
REPORT OF STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2008

Chairman: * Councillor Marilyn Ashton

Councillors: * Don Billson * Julia Merison
 * Mrinal Choudhury * Narinder Singh Mudhar
 * Keith Ferry Joyce Nickolay
 * Thaya Idaikkadar

* Denotes Member present

PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS - NIL
PART II - MINUTES

 207. **Attendance by Reserve Members:**

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

<u>Ordinary Member</u>	<u>Reserve Member</u>
Councillor Joyce Nickolay	Councillor Manji Kara

 208. **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 items indicated:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Planning Application</u>
Councillor Husain Akhtar	Planning application 1/03
Councillor Paul Osborn	Planning application 3/01

 209. **Declarations of Interest:**

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
1/03	Councillor Manji Kara	Councillor Manji Kara declared a prejudicial interest in the application because he frequented the temple. Accordingly, he would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or decision making process.
3/01	Councillor Don Billson	Councillor Don Billson declared a prejudicial interest in the application because he knew one of the residents in the road concerned. Accordingly, he would leave the room and take no part in the discussion or decision making process.

 210. **Arrangement of Agenda:**

RESOLVED: That (1) in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the following item be admitted late to the agenda by virtue of the special circumstances and grounds for urgency detailed below:-

<u>Agenda item</u>	<u>Special Circumstances / Grounds for Urgency</u>
Addendum	This contained information relating to various items on the agenda and was based on information received after the dispatch of the agenda. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the items before them for decision.

(2) all items be considered with the press and public present.

211. **Minutes:**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2008, be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

212. **Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations:**

RESOLVED: To note that no public questions were put, or petitions or deputations received at this meeting under the provisions of Committee Procedure Rules 19, 16 and 17 respectively.

213. **References from Council and other Committees/Panels:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no references from Council or other Committees or Panels to be received at this meeting.

214. **Representations on Planning Applications:**

RESOLVED: To note that no requests for representations had been received.

215. **Planning Applications Received:**

RESOLVED: That authority be given to the Head of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered, as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

216. **Planning Appeals Update:**

The Committee received a report from the Head of Planning which listed those appeals being dealt with and those awaiting decision.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

217. **Cannon Farm Barn:**

The Committee received a report on the need to serve an Urgent Works Notice under Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The notice was required to safeguard the future of Cannon Farm Barn, a grade II listed barn, which is on English Heritage's Buildings At Risk Register.

RESOLVED: That (1) the Director of Legal and Governance be authorised to take all necessary steps for the preparation, issue and service of an Urgent Works Notice under Section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 for the preservation of Cannon Farm Barn;

(2) the Director of Planning, Development and Enterprise be authorised to take the necessary steps for execution of the works by the Council in the event of non-compliance with the Urgent Works Notice, and

(3) the Director of Planning, Development and Enterprise be authorised, if necessary, to issue and serve a notice to recover the Council's costs/expenses incurred in carrying out the works.

218. **Member Site Visits:**

RESOLVED: To note that there were no Member site visits to be arranged.

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 7.50 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR MARILYN ASHTON
Chairman

- DECISION:**
1. Inform the applicant that the proposal is acceptable subject to the completion of a legal agreement within 6 months (or such period as the Council may determine) of the date of the Committee decision on this application relating to :
 - (i) a variation of the section 106 Agreement dated 18 May 2006 to allow the extension to the car park hereby permitted (car park 3) to be used on a maximum of thirty-five days a year for a temporary period of 1 year
 2. GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to the above legal agreement and the conditions and informatives reported as amended as follows:
 1. The deletion of conditions 4 and 5
 2. The amendment of condition 3 to read:

Details of a boundary treatment around the extension to car park 3 hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details before the use commences.

REASON: To prevent the extension of parking outside the defined parking area and to protect the character of the Green Belt, the Little Common Conservation Area, the Area of special character and the setting of the adjacent Listed Buildings.

(Note: Minute 209 refers)

(Note: Following extensive discussions, the Committee resolved to amend the officer recommendation to permit the use of the car park for 35 days a year instead of 20 occasions as recommended. The Committee wished for it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous).

LIST NO:	1/04	APPLICATION NO:	P/0480/08/CVA
LOCATION:	Unit 1, Northolt Road, South Harrow, HA2 0EG		
APPLICANT:	Lasalle Investment Management		
PROPOSAL:	Removal of condition 21 of west/407/98/ful to allow subdivision of retail warehouse		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informative reported.		
	(Note: The Committee wished for it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous)		

SECTION 2 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR GRANT

LIST NO:	2/01	APPLICATION NO:	P/0286/08/CVA
LOCATION:	Unit 1, Northolt Road, South Harrow, HA2 0EG		
APPLICANT:	Lasalle Investment Management		
PROPOSAL:	Installation of a mezzanine floor (in new subdivided retail store)		
DECISION:	GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informative reported.		
	(Note: The Committee wished for it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous).		

