

Planning Committee

Minutes

24 October 2024

Present:

Chair: Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Councillors: Ghazanfar Ali Nitin Parekh
Christopher Baxter Zak Wagman
Simon Brown

Apologies received: Councillor Peymana Assad

Absent: Councillor Samir Sumaria

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 Peymana Assad

Councillor Simon Brown

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 the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 2/03 – Stanmore Hall Stanmore

Councillor Marilyn Ashton and Councillor Zak Wagman both declared a non-pecuniary interest in that they both knew someone who lived in Stanmore Hall. They would both remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

392. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2024 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

393. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

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

394. References from Council and other Committees/Panels

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

395. Addendum

RESOLVED: To accept the Addendum.

396. Planning Appeals

The Committee received a report on the latest planning appeals received for Quarter One.

Resolved Items

397. 2/01 16 Church Road, HA7 4AR - PL/0965/24

PROPOSAL:

Change of use from bowling alley (use class E(d)) and restaurant/bar (use class E(b)) to gym (use class E(d)).

RECOMMENDATION:

The 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: GRANTED

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

398. 2/02 43 Elm Park, HA7 4AR - PL/1871/24

PROPOSAL:

Single storey rear extension; external alterations (demolition of rear extension and conservatory)

RECOMMENDATION:

The 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.

It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit.

DECISION: That consideration of the application be deferred for a site visit.

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

399. 2/03 Stanmore Hall, HA7 4JY - PL/2099/24

PROPOSAL:

Listed Building Consent: Installation of a handrail to the Rhodes House entrance.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee was asked to:

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

DECISION: GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT.

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

400. 2/04 21 Church Road, HA7 4AR - PL/0840/23

PROPOSAL:

Redevelopment of car park to create three storeys building with habitable roof space comprising of six self-contained flats (4 X studio, 1 X 1 bed and 1 X 2 bed); proposed vehicle access; parking; bin and cycle stores.

RECOMMENDATION A:

The Committee was asked to:

- 1) Agree the reasons for approval as set out in the 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 report) or the legal agreement. The Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms would cover the following matters:

Parking Permit Restrictions:

The development to be “resident permit restricted” in accordance with section 16 of the GLC (Gen Powers) Act 1974 and the developer to ensure that

- 1) all marketing/advertising material makes reference to this fact and
- 2) all agreements contain a covenant to the effect that future occupiers and tenants (other than those who are registered disabled) would not be entitled to apply for residents parking permit or a visitor permit. A contribution in accordance with the adopted fees and charges was required to amend the Traffic Management Order

Legal Costs and Monitoring Fee:

- 1) Payment of section 106 monitoring fee upon completion of section 106 agreement (amount TBC).
- 2) Payment of all reasonable legal fees upon completion of section 106 agreement.

REASON FOR THE RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed redevelopment of the site would provide six new dwellings which contribute to the character and appearance of the local area. The siting of the dwellings would be appropriate in this location and would not be at odds with the existing character of development in the immediate area. The proposed internal layouts, specifications and management of the proposed development would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in accordance with Policies D6 of The London Plan (2021), Policy DM1 of the DMP (2013).

RECOMMENDATION B:

That if the Legal Agreement was not completed by 04th January 2025, or as such extended period as may be agreed by the Chief Planning Officer, then it would be recommended to delegate the decision to REFUSE planning permission to the Chief Planning Officer on the grounds that: The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to provide appropriate provision for restriction of resident parking permits would fail to comply with the requirements of policy T6 of The London Plan (2021), policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM42, DM43 and DM50 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and would therefore be unacceptable.

DECISION: GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

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

401. 4/01 Heathbourne Green, Bushey Heath, Herts - PL/1666/24

PROPOSAL:

Consultation from Neighbouring Authorities: Ref: 24/0692/OUTEI: Outline application (with all matters reserved except access) to reclaim a previous landfill site to create a phased Intergenerational Continuing Care Community development based on principles of social prescribing and Age Friendly place-making. The development would comprise of: a range of types and tenures of C2 and C3 residential units; C2 care facilities; clubhouse building; other buildings and lifestyle facilities providing a range of Class E, F1, F2 and sui generis uses; open spaces, park and natural green spaces, play and outdoor sports facilities, community growing facilities and ancillary Class E and F2 amenities; a new transport hub and related transport facilities, together with associated vehicular means of access, parking, cycle routes and footpaths; and infrastructure works to provide drainage, utilities and associated services.

RECOMMENDATION:

INFORM Hertsmere Borough Council that the London Borough of Harrow raised an objection to the application on the following grounds:

1) **General:** The planning application and supporting information was deficient due to the lack of meaningful reference to the adverse impact that the proposal development would have on the London Borough of Harrow. This was considered a significant omission given the application site physically adjoins the borough boundary and the scale of the proposal.

2) **Green Belt:** The proposed development lay entirely within the designated Green Belt. The affected green belt was designated in the 1950s and continues to meet the green belt purposes as set out in the NPPF, particularly in relation to preventing coalescence, preventing sprawl and protecting the countryside. The proposed development (and any subsequent removal of its green belt designation) would significantly reduce the gap between Bushey Heath and Elstree, and the wider gap between Greater London (Stanmore) and Elstree and would encroach on the wider countryside, particularly towards

the high amenity value of Stanmore Common. No substantive 'very special circumstances' have been submitted as part of the planning application to justify this inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

3) Previously Developed Land (PDL): The application site would not fall within the definition of PDL contained in Annex 2 of the NPPF that excludes 'land that had been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration had been made through development management procedures. Therefore, the site could not be classified as Previously Developed Land (PDL) in terms of justifying the proposed development within the Green Belt by virtue of its former landfill use.

4) Area of Special Character: The development would likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjoining Harrow Area of Special Character, due to the form, scale and massing of the proposed development. Further analysis should be undertaken taking into account differences in ground levels in the area to assess the impact of the proposal on the strategic value of the Area of Special Character, including the desirability of preserving or enhancing the environmental, architectural, historic and landscape features that contribute to the area of special character and the protected views to and from areas of special character.

5) Nature Conservation: The proposed development was likely to have a detrimental impact on the adjoining Watling Chase Planting Site and Environs SINC (site of local importance) and the Stanmore and Little Commons SINC (site of Metropolitan importance). Further assessment was required to ensure that the development preserves these natural habitats and through biodiversity net gain measures on-site that these complement and enhance habitats and wildlife in the wider area. This should be reflected in the proposed strategies for landscape, habitats, ecology and water and recreational access that both respects and protects the heathland of the site and adjoining Stanmore Common.

6) Housing accommodation: The proposed development may not meet the specific needs of adjoining Harrow residents. There was no indication in the application as to how the proposed housing accommodation and health facilities could be accessed to specifically meet the needs of Harrow residents.

7) Impacts on local centres: The proposed development, through the provision of the proposed ancillary services, may result in a detrimental impact on the viability and vitality of the Stanmore District Centre in Harrow. A full retail/leisure impact assessment was therefore required.

8) Community and Infrastructure provision: The extent to which supporting uses could be accessed by Harrow residents would need to be determined, particularly in relation to GP services, so that added pressures are not put out on healthcare provision within Harrow.

DECISION: OBJECTED

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

402. Any Other Urgent Business

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 7.41 pm).

(Signed) Councillor Marilyn Ashton
Chair