

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 24 JUNE 2015

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Ghazanfar Ali (1) \* Graham Henson  
\* June Baxter \* Pritesh Patel  
\* Stephen Greek \* Mrs Christine Robson (2)

**In attendance:** Susan Hall Minute 133  
**(Councillors)** Ameet Jogia Minute 133

\* Denotes Member present  
(1) and (2) Denote category of Reserve Members

#### 126. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Nitin Parekh  
Councillor Anne Whitehead

Reserve Member

Councillor Mrs Christine Robson  
Councillor Ghazanfar Ali

#### 127. 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:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Planning Application</u>
Susan Hall	1/01
Ameet Jogia	2/03

## **128. Declarations of Interest**

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

### Agenda Item 11 – Planning Applications Received

Councillor Ghazanfar Ali declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Council appointed Trustee of Victoria Hall. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Stephen Greek declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Council appointed representative on Harrow Weald Common Board of Conservators. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Pritesh Patel declared a non-pecuniary interest in that he was a Council appointed representative on Harrow Weald Common Board of Conservators. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

## **129. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2015 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## **130. Public Questions, Petitions & Deputations**

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

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

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

## **132. 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 1/01 on the list of planning applications.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 133. 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.

#### 1/01 - 51 COLLEGE ROAD, HARROW

Reference: P/0737/15 (The Hyde Group) Description: Redevelopment Of The Former Harrow Post Office To Provide 318 Flats (Class C3), 862 Sq. Metres Floor space For Retail (Class A1), Financial & Professional Services (Class A2), Restaurants And Cafes (Class A3), Pubs And Bars (Class A4), Hot Food Take-Aways (Class A5), Business (Class B1) And Non Residential Institutions (Class D1) Uses And 1,672 Sq. Metres Floor space For Library (Class D1) Use In Buildings Of Up To 20 Storeys (134.5 Metres AOD) In Height; 2,413 Sq. Metres Public Realm Including New Public Square; Basement And Surface Servicing And Parking (Total 50 Car Spaces, 3 Motorcycle Spaces And 521 Cycle Spaces); Principal Vehicular Access From Station Road And William Carey Way. Proposal Also Includes Combined Heat & Power Plant; Hard And Soft Landscaping, Balconies And Roof Gardens; And Demolition Of Former Post Office Buildings. (Resident Permit Restricted)

Following an overview of the report and following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- there had been extensive, pre-application discussions with Council officers and officers of the Greater London Authority (GLA). Both the GLA and the Council's Design & Regeneration officer were of the view that the development would meet the requirements for the design quality of tall buildings as set out in the London Plan and the Harrow & Wealdstone Area Action Plan;
- an independent consultant has confirmed that the proposal would not harm any of the locally protected views. The architectural quality of the development meant that the proposal would display outstanding qualities which would add visual interest to the overall composition of a number of the views. Officers considered that the proposal would result in an enhancement to the views from The Grove open space, Old Redding and Wood Farm;
- the less than substantial harm that has been identified in respect of heritage assets, as identified in the report, has been carefully

considered in relation to the local planning authorities statutory heritage duties and the very significant social and economic benefits of the development;

- the provision of a central library in the Town Centre, was a key aspect of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which was prepared to underpin the preparation of the Local Plan;
- separate conditions are proposed to deal with foul (as recommended by Thames Water) and surface water (as recommended by the Council's drainage team) drainage;
- a limited number of parking spaces would be available and prospective buyers would be made aware of this. In Planning Policy terms and in particular the London Plan, it was important to drive down car-use. Allocating more parking spaces would be likely to elicit objections from the GLA and TfL. For visitors to the non-residential floor space within the development there would be sufficient parking available locally at the St Ann's, St George's and the Council's car parks and there is good public transport links in the area, which made the site easily accessible. There would be cycle parking available for staff working in the retail units and there was a dedicated loading bay area for commercial and other deliveries. Additionally, the carriageway into the site from William Carey Way would be widened and tracking runs had demonstrated that vehicles would be able to turn around and drive out of William Carey Way in forward gear;
- all objections relating to harming of locally protected views had been addressed in the officer report. In terms of opportunities to create a new view, St Mary's Church on Harrow-on-the Hill would be visible from the mezzanine level of the proposed library;
- following a meeting between representatives of the Ministry of Defence (MoD) and Council officers, the MOD has agreed to review its calculations regarding whether the proposed development would affect navigation equipment and the extent of any residual effect. If an objection is maintained by the MOD, then there was a statutory mechanism in place for dealing with this, which would have to be followed.

