

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 2 SEPTEMBER 2020

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Marilyn Ashton \* Simon Brown  
\* Peymana Assad (3) \* Anjana Patel  
\* Christopher Baxter \* Christine Robson (1)

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

#### 389. 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 Peymana Assad

Councillor Sachin Shah

Councillor Christine Robson

#### 390. 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.

### **391. Declarations of Interest**

**RESOLVED:** To note that:

1) the Declarations of Interests published in advance of the meeting on the Council's website were taken as read; and

2) the following interests were declared at the meeting:

a) Agenda Item 2/02, Pinner Park Primary School Melbourne Avenue Pinner HA5 5TJ - P/1614/20

Councillor Christine Robson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was the Portfolio Holder for Young People and Schools. She would remain in the meeting whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

b) Agenda Item 2/04, Nower Hill High School, George V Avenue Pinner HA5 5RP - P/1190/20

Councillor Christine Robson declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was the Portfolio Holder for Young People and Schools. She would remain in the meeting whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

c) Agenda Item 3/02, Mallory, Priory Drive, Stanmore, HA7 3HN - P/1463/20

Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a non-pecuniary interest in that she was acquainted with the applicant.

### **392. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

### **393. Public Questions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no public questions were put.

### **394. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no petitions were received.

### **395. Deputations**

**RESOLVED:** To note that no deputations were received.

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

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

**397. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept the Addendum, and two Supplemental Addendums.

**398. 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 Agenda items 2/05, 2/08, 2/09, 3/01, and 3/02 on the list of planning applications.

**[Note: Planning application 3/02 was subsequently deferred, and representations were not received.]**

**RESOLVED ITEMS**

**399. 2/01 - Roger Bannister Sports Centre, Uxbridge Road Harrow Weald HA3 6SP - P/1776/20**

**PROPOSAL:** enlargement of vehicle access (retrospective) (as amended by the Addendum and Supplemental Addendum).

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed that planning permission be granted for 18 months. The motion was seconded, put to the vote, and agreed.

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject, for 18 months, to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

**DECISION: GRANT**

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application, for 18 months, was unanimous.*

**400. 2/02 - Pinner Park Primary School, Melbourne Avenue, Pinner HA5 5TJ - P/1614/20**

**PROPOSAL:** a single storey front and side extension to sports hall building (as amended by the Addendum).

The Committee resolved to accept the officer recommendation.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

## **DECISION: GRANT**

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

### **401. 2/03 - Street Record, Elizabeth Gardens, Stanmore HA7 4TE - P/2408/20**

**PROPOSAL:** prior approval of details and siting for installation of 20m high Phase 8 Monopole with wraparound cabinet at base; three equipment cabinets and associated works for 5G Network (as amended by the Addendum and Supplemental Addendum).

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal on the following grounds:

- 1) the proposed telecommunications mast, by reason of its excessive height and noticeable location, would be visually obtrusive in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenities and character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DM1 and DM49 of the Harrow Development Management Policies local plan 2013.

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

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) grant prior approval of details of siting and appearance for the development described in the application and submitted plans.

## **DECISION: GRANT**

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

*Councillors Assad, Brown, Ferry and Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Ashton and Patel voted against.*

*Councillor Baxter abstained from voting.*

**402. 2/04 - Nower Hill High School, George V Avenue, Pinner HA5 5RP - P/1190/20**

**PROPOSAL:** single storey front and side extension to sports hall building (as amended by the Addendum).

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**403. 2/05 - 1 Canons Park Close, Donnefield Avenue, Edgware HA8 6RJ - P/1277/20**

**PROPOSAL:** creation of an additional floor to create 8 flats (8 x 1 bed); parking and cycle storage; refuse storage.

The Committee received written representation from Mr K R Chainani (objector). In the statement, which was read by Chair, the objector outlined his reasons for seeking refusal of the application.

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee is asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report, and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**404. 2/06 - 350 High Road High Road, Harrow HA3 6HF - P/1069/20**

**PROPOSAL:** first floor rear extension; rear dormer; creation of 8 additional flats to first and second floors; external alterations.

Following a question from a Member, an officer advised that:

- the size of rooms in the flats conformed to the London Plan.

The Committee resolved to approve officer recommendation.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

### **DECISION: GRANT**

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

#### **405. 2/07 - Hermitage Gate, Clamp Hill Stanmore HA7 3JP - P/1426/20**

**PROPOSAL:** two storey side to rear extension; detached double car port; installation of 1.6m to 2m high brick pier boundary wall; installation of wrought iron pedestrian and vehicle access gates to front; relocation of pedestrian and vehicle access; external alterations (demolition of detached double garage; plant room; changing rooms, swimming pool and tennis courts) (as amended by the Addendum).