LIST NO: 2/02 **APPLICATION NO:** P/0364/08/CFU
LOCATION: Viking House, 17 Peterborough Road, Harrow, HA1 2AX
APPLICANT: Mr Shany Gupta
PROPOSAL: Rear extension at ground to third floor level and additional floor at fourth floor level to provide additional office (class B1) floorspace.
DECISION: GRANTED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to the conditions and informative reported.

(Note: The Committee wished for it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was unanimous)

LIST NO: 2/03 **APPLICATION NO:** P/4037/07/CDP
LOCATION: Former Government Offices, Honeygot Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Berkeley Urban Renaissance Ltd
PROPOSAL: Details of compensatory flood storage works measures pursuant to condition 29 of planning permission ref: P/2317/06/CFU allowed on appeal 12 November 2007 (redevelopment for 798 residential units (including 40% affordable housing), 959 sq m class A1A2/A3/A4/A5/D1 & D2 floorspace; 7927 sq m of B1 (a), (b), (c) floorspace).
DECISION: DEFERRED at the request of the officers to await clearance by the Environment agency.

LIST NO: 2/04 **APPLICATION NO:** P/4036/07/CDP
LOCATION: Former Government Offices, Honeygot Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Berkeley Urban Renaissance Ltd
PROPOSAL: Details of surface water control measures pursuant to Condition 28 of planning permission ref: P/2317/06/CFU allowed on appeal 12 November 2007 (redevelopment for 798 residential units (including 40% affordable housing), 959 sq m class A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1 & D2 floorspace; 7927 sq m of B1 (a), (b), (c) floorspace).
DECISION: DEFERRED at the request of the officers to await clearance by the Environment agency

LIST NO: 2/05 **APPLICATION NO:** P/4040/07/CDP
LOCATION: Former Government Offices, Honeygot Lane, Stanmore
APPLICANT: Berkeley Urban Renaissance Ltd
PROPOSAL: Details of the maintenance regime for the flood storage works pursuant to condition 30 of planning permission ref: P/2317/06/CFU allowed on appeal 12 November 2007 (redevelopment for 798 residential units (including 40% affordable housing), 959 sq m class A1A/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1 & D2 floorspace; 7927 sq m of B1 (a), (b), (c) floorspace).
DECISION: DEFERRED at the request of the officers to await clearance by the Environment agency.

SECTION 3 – OTHER APPLICATIONS RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL

LIST NO: 3/01 **APPLICATION NO:** P/0208/08/CFU
LOCATION: Land Forming Part Of Woodpeckers, Moss Lane and 9 Eastglade, Pinner
APPLICANT: Village Homes (Southen) LLP

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 9 Eastglade and erection of 3 single/ two storey detached houses with accommodation at loft level with double garages, layout of access road and vehicular access onto Eastglade.

DECISION: REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposed development by reasons of its scale, bulk, massing and layout would be overbearing, visually obtrusive and incongruous and would fail to preserve or enhance the nearby Conservation Area and the Listed Buildings to the detriment of the setting of nearby Listed Buildings and character of the Conservation Area of historic interest contrary to policies D4, D5, D9, D11, D14, D15 and D16 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance; 'Designing New Development' (2003) and Supplementary Planning Guidance; 'Extensions: A Householders Guide' (2003).
- (2) The proposed development by reason of its layout, scale, bulk and massing would be out of character with the existing established pattern of development in the immediate vicinity, and would be overbearing in appearance and resulting in a potential loss of outlook and privacy to nearby occupiers to the detriment of their amenities contrary to policies D4 and D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Supplementary Planning Guidance; 'Designing New Development' (2003) and Supplementary Planning Guidance; 'Extensions: A Householders Guide' (2003).
- (3) The proposed access road would be unsatisfactory and inadequate and substandard to service the proposed development and this together with the existing unsatisfactory sight lines at the junction of Eastglade and Moss Lane would be prejudicial to highway safety within the site and in the vicinity contrary to policies D4, T13 and T15 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).
- (4) The proposal would result in the topping/ lopping and/or the loss of protected trees of significant amenity and landscape value, which would be detrimental to the character, and appearance of the locality, contrary to policies D4, D10 and EP29 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).
- (5) The proposed scheme fails to provide sufficient information regarding biodiversity and in the absence of such information and justification the proposed development would be inappropriate and would be potentially harmful to features of natural conservation or ecological value on the site contrary to policies D4, EP26, EP27 and EP28 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).
- (6) The proposed development would not be fully accessible and would fail to make adequate provision for people with disabilities, contrary to policy 3A.4 of the London Plan and the Supplementary Planning Document: Accessible Homes (2006).

(Note: (1) Minute 209 refers.

(2) The Committee wished for it to be recorded that the decision to refuse the application was unanimous.)