The Chair stated it was the responsibility of the Committee to consider the application in its current form and to judge it on its merits. If the MOD did not withdraw its objection, then the applicant may chose to submit an amended version of the proposal at a later date, which would also need to be considered on its merits.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Mrs Wears, and from a representative of the Applicant, Mr Connell.

A Member proposed a motion for refusal on the following grounds:

1. The proposal would be an overdevelopment, with excessive and overbearing bulk, mass, scale and intensity, to the detriment of local character and amenity, including local Conservation Areas, Areas of Special Character, Metropolitan Open Land and other heritage assets, contrary to policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan, CS 1 of the Core Strategy and AAP 1, AAP 4, DM 1, DM 6 and DM 7 of the Local Plan.
2. The proposal fails to meet the test of exceptional design quality in order to merit a tall building on this site or its position within protected viewing corridors at Old Redding and Wood Farm. It would therefore appear over dominant in the skyline and harm the primacy and views of St Mary's Spire, Harrow on the Hill and Harrow Weald Ridge, failing to protect, conserve or enhance these views and heritage assets. This would be contrary to policies 7.7 of the London Plan, CS 1 and CS 2 of the Core Strategy, and AAP 6, DM 1 and DM 3 of the Local Plan.
3. The proposal fails to provide sufficient community benefit to justify the proposed tall buildings, as required in the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan, contrary to policy AAP 6 of the Local Plan.
4. The proposal fails to meet internal space standards in all housing units, contrary to policy 3.5 of the London Plan, policy CS1 of the Core Strategy and policy DM1 of the Local Plan.
5. The proposal fails to adequately mitigate the impact of additional traffic and loss of existing parking spaces within William Carey Way, contrary to policies 6.12 of the London Plan and CS 1 of the Core Strategy.
6. The development would cause adverse interference with the operations of Northolt Airport, contrary to policy 7.7 of the London Plan.

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

#### **DECISION: GRANTED**

#### **RECOMMENDATION A**

**GRANTED** planning permission subject to the following conditions, as amended by the addendum:

- (i) the withdrawal by the Ministry of Defence of its objection or referral to the Secretary of State;
- (ii) referral to the Greater London Authority (GLA);
- (iii) conditions; and
- (iv) the completion of a section 106 Planning Obligation;

by 24th September or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chairman of the Planning Committee

## **RECOMMENDATION B**

That if, by 24th September 2015 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chairman of the Planning Committee, the section 106 Planning Obligation is not completed, then delegate the decision to the Divisional Director of Planning to REFUSE planning permission for the appropriate reason.

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Graham Henson and Christine Robson voted for the application.*

### **1/02 - CUMBERLAND HOTEL, 1 - 3 ST JOHNS ROAD, HARROW**

Reference: P/0586/15 (Origin Housing) Description: Demolition Of Existing Hotel Buildings (Use Class C1) And Phased Redevelopment Of The Site To Provide 123 Residential Flats (Use Class C3) Including Affordable Housing Within Two Blocks With Basement And Ranging From Five To Nine Storeys In Height; A Pedestrian Link Between Sheepcote Road And St John's Road With Associated Landscaping, Raised Planters, Boundary Treatment, Entrance Gates; New Vehicle Crossover With Access Drive On Sheepcote Road (Reinstatement Of Existing Vehicle Access Points), Associated Mechanical And Ventilation Plant, Refuse Stores, Bicycle And Car Parking Spaces; Pv Panels.

Following questions from Members, an officer advised that:

- the layout and orientation of the buildings and separation distance to neighbouring properties was deemed to be satisfactory to protect the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers;
- any climatic impact had been fully assessed and the development would act as a wind breaker, rather than create a wind tunnel;
- there was no requirement to carry out an urban heat study;
- the ground floor of the development would be given over to town centre use and would meet the requirements of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan (2013);
- granting the application would not prejudice any possible future re-development of the neighbouring Victoria Hall site;
- any safety and security issues would be addressed through condition 9.

