

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 13 JUNE 2018

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Ghazanfar Ali \* Anjana Patel  
\* Stephen Greek \* Kiran Ramchandani (4)  
\* Graham Henson \* Bharat Thakker

\* Denotes Member present

(4) Denotes category of Reserve Members

#### 27. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Christine Robson

Councillor Kiran Ramchandani

#### 28. Right of Members to Speak

**RESOLVED:** That no Members, who were not members of the Committee, had indicated that they wished to speak at the meeting.

#### 29. Declarations of Interest

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

### **30. Reasons for Lateness & Urgency**

**RESOLVED:** That the reasons be noted.

### **31. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2018 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

page 4, paragraph 8, line 1: replace the words Bharat Patel with Bharat Thakker.

### **32. Public Questions**

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

### **33. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 16 (Part 4B of the Constitution), the following deputation be received:

‘To seek better protection for County Roads residents from the impact of terraced houses being turned into HMOs without planning scrutiny.’

The depute made the following points:

- the Council’s Planning Policy should be designed to protect and promote social cohesion and neighbourhoods;
- he lived in Headstone South Ward, which was 50% more densely populated than the national average and four times higher than in Harrow on the Hill Ward. This increase in density was largely due to the increasing number of HMOs (houses in multiple occupation) in the area. The Council had powers to scrutinise HMOs in Harrow on the Hill Ward and the granting of HMOs in Harrow on the Hill Ward was restricted and the same protections should be afforded to all Wards in Harrow;
- 15 out of 58 properties on his road were HMOs, which equated to a quarter of the street;
- some local authorities which required applicants to seek planning permission had opted to place a cap of 10% on the number of HMOs and Harrow should consider doing the same;
- HMOs contributed to overcrowding, loss of amenity space and had an adverse impact on traffic and parking, community cohesion, anti social behaviour, litter and waste disposal;
- he sought assurances from the Council that it would not be licensing large HMOs and would restrict the number of small HMOs and that the

planning service and the licensing service would take a co-ordinated approach when dealing with this issue;

- some local authorities in London, for example, Barnet and Enfield required landlords to seek planning permission for all HMOs;
- the Council could seek to implement an article 4 Direction to limit the number of HMOs in the borough.

An officer advised that she would look into to each of the points raised, including whether an Article 4 Direction would be appropriate in relation to small HMOs. She confirmed that the Planning & Licensing services worked closely together when licensing and dealing with HMOs and that the enforcement team would investigate any unauthorised conversions. She added that she would send a detailed response the points raised by the depute after the meeting.

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

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

#### **35. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept the addendum.

#### **36. 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**

#### **37. 1-01: Kilby's Industrial Estate, Bacon Lane - P/5810/17**

**PROPOSAL:** Redevelopment to provide 24 houses; associated landscaping and parking; refuse storage

Following questions and comments from Members, officers advised that:

- the Council recognised that not all new developments could provide a quota of affordable housing. The financial viability assessment submitted by the applicant had been reviewed independently by experts (this was standard practice for planning authorities), and she had every confidence in this process. The review had concluded that the proposed development could reasonably provide a financial contribution of £110,000 in lieu of on site provision. This contribution would help the Council to provide housing in the borough, for example, by bringing long-term vacant properties back into use. Furthermore, the viability review mechanism would allow the financial contribution to be re-assessed at a later date;

- the alleyway referred to by an objector to the scheme was not within the development site;
- condition 5 related to permitted development rights, and the applicant would require planning permission to convert any of the units into HMOs. This restricted the use from being anything other than a 'dwellinghouse' without applying for permission;
- no landscaping was proposed at the entrance to the site so as to not obstruct views for vehicles entering and exiting the site;
- the restricted width of the access road meant that it would not support two lanes. There was sufficient space between the two terraces for emergency vehicles to turn around.

Members expressed the view that this was an excellent scheme which would replace a derelict site with a new development that would provide much needed family homes.

The Committee received representations from an objector, Mr Welby and from, Ms Hanslip, the applicant's agent.

## **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 29<sup>th</sup> August 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.*

**38. 2-01: 30 Westwood Avenue - P/1654/18**

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of a single storey rear extension.

**DECISION: GRANTED**, planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.18 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair