

PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES

23 FEBRUARY 2012

Chairman: * Councillor Keith Ferry

Councillors: * Stephen Greek * Joyce Nickolay
* Thaya Idaikkadar * Bill Phillips
* Nizam Ismail (3) * Simon Williams (1)

* Denotes Member present
(3), (1) Denote category of Reserve Members

228. Attendance by Reserve Members

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

Ordinary Member

Councillor Anthony Seymour
Councillor Sachin Shah

Reserve Member

Councillor Simon Williams
Councillor Nizam Ismail

229. 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

Chris Mote

Planning Application

2/03 69 West End Lane, Pinner, HA5 1AF

230. Declarations of Interest

RESOLVED: To note that the following interests were declared:

Agenda Item 10 – Planning Applications Received – 2/03 – 69 West End Lane, Pinner, HA5 1AF

Councillor Keith Ferry declared a personal interest in that he was a Council appointed trustee on the Heath Robinson Museum Trust. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

Councillor Chris Mote declared a personal interest in that he would be renting the top floor of West House. He would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.

231. Minutes

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2012 be taken as read and signed as a correct record.

232. Public Questions and Deputations

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

233. Petitions

RESOLVED: To note the receipt of a petition objecting to application 2/05 Sundridge, South Hill Avenue, Harrow on the Hill, HS1 3NX with 8 signatories.

234. References from Council and other Committees/Panels

RESOLVED: To note that there were none.

235. Representations on Planning Applications

RESOLVED: That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30.5, representations be received in respect of items 2/03 and 2/05 on the list of planning applications.

RESOLVED ITEMS

236. 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.

90-100 PINNER ROAD, HARROW, HA1 4JD (APPLICATION 1/01)

Reference: P/2098/11 – (Mr R Dalia). Retrospective Application for a Mixed Use Three Storey Building Containing Retail Use (Class A1) on the Ground Floor and 12 Residential Units (Class C3) on the First and Second Floors; Associated Car Parking and Bicycle Storage [Resident Permit Restricted].

It was noted that in terms of a comparison with the previously approved scheme on the site, the application related to an entire redevelopment of the site rather than the extension and conversion of the previous building on the site. However, the land uses proposed and the intensity of these uses differed little from that approved previously. There had been no relevant changes in planning policy subsequent to the approval of the previous planning permission.

In response to questions it was noted that:

- the permission would restrict ground floor use to A1 retail only. Planning permission would be required for use as a restaurant;
- a resident parking permit restriction was already in place. The traffic impact was not expected to be significant.

DECISION: GRANTED permission 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.

1 & 2 BANKFIELD COTTAGES, ASS HOUSE LANE, HARROW (APPLICATION 1/02)

Reference: P/3063/11 – (Grims Dyke Golf Club). Extension of Time to Planning Permission P/0838/08DFU dated 17/03/2009 for 'Two Two-Storey Semi-Detached Houses With Parking'.

The Committee noted that the application was for an extension of time. Members were informed that there had been no changes to legislation, policies or circumstances that would affect the previous decision.

DECISION:

- 1) GRANTED permission for the development as described on the application and submitted plans, as amended by the addendum, subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement within 6 months (or such period as the Council may determine) of 23 February 2012 to require the implementation of either planning permission P/3026/05/CFU only or the proposal subject of this application P/3063/11, but not both, and the conditions and informatives reported;

- 2) The delegation to the 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 within six months (or such period that the Council may determine), of 23 February 2012, the decision to REFUSE planning permission be delegated to the Divisional Director of Planning, on the grounds as set out in the addendum.

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

101 CHRISTCHURCH AVENUE, HARROW, HA3 8LZ (APPLICATION 1/03)

Reference: P/2779/11 – (Mr Rajesh Raithatha). Conversion of Property into Two Flats; Single Storey Front, Side and Rear Extensions; Two Storey Side to Rear Extensions; Rear Dormer; Two Rooflights in Front Roofslope; Access Ramps at Front and Rear.

It was noted that the application was submitted to the Planning Committee as a petition with ten signatures had been received. In response to questions, it was noted that:

- a condition regarding soundproofing between the application property and the adjoining property was proposed;
- public transport accessibility was not very good. It was a balanced situation regarding car parking: there was room for two parking spaces on the frontage but there would be insufficient amenity.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the grounds that:

1. the proposed conversion of the dwelling house would result in an over-intensive use of the property which, by reason of increased activity and inappropriate horizontal stacking of rooms would detract from the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring attached house at no. 99, contrary to saved Policy D5 of the Harrow Unitary Development Plan (2004);
2. the provision of one onsite parking space for two units comprising 6 bedrooms does not reflect the allowance in the London Plan Policy No. 6.13 for 3 spaces, and has not taken account of paragraph 4.21.12 for well integrated parking of the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD. It also constitutes the over-development of a site with a low public transport accessibility rating, contrary to Core Strategy policy CS1.S and will have a detrimental impact on parking in the local area, contrary to saved Policy T13 of the Harrow UDP (2004).

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

DECISION: GRANTED permission 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 as follows:

Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar, Bill Phillips voted to approve the application.

Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against.

Councillor Nizam Ismail abstained.

The Chairman used his casting vote to approve the application.

1 & 1A SILVERDALE CLOSE, NORTHOLT, UB5 4BL (APPLICATION 2/01)

Reference: P/3497/11 – (Lazbeth Properties Limited). Change of Use from a Children’s Residential Home and Contact Centre to Six Residential Dwellings (Class C2/D1 to Class C3); New Windows and Doors to All Elevations; External Alterations; Provision of Four Parking Spaces; Landscaping and Refuse.

The Committee was informed that there was some shortfall in the gross internal area (GIA) but these shortfalls were in part as a result of the constraints of the site and were not so significant as to warrant refusal of the scheme as a whole.

DECISION: GRANTED permission 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, MIDDLESEX, 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.

It was noted that the application was for an extension of time and that there had been no changes to planning policies to alter the recommendation with regard to the principal of development proposed. The application was considered to have a minimal impact with respect to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the three new dwelling houses on land at the rear of the application site.

DECISION: GRANTED permission 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.

69 WEST END LANE, PINNER, HA5 1AF (APPLICATION 2/03)

Reference: P/3455/11 – (Quebe Ltd). Demolition of Nursery School Building; Redevelopment to Provide a Part 3/4 Storey Building Comprising 9 Flats; Landscaping, Refuse & Provision of 9 Parking Spaces; New Vehicle Access [Resident Permit Restricted].

The officer reported that a site visit had taken place. In response to questions, it was noted that:

- the distance from the school playing fields was 12.5 at the nearest point, which was an increase from the previous application. The sight lines for access to the school should not cause problems for pedestrians or vehicles;
- the footprint had increased from 196 square metres to 260 square metres;
- the figure of a requirement for 171 new housing units had been recently adopted and was calculated from extant planning permissions and identified sites and was not a windfall figure.

A Member referred to table 3.2 of the London Plan which set out that a density of 50-95 units per hectare and 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare would be the most suitable for the site. The development proposed a density of 105 units per hectare and 304 habitable rooms per hectare. The officer reported that the PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) of 2 was indicative.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal, which was seconded, put to the vote and agreed.

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Cynthia Wells and Patricia Clarke, and a representative of the Applicant, Alan Ward.

DECISION: that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. the proposed development, by reason of excessive bulk, massing and frontal siting, particularly as the number of units per hectare proposed exceeded the recommended levels set out in The London Plan 2011, is contrary to Policy 47.B of the London Plan, saved Policies D4 and D9 of the Harrow UDP and Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010);

2. the proposed modern design is out of character with the area and does not respect the local and public realm, contrary to Policy 7.4.B of the London Plan 2011 and saved policy D4 of the Harrow UDP and Policy CS1.B of the recently adopted Core Strategy requiring all new development to respond positively to local context in term of design, siting and density;
3. the limited range of units of one and two-bedroom units does not provide a range of housing choices, particularly in this area of large family houses, contrary to London Plan Policy 3.9 and Harrow UDP Policy H7.

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

Councillors Keith Ferry, Stephen Greek, Thaya Idaikkadar, Nizam Ismail Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted to approve the application.

Councillor Bill Phillips abstained

**SUNRIDGE, SOUTH HILL AVENUE, HARROW ON THE HILL, HA1 3NX
(APPLICATION 2/04)**

Reference: P/2735/11 – (Mr James Kavanagh). Conservation Area Consent: Partial Demolition of Rear Walls and Roof.

DECISION: GRANTED Conservation Area Consent as described in the application and associated plans.

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

Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar, Nizam Ismail and Bill Phillips voted to approve the application.

Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against.

**SUNRIDGE, SOUTH HILL AVENUE, HARROW ON THE HILL, HA1 3NX
(APPLICATION 2/05)**

Reference: P/2735/11 – (Mr James Kavanagh). Single Storey Side to Rear Extension and Single Storey, Two Storey and Three Storey Rear Extensions; Rooflight in Front Roofslope; Front Boundary Treatment including a Fence and a Gate; New Side Gates; Hard and Soft Landscaping.

The officer reported that a site visit had taken place. It was noted that the application was reported to Committee as a petition had been received in objection to the application and this went against the officer's recommendation.

The Committee noted that the property was mentioned in the character appraisal as being of particular note but was in a degree of disrepair and had been unsympathetically worked on. The foundations of a previous side extension were visible.

In response to questions, it was noted that:

- due to the separation distance of approximately 9 metres between Helmsley and the flank wall of the subject site and the existence of a single storey side extension at the adjacent property, it was considered that there would not be an unreasonable loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property;
- there was not a policy to prevent an extension in garden land in a Conservation Area, there was evidence of a ramp with hardstanding and the line of a wall;
- the extension met current policy considerations. The Conservation Officer comments were taken into account, but weighed in relation to the details of the scheme, the overall impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, taking into account the advice within the South Hill Avenue Conservation Appraisal and Management Strategy.

A Member of the Committee proposed refusal on the grounds that 'the proposal is too bulky and out of proportion and would not relate sensitively to the original building to which it would adjoin at the rear of the property or to the neighbouring property at Helmsley. The virtual infilling of the gap on the side adjacent to Helmsley in a proposed forward position would detract from the special character of this conservation area comprising of detached houses in their own grounds. This development threatens the integrity of the original houses and the setting of this locally listed building would be spoilt by this development and is contrary to PPS5 policies HE7.2, HE7.4, HE9.1 and saved Harrow UDP policies D12, D14 and D15 and policy 7.8 of The London Plan.'

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

The Committee received representations from two objectors, Austin Mackie and Eileen Kinnear, and a representative of the Applicant, Andrew Reed.

DECISION: GRANTED permission 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 as follows:

Councillors Keith Ferry, Thaya Idaikkadar, Nizam Ismail and Bill Phillips voted to approve the application.

Councillors Stephen Greek, Joyce Nickolay and Simon Williams voted against.

237. Homes in Multiple Occupation (HMO)

RESOLVED: That it be noted that the report would be submitted to the March meeting.

238. Member Site Visits

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

239. Any Other Urgent Business

(Note: The meeting, having commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 8.43 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY
Chairman