The planning application was reported to the Planning Committee with a recommendation for refusal on 22 July 2020. However, Members resolved to be minded to grant planning permission. In accordance with the Protocol on Planning Committee Meetings (7.2), the application was deferred to the next meeting held on September 2020.

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Should the Planning Committee still be minded to grant planning permission, the Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree conditions and grant the application subject to the conditions set out at Appendix 1 of the report.

### **DECISION: GRANT**

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

#### **406. 2/08 - 42 Roxeth Hill, Harrow HA2 0JW - P/1715/20**

**PROPOSAL:** single storey rear extension (demolition of conservatory) (as amended by the Addendum).

The Committee received representations from Tina Hussein (objector) and Mallika Vaja (applicant). Both speakers outlined their reasons for seeking refusal, and approval, of the application, respectively.

Councillor Marilyn Ashton proposed refusal on the following grounds:

- 1) the proposed extension, by reason of its height and scale, would appear visually obtrusive and would give rise to a loss of outlook and overbearing impact to the rear protected windows and amenity space of 44 Roxeth Hill, thereby doing harm to the amenities of the neighbouring property, contrary to policies, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, D1 of the Draft London Plan 2019 and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Roxeth Hill Conservation Area, contrary to the Roxeth Hill Character Appraisal and Management Strategy.

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

The Committee resolved to approve the officer recommendation.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the report.

## **DECISION: GRANT**

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

*Councillors Assad, Brown, Ferry and Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel voted against.*

### **407. 2/09 - Land Rear of 259 Pinner Road, Harrow HA1 4HF - P/4355/19**

**PROPOSAL:** redevelopment to provide three storey building comprising of seven flats (6 x 2 bed; and 1 x 1 bed); bin and cycle stores (as amended by the Addendum).

The Committee received representations from Asif Mohammed (objector) and Sarah King (applicant). The Chair read the written statement from Asif Mohammed. Both objector and applicant outlined their reasons for seeking refusal, and approval, of the application, respectively.

The Committee resolved to approve officer recommendations.

## **RECOMMENDATION A**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) agree the reasons for approval as set out in the report; and
- 2) grant planning permission subject to the conditions in Appendix 1 of the report and the Addendum and subject to authority being delegated to the Interim Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the completion of a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other powers with the following Heads of Terms:
  - a. development to be Resident Permit Restricted - with the exception of disabled persons, no resident of the development would obtain a Residents' Parking Permit within the Controlled Parking Zone;
  - b. an additional £1,500 contribution towards the cost of amending the traffic order; and
  - c. legal fees - payment of Harrow Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the legal agreement.

## **RECOMMENDATION B**

That if, by 22 October 2020 or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Interim Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the section 106 Planning Obligation was not completed, then delegate the decision to the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission for the appropriate reason. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to ensure a car-free development through the restriction of resident parking permits for future occupiers of the proposed dwellings, would result in increased parking stress in the locality, in a sustainable location, to the detriment of the Council's aim to reduce reliance on the private motor car in sustainable locations. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2016), Policy T6 of the Draft London Plan (2019) Policy CS1.R of the Core Strategy (2012), and policies DM42, DM43 and DM50 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

## **DECISION: GRANT**

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

*Councillors Assad, Brown, Ferry and Robson voted for the application.*

*Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel abstained from voting on the application.*



**408. 3/01 - The Hive Football Centre, Prince Edwards Playing Fields, Camrose Avenue, Edgware HA8 6AG - P/1564/20**

**PROPOSAL:** outline application for Access Only - redevelopment to provide four storey building with basement comprising of sporting higher education facility, student accommodation, hotel, medical diagnostic centre; plant and associated works (as amended by the Addendum and Supplemental Addendum).

In accordance with the Protocol on Planning Committee Meetings (7.2), the Committee received representations from Mr Sean McGrath (for the applicant). He outlined reasons for seeking refusal of the officer recommendations, and subsequently requesting that the application be granted.

The Chair proposed that the Committee be minded to disagree with officer recommendations, and that the application be brought back to Committee for determination at a later date.

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

The Committee resolved to refuse the officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION A**

The Planning Committee was asked to refuse the application for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed uses comprising of a hotel, sporting higher education facility including student accommodation and medical diagnostics centre would give rise to inappropriate uses on the site which would be in direct conflict with the site's allocation for community outdoor sport development and by reason of the site's low accessibility, sitting outside of a town centre and insufficient evidence to demonstrate the need for the uses proposed, would give rise to an unsustainable development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 3.16, 3.19 and 4.5 of The London Plan (2016), policies S5, E10G, SD7, S1 and S3B of The Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), core policies CS1 Z, F and L of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policies DM 34, DM 46 and DM 48B of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and Site MOS5 of the Harrow Site Allocations (2013);
- 2) The proposed development would result in a direct loss of protected designated open space and would not provide a use which is ancillary or appropriate to the existing open space, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.18 of The London Plan (2016), policy G4 of The Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), core policy CS1 F of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM18 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);

- 3) The proposed development, in the absence of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, fails to demonstrate the impacts of the development on the surrounding highway network, and to propose measures to promote sustainable travel modes and to reduce the effects of travel by car. Insufficient information has therefore been provided to demonstrate that the proposals would not result in unacceptable harm to the surrounding highway network through increased pressure on local parking amenity and on local transport infrastructure from excessive vehicle trips, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 6.3, 6.10 and 6.13 of The London Plan (2016), policies T1, T2, T4, and T6 of the Draft London Plan – Intend to Publish (2019), policy 1 of the Mayor’s Transport Strategy, policy CS1 R of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM 42 and DM 43 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 4) The proposed development, in the absence of a Preliminary Ecological Assessment and the site’s close proximity to the adjoining Borough Grade I Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and the River Brent, fails to demonstrate that biodiversity value of the surrounding area would not be harmed, protected or enhanced, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.19 of The London Plan (2019), policy G6 of the Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019), and policies DM 48 A b, DM 20 and DM 21 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 5) The proposal, by reason of an unsatisfactory Flood Risk Assessment, fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would result in a net reduction in flood risk, be resistant and resilient to flooding, would not exacerbate the risk of flooding within the site or increase the risk and consequences of flooding elsewhere or provide a dry means of escape for the future users, to the detriment of the safety of the adjoining occupiers and the future users of the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 5.12 and 5.13 of The London Plan (2016), policies SI12 and SI 13 of the Draft London Plan (2019), Core Policy CS1 U of Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policies DM 9 and DM 10 of the Harrow Development management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 6) The proposed development, by reason of the indicated heights and conflicting floorspace figures proposed, would be likely to result in a harmful, bulky and unduly dominant addition to the site which would significantly detract from the open character of the site and the surroundings, and would fail to respect the existing development on the site or contribute positively to the site’s setting and the quality of the open space, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of The London Plan (2017), policies D1 and D3 of the Draft London Plan (2019), core policy CS 1 B and F of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy DM 18 C/D of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);
- 7) The proposed development, by reason of the excessive amount of development proposed, the proposed uses and the absence of a Noise

Assessment or Lighting Impact Assessment, would give rise to unacceptable harmful outlook and visual impacts, as well as potential unreasonable noise and disturbance impacts from the increased intensity of use of the site, to the detriment of the residential and visual amenities of the adjacent neighbouring occupiers, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policies 7.4 B, 7.6B and 7.15 of The London Plan (2016), policies D3, D13 and D14 of the Draft London Plan - Intend to Publish (2019) and policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013);

- 8) The proposed development, in the absence of an Air Quality Assessment, fails to demonstrate that the proposed development would be Air Quality Neutral and would not have the potential to contribute to a deterioration in air quality in the locality, to the detriment of the future users of the site and wider area and the overall environmental quality of the London Borough of Harrow, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), policy 7.14 of The London Plan (2016), policy of the SI 1 of the Draft London Plan – Intend to Publish (2019) and policies DM 1 and DM 12 of the Harrow development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

#### **DECISION: MINDED TO GRANT**

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that their decision to be “minded to grant” the application, which would be brought back to Committee at a later date, was by the Chair’s Casting Vote.*

*Councillors Assad, Brown and Ferry voted for the application.*

*Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel voted against.*

*Councillor Robson abstained from voting on the application.*

*The Chair used his Casting Vote to be minded to grant the application.*

#### **409. 3/02 - Mallory, Priory Drive, Stanmore HA7 3HN - P/1463/20**

**PROPOSAL:** single storey outbuilding and linked garage in garden (retrospective).

The Chief Planning Officer requested that the item be deferred to allow for further consultation, following legal advice. The application would be brought back to Committee at a later date.

Councillor Ashton proposed that the application be determined at the meeting, instead of deferred.

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

The Committee resolved to accept the Interim Chief Planning Officer’s request.

**DECISION: DEFER**

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

*Councillors Assad, Brown, Ferry and Robson voted for the application to be deferred.*

*Councillors Ashton, Baxter and Patel voted against the application being deferred.*

**The audio recording of this meeting can be found at the following link:**

<https://www.harrow.gov.uk/virtualmeeting>.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.46 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair