

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

21 MARCH 2018

Chair: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors: * June Baxter * Pritesh Patel
* Simon Brown (2) * Mrs Christine Robson
* Stephen Greek * Anne Whitehead

In attendance: Barry Macleod-Cullinane Minute 562
(Councillors) Norman Stevenson Minute 561

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

553. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Ghazanfar Ali

Councillor Simon Brown

554. 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>
Barry Macleod-Cullinane	1/02
Norman Stevenson	1/01

555. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that there were no declarations of interests made by Members.

556. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

557. Public Questions, Petitions & Deputations

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

558. References from Council and other Committees/Panels

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

559. 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, 1/02 and 2/01 on the list of planning applications.

RESOLVED ITEMS

560. Addendum & Supplemental Agenda

RESOLVED: To accept both Addendums and the Supplemental Agenda.

561. 1/01: WAXWELL LANE CAR PARK, WAXWELL LANE, PINNER - P/5680/17

PROPOSAL: *Redevelopment of existing car park to provide 20 three-storey dwellinghouses (use class c3) (14 x 3 bedroom houses & 6 x 4 bedroom houses) associated car & cycle parking, refuse storage, landscaping & replacement boundary treatment*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- traffic surveys had indicated that there were sufficient parking spaces located throughout the local area that could accommodate the displaced vehicles from Waxwell Lane Car Park. The intention of the surveys was to demonstrate the likely impact the development would

have on parking in the area. The surveys were not intended to consider any possible future expansion of the town centre or any additional potential increase in footfall or parking needs. It should be noted that a one-hour restriction on parking in the mornings from 11.00 am -12.00 pm was currently in operation.

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Ms J Waller and Mr K Kirilenko; from Mr Bond, a representative of the applicant; and Councillor Norman Stevenson.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposal will result in an unacceptable loss of public parking and an insufficient level of residential parking provision, causing harm to local economic vitality and local amenity, contrary to policies DM1, DM42 and DM43 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 4.8 and 6.13 of the London Plan.'

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

A Member stated that Pinner was well served by public car parks, on street parking, pay and display bays and added that the station car park offered free parking on weekends.

DECISION: GRANTED,

- (1) planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and as amended by the Addendum and the Supplemental Agenda;
- (2) authority delegated to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of the Shadow Section 106 legal agreement and other enabling legislation and issue of the planning permission.

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

Councillors Simon Brown, Keith Ferry, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.

Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.

562. 1/02: GRANGE FARM ESTATE, HARROW - P/3524/16

PROPOSAL: Hybrid planning application for the comprehensive, phased, redevelopment of the Grange Farm Estate. The development comprises two elements:

- i) Detailed Planning Application for Phase 1 (Plot 2) comprising; Demolition of existing dwellings; Erection of Buildings C, D and E ranging from three to seven storeys in height to provide 89 residential units; Realignment of public highway; Landscaping of public realm; associated parking and cycle parking spaces.
- ii) Outline Application for access only and subject to Design Code (December 2017) in respect of Phases 2 and 3 comprising: Demolition of existing buildings; Erection of buildings on Plots 1 and 3 to 8 of up to max 93.70 metres in height above ordnance survey to provide 485 residential units; Community Centre (up to 1,350sqm) for D1/D2 uses within Plot 9; Community Facility (up to 282sqm) for D1 use within Plot 7.

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- the Ministry of Defence had voiced concerns regarding the height of the cranes that could be used at the site and suggested a condition relating to this be attached in the event planning permission were to be granted. Condition 32 required the applicant to provide details of cranes and other tall construction equipment to the local planning authority for approval;
- if the MOD required additional revisions to be made to the application then this would need to be reported back to the Planning Committee.

The Committee received representations Councillor Barry Macleod-Cullinane.

DECISION: GRANTED,

- (1) authority delegated to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning to finalise the drafting of the planning conditions and Planning Obligations listed within the officer report, and as amended by the Addendum; and
- (2) the application be referred to the Mayor of London (the GLA) as a Stage 2 referral; and
- (3) subject to the Mayor of London (or delegated authorised officer) advising that he is content to allow the Council to determine the application itself and does not wish to direct refusal, or to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purpose of determining the application; and
- (4) that by 24th June 2018 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chairman of the Planning Committee, authority to be given to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the (shadow) section 106 Planning Obligations, other enabling legislation, and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or the Planning Obligations. The

proposed (shadow) section 106 Planning Obligation Heads of Terms cover the matters listed below under Planning Obligations; and

- (5) subject to the withdrawal of the Statutory Objection of the Ministry of Defence, or the applications referral to the Secretary of State as an application not in accordance with the Development Plan.

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

563. 1/03: HATCH END HIGH SCHOOL, HEADSTONE LANE - P/0302/18

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment to provide three storey building for 8 form entry secondary school; associated ground works including provision of soft landscaping and hard landscaping (part demolition of existing single storey teaching block)

DECISION: GRANTED

- (1) planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and as amended by the Addendum.

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

564. 1/04: GLADSTONE WAY AND ADJOINING LAND AND BUILDINGS (INCLUDING PEEL HOUSE CAR PARK, NO. 22 PALMERSTON ROAD AND PALMERSTON ROAD SURFACE CAR PARK) - P/5737/17

PROPOSAL: Full planning application: Redevelopment to create a part four/part six storey building with additional rooftop plant and façade/screen above fifth floor level, to provide approximately 9,362 sqm Gross Internal Area (GIA) of office floorspace (Use Class B1) and associated civic facilities, incorporating a semi basement car park (34 spaces) /plant area, a surface level car park (57 spaces) associated public realm and landscaping works, incorporating service bays, a cycle parking pavilion/ other cycle parking.

Outline planning application: Construction of a building for a place of worship and ancillary residential use (Use Class D1 (h)) between one and three storeys in height with a single basement level to provide floorspace between 321 and VL (GIA) together with public realm and landscaping works, incorporating surface level car parking (2 accessible spaces) and cycle parking (with all matters reserved)

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- the Transitional Travel Plan would allow time for staff to adapt to the new arrangements and to travel to work by alternative methods;
- evidence from the staff travel survey had informed the Travel Needs Assessment. In accordance with the Mayor of London's Transport

Strategy, officers were working closely with Transport for London (TfL) to encourage modal shift. It should be noted that the proposed site was located in a high PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) area, and a number of local transport initiatives would mitigate against the loss of parking spaces at the current civic centre site. These included the provision of a car pool scheme at the new Civic Centre, three additional Highways projects planned in the vicinity of the proposed new Civic Centre, a bus priority scheme, the implementation of a 'quietways' cycle route to Wembley and Central London and a 'Liveable Neighbourhoods' funding bid to improve the rates of walking and cycling in the area;

- parking at the current Civic Centre site would continue to be available during the initial stages of construction of the new site but these would be gradually phased out. Officers were also looking into additional parking options in the area as part of the Transitional Travel Plan;
- the Town Centre parking survey had indicated the need for 60 spaces. There were 57 spaces available in the Town Centre and an additional 12 spaces in surrounding streets, which exceeded the requirements. The Survey had factored in projected increase in parking, assessed parking spaces available in other parts of Wealdstone and how this would affect local businesses and residents. The Banqueting Suite would be impacted by the loss of parking to some degree and the Council was in discussions with the owner of the Banqueting Suite regarding how to mitigate against this;
- in terms of design, the intention was that the new Civic Centre building should be a vibrant landmark building that would stand out in the local context and its design would re-inforce its civic purpose. The proposed massing and scale were sympathetic to the local context. The green ceramic tile proposed for the façade had been chosen in reference to Harrow being a 'leafy green' borough. The suitability of the ceramic tile would be further assessed at the conditions stage for longevity, but it should be noted that there were several other precedents of its use in public buildings;
- the proposed development would not adversely impact on any locally protected views;
- a full Transport Assessment had been carried out in the Wealdstone area which indicated that the impact of future regeneration on surrounding junctions would be nominal and no further modelling impacts were required for this application. A new transport corridor, inclusive of bus and cycle only lanes in a section of Canning Road and other planned changes to the Highway Network in the area would facilitate the Regeneration Process and alleviate traffic congestion in the area.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

1. The proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of public parking and an inadequate level of on-site parking provision for its users, with a lack of sufficient travel planning to mitigate this, causing harm to local economic vitality, local amenity and highway safety, contrary to policies DM1, DM42, DM43 and DM46 of the Local Plan, AAP3 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 4.8 and 6.13 of the London Plan.
2. The proposal would result in a poor quality of design, causing harm to local character and heritage assets, and would lack sufficient quality to justify the provision of a tall building, contrary to policies DM1, DM3 and DM6 of the Local Plan, AAP6 and AAP8 of the Harrow and Wealdstone Area Action Plan, CS1 and CS2 of the Core Strategy, and 7.4, 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 of the London Plan.
3. The proposal would have an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, contrary to policies DM1 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy, and the Residential Design Guide SPD.

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

DECISION: GRANTED

RECOMMENDATION A

- (1) the reasons for approval as set out in the officer report be agreed and as amended by the Addendum and the Supplemental Agenda; and
- (2) the application be referred to the Mayor of London (the GLA) as a Stage 2 referral; and
- (3) subject to the Mayor of London (or delegated authorised officer) advising that he is content to allow the Council to determine the case itself and does not wish to direct refusal, or to issue a direction under Article 7 that he does not wish to direct refusal, or to issue a direction under Article 7 that he is to act as the Local Planning Authority for the purposes of determining the application delegate authority to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning to issue the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions (set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report) or the Committee resolutions.

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

Councillors Simon Brown, Keith Ferry, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.

Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.

565. 2/01: 1 COLMER PLACE, HARROW - P/5660/17

PROPOSAL: Conversion of dwelling into three flats; first floor side extension; single storey rear extension; single storey front infill extension; external alterations; bin and cycle stores

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- the floorspace and width of the first floor flat complied with the minimum requirements of the London Plan;
- currently the property was a single family dwelling house with a single parking space and there would be no changes to this provision. The parking allocated at the proposed development was within London Plan guidelines. Additionally, the width of the space at the front of the property would not accommodate additional parking spaces. The limited parking provision was in keeping with the Mayor of London's plans to encourage modal shift in London through the use of more sustainable forms of transport.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Mr Western and from, Mr Modi, the applicant.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

'The proposal is an over-development and over-intensive use of the site, with insufficient parking provision, and which fails to meet minimum bedroom and storage space standards, to the detriment of local character and the amenities of neighbours and future occupiers, contrary to policies DM1 and DM42 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy, and 3.5C, 6.13, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan.'

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

DECISION: GRANTED

- (1) planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and as amended by the Addendums.

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

Councillors Simon Brown, Keith Ferry, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.

Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.

566. 2/02: BUCKINGHAM HOUSE EAST, BUCKINGHAM PARADE, THE BROADWAY, STANMORE - P/4904/17

PROPOSAL: Creation of additional third floor to existing building to provide an additional 9 self contained flats (Use Class C3).

DECISION: GRANTED,

RECOMMENDATION A

Granted planning permission subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of the Section 106 legal agreement and other enabling legislation and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions (set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report) or the legal agreement.

RECOMMENDATION B

That if the Section 106 Agreement is not completed by 21st of June 2018, or as such extended period as may be agreed by the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, then it is recommended to delegate the decision to **REFUSE** planning permission to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning.

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

567. 2/03: UNIT 4, PHOENIX WAY, CORNWALL ROAD - P/5202/17

PROPOSAL: *Redevelopment to provide two storey office building (Class B1); Parking; Refuse storage*

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that condition 9 sought to restrict any future permitted development rights associated with the application.

DECISION: GRANTED,

planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report, and as amended by the Addendums and the Supplemental Agenda.

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

568. 2/04: CARNEGIE HOUSE, 21 PETERBOROUGH ROAD - P/5102/17

PROPOSAL: *Three and four storey side extension from first floor level to provide 7 flats; Refuse and cycle storage.*

DECISION: GRANTED

RECOMMENDATION A

Granted planning permission subject to authority being delegated to the Divisional Director of Regeneration, Enterprise and Planning in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of the Section 106 legal agreement and other enabling legislation and issue of the planning permission and subject to minor amendments to the conditions (set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report) or the legal agreement, and as amended by the Addendums.

RECOMMENDATION B

That if, by 24th April 2018 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Divisional Director of Planning, 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 unanimous.

569. 2/05: 11 ELMS ROAD, HARROW WEALD - P/0106/18

PROPOSAL: Re-Development To Provide A Two Storey Building For Six Flats; Parking; Landscaping; Separate And Communal Amenity Space; Bin / Cycle Storage

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- Condition 10 required the applicant to submit a landscape and management plan;
- the proposal currently showed the refuse storage in a container near the front of the site. Condition 6 required the applicant to submit further details regarding this;
- the number of parking and cycle spaces proposed at the site was compliant with the requirements of the London Plan and the site was located within a PTAL 3.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

1. The proposed building, by reason of its excessive scale, bulk and massing would give rise to a form of development which would be disproportionate, incongruous and overly dominant, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene, and the visual amenities of the area, contrary to policies 7.4 B and 7.6.B of The London Plan 2016, policies CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013

and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010;

2. The proposed redevelopment to six flats would be an over-intensive use of the site, and would have an insufficient level of parking provision, to the detriment of local character and amenity, contrary to policies DM1 and DM42 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy, and 6.13, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan.'

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

DECISION: GRANTED, planning permission, subject to the additional condition below agreed by the Committee:

The development hereby approved shall not be first occupied until a scheme for the on-going management and maintenance of all the hard and soft landscaping within the development, to include a Landscape Management Plan, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules to include details of the arrangement for the implementation for all landscape areas including the communal residential garden (other than small, privately owned, domestic gardens), shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. Details shall also include schedule of landscape maintenance for year 1, years 2-5 and on-going maintenance from year 6 onwards. The Landscape Management Plan shall be carried out in a timely manner as approved.

REASON: To safeguard the appearance and character of the area, and to enhance the appearance of the development, and to ensure that the development makes provision for hard and soft landscaping which contributes to the creation of a high quality, accessible, safe and attractive communal garden.

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

Councillors Simon Brown, Keith Ferry, Christine Robson and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.

Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.33 pm, closed at 9.35 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chair