had been sought from two independent planning consultants who were not prepared to provide evidence on the Council's behalf to the planning enquiry. A decision had been taken to withdraw the enforcement notice that afternoon and a Special Meeting was proposed by the officers for the consideration of the current position on the basis of the independent advice. The item was agreed on the grounds of urgency because the Council was required to submit its statement of case by 28 April and the next meeting was not until 30 April.

**RESOLVED:** That a Special Meeting of the Planning Committee be held on Wednesday 16 April 2014 at 6.30 pm to consider an officer report on The Hive Football Centre (Formerly Prince Edward Playing Fields). Camrose Avenue, Edgware.

**530. Extension of Meeting**

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedural Rule 14, a proposal to extend the length of the meeting until 10.30 pm, if necessary, be agreed.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.35 pm, closed at 10.28 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR WILLIAM STOODLEY  
Chairman