

# Planning Committee

## Minutes

### 22 November 2023

**Present:**

**Chair:** Councillor Marilyn Ashton

**Councillors:** Ghazanfar Ali Nitin Parekh  
Peymana Assad Samir Sumaria  
Christopher Baxter Zak Wagman

**In attendance  
(Councillors):** Simon Brown

**261. Attendance by Reserve Members**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

**262. 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>
Simon Brown	1/01 R/O 121-255 Pinner Road.

**263. Declarations of Interest**

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

**264. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2023 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

**265. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations**

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

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

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

**267. Addendum**

**RESOLVED:** To accept the Addendums.

**268. Representations on Planning Applications**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 29 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 2/03 and 2/04 on the list of planning applications.

[Note: Planning application 2/04 was subsequently deferred, and so the representations were not received].

**Resolved Items**

**269. R/O 121-255 Pinner Road - P/0669/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Development of three detached buildings comprising residential units (use class C3); New vehicle and pedestrian accesses and gates; Car parking; Cycle parking; Refuse stores; Soft and hard landscaping including amenity space; and associated ecological related works Details:

Height ranging from 2 - 4 storeys and comprising 37 residential units (22 x 1 Bed, 14 x 2 Bed & 1 x 3 Bed).

**RECOMMENDATION A:**

- 1) To agree the reasons for approval as set out in the officer report, and
- 2) Grant planning permission, subject to authority being delegated to the Chief Planning Officer 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. The Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms would cover the following matters:

**RECOMMENDATION B:**

That if by 31 January 2024, or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer, the section 106 Planning Obligation is not completed, then delegate the decision to the Chief Planning Officer to REFUSE planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development, in the absence of a Legal Agreement to provide appropriate improvements, benefits and monitoring that directly relate to the development, would fail to adequately mitigate the impact of the development on the wider area and provide for necessary social, environmental and physical infrastructural improvements arising directly from the development, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), policies D7, H5, H6, H7, E11, S4, G6, G7, SI 2, T4 and DF1 of The London Plan (2021), Affordable Housing & Viability SPG, Mayor of London (2017), Play and Informal Recreation, Mayor of London (2012), policy CS1 of the Core Strategy (2012), policies DM1, DM12, DM20, DM21, DM28, DM43, and DM50 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document: Planning Obligations & Affordable Housing (2013).

Members requested clarification that the site was within PTAL 3 and this was confirmed by the Officer, Clarification was sought about the badgers' sett and it was advised that a new sett would be built before works started. Clarification was sought in terms of pedestrian and vehicular access and the officer advised that it was not a through road and would only be used for residents. Members asked about whether there would be a buffer zone as currently there was a tree buffer zone. Officers advised that there would be a buffer zone. Members wanted more clarification about the previous 30,000 objectors who had objected to this application and the officers advised that the previous application had been withdrawn and this was a new application and many changes had been made since the previous application and that there were only 298 objectors for this application, and 70 were out of borough. Members asked that more analysis should be available for out of borough and in borough objectors.

Councillor Nitin Parekh proposed that the application should be refused on the following grounds:

- 1) The proposal would cause significant harm to the neighbouring residential amenity, in contravention of Policy D 6 of London Plan 2021 and Policy D M 1 of Harrow D M P 2013.
- 2) Inadequate provision for the parking and safe access to and within the site and substandard vehicular and pedestrian access policy DM 1 and DM 42. Harrow DMP 2013.

This was seconded by Councillor Peymana Assad.

The refusal was put to the vote, and not agreed.

## **DECISION: GRANTED**

The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to GRANT the application subject to Section 106 was by majority of votes.

Councillors Marilyn Ashton, Christopher Baxter, Samir Sumaria and Zak Wagman voted to grant the application.

Councillors Peymana Assad, Ghazanfar Ali and Nitin Parekh voted against granting the application.

**270. 2/01 Apollo Court, 57 The Gardens - P/1764/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Redevelopment to provide part three/part four storey building comprising of eight flats (5 X 2 bed, 3 X 1 bed); roof terrace; bin and cycle stores; footpath link incorporating alterations to existing Tesco vehicular access and parking.

The Committee voted and resolved to accept officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION A:**

The Planning Committee are asked to:

- 1) Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the officer report, and
- 2) Grant planning permission subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report and, subject to authority being delegated to the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services for the completion of Section 106 legal agreement.