Following a question from a Member, the Chair stated that it was the Committee's remit to consider the merits of the application submitted and the effects of any possible future development of neighbouring sites were not pertinent.

**DECISION: GRANTED**

**RECOMMENDATION A**

**GRANTED** permission subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of the Section 106 legal agreement and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement, as amended by the addendum.

**RECOMMENDATION B**

That if, by 24th September 2015 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chairman of the Planning Committee, the section 106 Planning Obligation is not completed, then delegate the decision to the Divisional Director of Planning to REFUSE planning permission for the appropriate reason.

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Graham Henson and Christine Robson voted for the application.*

**2/01 - 94 CROSHOTT AVENUE, STANMORE**

Reference: P/1320/15 (Mr Denis Maharjan) Description: First Floor Side To Rear Extension; Front Porch; Extension To Hipped Roof

**DECISION: GRANTED** planning permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to conditions:

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

**2/02 - 1 JOHN LAMB COURT, THE BYE WAY, WEALDSTONE**

Reference: P/1961/15 (London Borough Of Harrow Housing Services) Description: Conversion With Two Storey Side Extension To Warden Accommodation To Two Flats (Class C3); Use Of Existing Two Storey Projection On Side Of Wardens House As Office/Reception On Ground Floor And Respite Room On First Floor; Linked Canopy Over Two Car Parking Spaces; Bin & Cycle Stores; Canopy Over Entrance To Flat 1a; External Alterations; Landscaping

**DECISION: GRANTED** planning permission under regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to conditions.

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

## **2/03 - 28 PANGBOURNE DRIVE, STANMORE**

Reference: P/1525/15 (Mr M Patel) Description: Conversion Of Dwelling house To Two Flats With Amenity Space And Parking; Single Storey Rear Extension; External Alterations

Following questions from Members, an officer advised that:

- the scheme was policy-compliant. Maintenance of the frontage, which did not fall within the remit of the Planning Committee, would be covered either by the lease or tenancy agreements. Any issues relating to the maintenance of the frontage would be covered under s 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990;
- notification letters had been sent to neighbouring properties, however, residents had contacted their local Ward Councillor to say that these had not been received. The Council regretted this, however, the Council could demonstrate that it had undertaken its statutory responsibility with regard to the despatch of the letters. There was an ongoing investigation into why the letters had not been received by neighbouring residents and the outcome of the investigation would be reported to Members. Nevertheless, comments had been received from the residents of neighbouring properties and these had been taken into consideration;
- granting the application would not set a precedent for this type of development as the Planning Committee was obliged to consider each planning application on its merits.

A Member proposed a motion for refusal on the following grounds:

The proposal would result in an over-intensive conversion and a loss of family housing, to the detriment of the established character of the locality, the housing needs of the area and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan, CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy, and DM 1, DM 24, and DM 26 of the Harrow Local Plan.

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

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



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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, Graham Henson and Mrs Christine Robson voted for the application.*

## **2/04 - 6 AYLWARDS RISE STANMORE HA7 3EH**

Reference: P/0959/15 (Mr & Mrs A Sharma) Description: Variation Of Condition 2 (Materials To Match Existing) Of Planning Permission P/1767/12 Dated 17/04/2014 Granted On Appeal Under Reference App/M5450/D/13/2193372; To Read The External Finishes Of The Development Hereby Permitted Shall Be As Shown On Drawing Number 150304-01 Unless Otherwise Agreed In Writing By The Local Planning Authority And Condition 5 (Approved Drawings) Planning Permission P/1767/12 Dated 30/11/12 Granted On Appeal On The 17/04/13 Under Reference App/M5450/D/13/2193372; To Read The Development Hereby Permitted Shall Be Carried Out In Accordance With The Drawings Numbered 150304-01 And 110308-01.

A Member proposed a motion to defer this item for a further site visit. The motion was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

**DECISION: GRANTED** planning permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to condition(s), as amended by the addendum.

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

*Councillors Ghazanfar Ali, Keith Ferry, and Mrs Christine Robson voted for the application. The Chair used his casting vote.*

### **134. Member Site Visits**

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

### **135. Any Other Urgent Business**

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.49 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair