

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 18 JANUARY 2012

**Chairman:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* Stephen Greek \* Joyce Nickolay  
\* Thaya Idaikkadar \* Anthony Seymour  
\* Jerry Miles (4) \* Sachin Shah

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

#### 218. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Reserve Member

Councillor Bill Phillips

Councillor Jerry Miles

#### 219. 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:

Councillor

Planning Application

Ben Wealthy

1/01 Tesco Supermarket, Station Road,  
Harro, HA1 2TU

Marilyn Ashton

1/02 Part of Former Government Offices Site (Stanmore Place), Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, HA7 1BB

## 220. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 10 - Planning Applications Received – 1/01 – Tesco Supermarket, Station Road, Harrow, HA1 2TU

Councillor Husain Akhtar declared a personal interest in that he shopped at Tescos. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 10 - Planning Applications Received – 1/02 – Part of Former Government Offices Site (Stanmore Place), Honeypot Lane, Stanmore, HA7 1BB

Councillor Husain Akhtar declared a personal interest in that the Ward had concerns regarding the application. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Agenda Item 10 - Planning Applications Received – Newton Park East Allotments, Alexandra Avenue, Harrow, HA2 6AQ

Councillor Thaya Idaikkadar declared a personal interest in that he was involved in the lease to the applicant. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

## 221. Minutes

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2011 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

## 222. Public Questions, Petitions and Deputations

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

## 223. References from Council and other Committees/Panels

**RESOLVED:** There were none.

## 224. Representations on Planning Applications

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30, representations be received in respect of items 1/01 and 1/02 on the list of planning applications.

## RESOLVED ITEMS

### 225. Planning Applications 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 various items 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 items before them for decision.

**RESOLVED:** That authority be given to the Divisional Director, Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered.

#### **TESCO SUPERMARKET, STATION ROAD, HARROW, HA1 2TU (APPLICATION 1/01)**

Reference: P/0832/11 – (Tesco Stores Ltd). Two Storey Extension to Front Side and Rear of Store; Decked Car Park at First Floor Level over Existing Car Park; New Four Storey Building to Provide Four Mixed Use Units of Retail/Financial and Professional Services/ Food & Drink Uses (Class A1/A2/A3) at Ground Floor and 14 Flats above Fronting Station Road; Landscaping and External Alterations to Existing Building and Car Park Layout.

It was reported that a site meeting had taken place. The officer advised that the boundary to Station Road would be increased and the frontage building height would be no greater than the building on the opposite side of Hindes Road. The distance of 29 metres between the rear of the development and properties in High Mead was similar, if not better, than the distance between the existing rear of store and properties on High Mead. A planning condition would seek to restrict access during unsociable hours to those areas of the car park closer to residential properties.

In response to questions, it was reported that:

- Harrow Town Centre was doing well with regard to comparison goods. A retail analysis anticipated a 4% draw to Tesco as a result of the expansion which would be made up. A draw of under 10% was not considered to be an issue that could justify a refusal of permission;
- it was a town centre application and was recognised as such in the Unitary Development Plan and the core strategy;
- the commercial units would be available for independent retailers;
- the car park would not be visible from Hindes Road due to design of screening and landscaping. The car park would be set further back.

With regard to traffic it was noted that:

- a small rise in traffic intensity on Station Road was projected, which would be spread out during the day, with an anticipated 100 additional vehicles during peak periods. Traffic modelling for the local development framework indicated a capacity element to the junction. The removal of the northbound bus gate and secondary signals and replacement with pedestrian paving and additional capacity to the junction would improve the traffic flow. The removal of unnecessary guardlines and widening of the pavements in Station Road, together with a Green Grid contribution for improvements in Hindes Road, would improve pedestrian access;
- approximately 75% of journeys were by private car. Over half the store would be comparison goods which would have a lower direct demand for parking;
- there was no specific parking allocation for employees, half of whom were identified as not travelling to work by car. A travel plan would be established by condition. A Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was in force and there was high public transport visibility and improved pedestrian access;
- there was an extant planning permission for a side extension which could be implemented.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the grounds that 'the proposed double storey car park and the proposed extension to the building, by reason of their siting, orientation, design, height and bulk, would be unduly obtrusive when viewed from nearby dwellings in Hindes Road, Hamilton Road and High Mead and would therefore be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties, contrary to policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2008) and saved policies D4 and D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004).

The proposed development, by reason of its height, bulk and site coverage when viewed in combination with the original store and the disturbance created by the increased activity, would represent an over-development of the area, to the detriment of the character of the area and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policies D5 and EP25 of the London Plan (2008) and saved policy D4 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004)'.

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

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Helen Webster and Arran Poyser, and a representative of the applicant, Tony Fletcher.

#### **DECISION:**

- (1) GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum,

subject to the referral to the Greater London Authority, the completion of a Section 106 Agreement by 27 March 2012 with the Heads of terms as detailed and the conditions and informatives reported, to include plan numbers;

- (2) the delegation to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the Section 106 Agreement and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement be approved;
- (3) should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed by 27 March 2012, the decision to REFUSE planning permission be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning for the reasons set out in the report.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was as follows:*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar, Jerry Miles and Sachin Shah voted to approve the application.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Anthony Seymour voted against.*

#### **PART OF FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICES SITE (STANMORE PLACE), HONEYPOT LANE, STANMORE, HA7 1BB (APPLICATION 1/02)**

Reference: P/2450/11 – (St Edward Homes). Redevelopment to Provide 213 Flats and 959 sq m of A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1/D2 Floorspace in Four, Five and Six Storey Blocks with Lower Ground Floor; Associated Landscaping and Car Parking (Amendments to Phases 7, 8 and 9 of the Development Approved Under Planning Reference P/2317/06 (Allowed on Appeal 12/11/2007) Comprising Additional Floors to Blocks PN, PQ, PS, PT and PU, Addition of Lower Ground Floor to Block PU, Amendments to External Appearance and Amendments to the Size and Arrangement of Flats Resulting in a Reduction in the Total Number of Residential Units on the Site as a Whole from 798 to 764).

The officer reported that a site meeting had taken place. Attention was drawn to the differences between the existing approved scheme and the application. The Committee was advised that there had been a net reduction in the number of total units from 798 to 764 to allow larger, family size, units.

In response to questions, the Committee was advised that:

- the stated child yield figures were standard calculations over which Harrow Council had no discretion;
- once the principles of development had been established, detailed discussion would take place with the applicant regarding the use of the Section 106 Stanmore Marsh Works contribution. It was noted that investment at Canons Park, in addition to Stanmore Marsh, was considered beneficial by the Committee;

- discussions would take place with the applicant regarding the Section 106 landscaping contribution towards treeplanting in The Hive Football Centre in order to help screen the proposed development. London Underground would be consulted as to the proximity to the railway line embankment. The planting was supplemental to the landscaping and planting within the site itself;
- there distance between the Crescent block and the rear of the closest house was a little over 90 metres;
- the location of the previously agreed formal playspace, in addition to the balconies, was indicated;
- it was anticipated that there would be deciduous trees, at a planting height of 5-5.5metres, which would require pruning.

The Committee received representations an objector, Mike Turner, and a representative of the applicant, Abby Dodson-Parker.

**DECISION:**

- (1) GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to the referral to the Greater London Authority, the completion of a Section 106 Agreement by 31 March 2012 with the Heads of terms as detailed and the conditions and informatives reported;
- (2) the delegation to the Divisional Director of Planning, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance Services, for the sealing of the Section 106 Agreement and to agree any minor amendments to the conditions or the legal agreement be approved;
- (3) should the Section 106 Agreement not be completed by 30 April 2012, the decision to REFUSE planning permission be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning for the reasons set out in the report.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was as follows:*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar, Jerry Miles and Sachin Shah voted to approve the application.*

*Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Anthony Seymour did not vote.*

**NEWTON PARK EAST ALLOTMENTS, ALEXANDRA AVENUE, HARROW,  
HA2 9PN (APPLICATION 2/01)**

Reference: P/1793/11 – (Harrow Council). Retrospective Application for Five Single Storey Buildings and Use of the Site for the Purposes of Education (Horticultural Training) (Use Class D1).

**DECISION:** GRANTED permission, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992, for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions and informatives.

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

**39 KINGSFIELD AVENUE, HARROW, HA2 6AQ (APPLICATION 2/02)**

Reference: P/2841/11 (Mr Wayne Mertins-Brown). Extension of Time to Planning Permission P/2826/08 Dated 17/10/2008 for Conversion of Dwellinghouse to Two Flats; Single/Two Storey Side to Rear & Single Storey Front Extensions; Rear Dormer with Juliet Balcony; External Alterations (Resident Permit Restricted).

**DECISION:** That the application be deferred to enable further consultation.

**226. INFORMATION REPORT - Urgent Non-Executive Decision: Additional Clause to Scheme of Delegation regarding Refusal of Planning Permission**

The Committee received an information report of the Director of Legal and Governance Services advising of a non-executive urgent action. It had been agreed to insert an additional clause (Clause 1.1 of Part 1) into the scheme of delegation considered and approved by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 16 November 2011.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted.

**227. Member Site Visits**

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

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.36 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chairman