**RECOMMENDATION B:**

That if by 31 January 2024, or such extended period as may be agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, the section 106 Planning Obligation is not completed, then delegate the decision to the Chief Planning Officer to REFUSE planning permission for the appropriate reason.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**271. 2/02 Perwell Court, Alexandra Avenue - P/2572/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Creation of 9 residential units in roof space (1 X 2 bed and 8 X studios); dormers to front rear and both side roof slopes; extensions to the stair cores to the rear; external alterations; cycle storage.

The Chair requested that an additional condition to be put on this application:

Prior to commencement of development, a communications and engagement plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which should include setting out how the existing residents on site,

will be given adequate notice of the start of development and what measures will be put in place to keep them advised on the way in which development will be carried out and the progress of construction works. The Chair advised the reason for this was to minimise disturbance to neighbouring occupants during the construction phase of the development.

The Committee voted and resolved to accept officer recommendations and Chair's condition.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Planning Committee are asked to:

- 1) Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the officer report, and
- 2) Grant planning permission, subject to the Conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

**DECISION: GRANT**

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

**272. 2/03 18 West Drive, HA3 3TS - P/2071/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Two storey front infill extensions; first floor front extension; single and two storey rear extension; first floor rear extension; extension and alterations to roof; rooflights in front, rear and both side roof slopes; external alterations (demolition of rear extension).

Members sought clarification on the depth of extension and whether it complied with the 45-degree code which officers advised confirmed. Clarification was sought on the report on page 278 paragraph 3.2, and officers advised that was to resolve any confusion on the depth and super imposed images on google earth.

The Committee received representation from Mr Vivek Sajip, who urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The Committee received representation from the applicant's agent.

The officer had clarified that the overhang had been removed.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Planning Committee was asked to:

- 1) Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the officer report, and
- 2) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions listed in Appendix 1 of the officer report:

### **DECISION: GRANT**

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

#### **273. 2/04 Astley Hse, South Hill Avenue - P/2116/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey rear extension; installation of French doors to rear and window and door to side elevation; external alterations.

Councillor Zak Wagman proposed that the application should be deferred.

This was seconded by Councillor Christopher Baxter, put to the vote, and it was agreed to defer to enable a site visit.

### **DECISION: DEFER**

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

#### **274. 3/01 35 Cranbourne Drive - P/2237/23**

**PROPOSAL:** Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission P/1221/21 dated 18/18/2021 to amend the roof design to include hip-to-gable extensions and a rear dormer above the main dwelling, and flat roof over two-storey side and rear extension (part retrospective).

The Committee voted and resolved to accept officer recommendations.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Refuse the application for the following reason:

The proposed hip to gables and rear dormer extensions above the original dwelling in conjunction with flat roof over the two-storey side extension and two storey rear extension, by reason of inappropriate design, excessive bulk, scale and massing would result in incongruous, discordant and ungainly cumulative additions to the dwelling and the rear dormer by reason of its excessive size and lack of visual containment would give rise to a bulky and dominant addition within the rear roof slope. On this basis, the proposed development would cause detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policy D3.D(1) and D3.D(11) of The London Plan (2021), policy CS1.B of the Core Strategy (2012), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013), and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010).

### **DECISION: REFUSE**

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

**275. 3/02 35 Cranbourne Drive - P/2275/23**

Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) attached to planning permission P/1221/21 dated 18/18/2021 to amend the roof design to include hip-to-gable extensions and a rear dormer above the main dwelling, and gable roof over two-storey side extension (Retrospective) The Planning Committee is asked to consider the following recommendation:

Members wanted clarification on the potential fallback position regarding permitted development. This was explained by the officer - the roof extension is on a detached dwelling, and this needs to be less than 50 cubic metres. There are other conditions of permitted development. Officer confirmed that the roof extension does not meet that requirement. Members wanted to make sure that legal advice had been taken and was advised by the Legal Officer and Chief Officer that this had been done and when assessing the application against the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO), there are limitations, strict limitations to be able to comply with it. This doesn't comply.

The Committee voted and resolved to accept officer recommendations.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Refuse the application for the following reason:

The proposed hip to gables and rear dormer extensions above the original dwelling in conjunction with gable over the two-storey side extension and flat roof over the two storey rear extension, by reason of inappropriate design, excessive bulk, scale and massing would result in incongruous, discordant and ungainly cumulative additions to the dwelling and the rear dormer by reason of its excessive size and lack of visual containment would give rise to a bulky and dominant addition within the rear roof slope. On this basis, the proposed development would cause detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policy D3.D(1) and D3.D(11) of The London Plan (2021), policy CS1.B of the Core Strategy (2012), policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013), and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010).

**DECISION: REFUSE**

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

**The 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 8.18 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Marilyn Ashton  
Chair