

# PLANNING COMMITTEE (1ST SPECIAL) MINUTES

## 24 FEBRUARY 2011

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Mrinal Choudhury \* Nizam Ismail (4)  
Stephen Greek \* Joyce Nickolay  
\* Thaya Idaikkadar Anthony Seymour

\* Denotes Member present  
(4) Denotes category of Reserve Members

### 97. Attendance by Reserve Member

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor William Stoodley

Councillor Nizam Ismail

### 98. Right of Members to Speak

**RESOLVED:** That, in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 4.1, the following Councillor, who was not a Member of the Committee, be allowed to speak on the agenda item indicated:

Councillor

Planning Application

Bill Phillips

1/01 5-14 Becket Fold, Harrow, HA1 2LA

**99. Declarations of Interest**

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

**100. Petitions & Deputations**

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

**101. Representations on Planning Application**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30 (Part 4B of the Constitution), a representation be received in respect of item 1/01.

**RESOLVED ITEM**

**102. Planning Application Received**

In accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, the Addendum was admitted late to the agenda as it contained information relating to the item on the agenda and was based on information received after the despatch of the agenda. It was admitted to the agenda in order to enable Members to consider all information relevant to the item before them for decision.

**RESOLVED:** That authority be given to the Divisional Director Planning to issue the decision notice in respect of the application considered.

**5-14 BECKET FOLD, HARROW, HA1 2LA (APPLICATION 1/01)**

Reference: P/3102/10 – (Harrow Churches Housing Association). Demolition of Two Single Storey Terraces (Comprising 10 Residential Units); Redevelopment to Provide Part 2/Part 3 Storey Building Comprising 13 Residential Units for Older People; Provision of 6 Parking Spaces with Access from Courtfield Crescent and Landscaping.

In introducing the report, an officer outlined the basis for the recommendation of officers. The officer acknowledged that the pre-application and consultation process had been criticised by local residents and that an alternative proposal to the application had been submitted by objectors. However, the Committee had to determine the application as submitted by the applicant.

He also made the following points:

- subject to the Section 106 funding being secured, officers were of the opinion that the principle of re-development on this site was acceptable;
- re-development of the site would meet an identified need for affordable elderly persons' housing in the borough;

- the proposed development was in accordance with the London Plan density matrix;
- the design of the building, its siting, orientation and any relative impact on amenities and neighbouring residents was considered by officers to be acceptable;
- officers were satisfied, given the anticipated levels of car-ownership, that provisions made for parking in such a development was acceptable;

In response to questions from Members it was noted that:

- the definition of 'older persons' accommodation' was those aged over 55 years of age. In this case the proposed definition provided for those aged over 60. In practice, the applicants claimed that the residents of similar properties tended to be older than 60 years of age;
- this development was not a nursing home. Residents would expect to be able to live largely independently within the flats but benefit from being part of the elderly community at Ewart House and the wider community surrounding the site;
- officers were of the opinion that that parking demand in such developments were usually significantly lower than in other residential developments;
- there were existing parking controls in the area and any overspill parking would be likely to be accommodated in the wider development or further afield. Access to the car park would be controlled by a vehicle gate;
- four trees in the area of the proposed car park would be replaced by ten trees, which would contribute towards screening the building in the future;
- the adjacent development had received The Mayor's Planning Award;
- the existing bungalows provided ten studio type units and the proposed development would have nine two-bedroom and four one-bedroom units. It was not possible to be precise about the total number of future occupants.

**DECISION:** REFUSED permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, for the following reasons:

1. The development proposes using the garden area of bungalows and the garden area of No 7 Becket Fold and would, therefore, represent an inappropriate form of development, contrary to saved policy EP20 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004) and the guidance set out

under Planning Policy Statement 3: (Housing 2010). There is insufficient need or policy benefit that would justify a departure from adopted policy.

2. The lack of appropriate parking, which would cause significant traffic and parking problems for the surrounding area is contrary to Harrow's UDP policy T13.
3. The proposal, by reason of its size, siting and design, would be an obvious and prominent new development which would fail to respect the character of Courtfield Crescent and is therefore detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the area, contrary to policies 4B.1 and 4B.8 of the London Plan (2008) and saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).
4. The proposed building, by reason of its siting, orientation, design, height and bulk, would be unduly obtrusive when viewed from nearby dwellings and gardens, especially Nos. 5,6,7 & 8 Courtfield Crescent, and is therefore detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties, contrary to policies 4B.1 and 4B.8 of the London Plan (2008) and saved policies D4 and D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).
5. The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk and site coverage when viewed in combination with the nearby development at Richard's Close, would represent an over development of the area, to the detriment of the character of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policies 4B.1 and 4B.8 of the London Plan (2008) and saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

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

*The application had been recommended for grant by the officers.*

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 7.33 pm, closed at 8.40 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chairman