

# PLANNING COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

### 13 JANUARY 2016

**Chair:** \* Councillor Keith Ferry

**Councillors:** \* June Baxter \* Nitin Parekh  
\* Stephen Greek \* Pritesh Patel  
\* Graham Henson \* Anne Whitehead

**In attendance:** Janet Mote Minute 202, item 2/02  
**(Councillors)**

\* Denotes Member present

#### 194. Attendance by Reserve Members

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were no Reserve Members in attendance at this meeting.

#### 195. 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 item indicated:

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Planning Application</u>
Janet Mote	2/02

#### 196. Declarations of Interest

**RESOLVED:** To note that no interests were declared at the meeting.

## **197. Minutes**

**RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2016 be taken as read and signed as a correct record, subject to the following amendment:

Minute 187, paragraph 1 be amended to read: 'Councillor Marilyn Ashton declared a non-pecuniary interest in that the applicant was a Member of the Conservative Group. She would remain in the room whilst the matter was considered and voted upon.'

## **198. Public Questions and Deputations**

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

## **199. Petitions**

**RESOLVED:** To note the receipt of the following petition, which was referred to the Divisional Director, Commissioning Services, for consideration:

Petition presented by the Chair on behalf of residents living in the vicinity of the Hawthorne Centre, HA1 2RF, containing 128 signatures, with the following terms of reference:

'In objection to planning application P/5525/15, for 15 metres high monopole with surrounding telecommunication structures at Hawthorne Centre. This is hardly more than 5 metres from the public footpath and within 20 metres of surrounding houses, flats and hundreds of passers-by, including children and parents to the local first and middle school. So we as residents and general public, by petition, asked for the planning authority in Harrow Council to refuse it as they have already done it on the two previous cases within the last four years.'

## **200. References from Council and other Committees/Panels**

**RESOLVED:** To note that there were none.

## **201. Representations on Planning Applications**

**RESOLVED:** That in accordance with the provisions of Committee Procedure Rule 30 (Part 4B of the Constitution), representations be received in respect of items 1/01, 2/01 and 2/02 on the list of planning applications.

## **RESOLVED ITEMS**

## **202. 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 Head of Planning to issue the decision notices in respect of the applications considered.

A document which set out late additional conditions in relation to item 1/01 – Aylward Primary School, Pangbourne Drive, Stanmore, was tabled at the meeting.

**1/01 - AYLWARD PRIMARY SCHOOL, PANGBOURNE DRIVE, STANMORE**

**REFERENCE:** P/4772/15

**DESCRIPTION:** Redevelopment To Provide A Single And Two Storey Building For A 630 Place Three Form Of Entry Primary School With Integrated 26 Pupil Nursery; Re-Establishment Of (Limited Vehicular Access) Entrance Off Dalkeith Grove; Associated Landscaping To Include Hard And Soft Play Areas And Boundary Planting; Demolition Of Existing Primary School Buildings

An officer advised objections to the plans had been withdrawn, and the application was subject to additional conditions set out in the addendum and tabled document.

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- screening was set out in the Design and Access statement, and the screening chosen was considered to be the most appropriate in terms of the location and site use. However, officers would carry out a further assessment of the screening and request that the levels of screening be enhanced to maintain the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties;
- the proposed landscaping strategy would ensure that there would be considerable additional planting, and this was further detailed in condition 8;
- under the re-development of the site, new buildings would be 52 metres from the nearest neighbouring property;
- the revised condition 3, which was set out in the tabled document, addressed the community use agreement and the conditions of use of the school premises and playing fields;
- the current main entrance to the school, which was on Pangbourne Drive, would be retained. The limited vehicular access entrance on Dalkeith Grove, would continue to be used for access to the ASD unit. There were long-standing traffic congestion issues on Dalkeith Grove.

The planned parking controls and increased enforcement action would help to mitigate against these. However, it was too early to predict how the implementation of the proposed parking controls and the increased pupil numbers at the school would impact on traffic and parking in Dalkeith Grove. Officers would monitor the situation. Furthermore, the school had a travel plan and the Council's travel plan officers would liaise with the school requesting that marshals be available at the Pangbourne Drive entrance during school picking up and dropping off times;

- the proposed plans had been reviewed by Highways and school travel plan officers, all of whom had extensive experience of advising on similar school expansion projects in the borough over recent years. They had concluded that the plans for the site were acceptable and compliant.

A Member proposed deferring the application in order to allow the applicant additional time to re-consider the positioning and siting of the new building in a way that would minimise disruption and minimise the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The motion was seconded, put to the vote and lost.

The Committee received representations from an objector Elizabeth Yantian & Bill Greensmith, residents, and from, Alfonso Padro, a representative of the applicant.

**DECISION: GRANTED** planning permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans subject to conditions, and as amended by the addendum and the document tabled at the meeting.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Nitin Parekh and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel abstained from voting.*

## **2/01 - 'THE COTTAGE', HILL CLOSE, HARROW**

**REFERENCE:** P/4926/15

**DESCRIPTION:** Single Storey Front Extension; Single And Two Storey Side To Rear Extension; Single Storey Rear Extension; Rooflight; (Demolition Of Existing Garage)

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

1. the proposed development, by reason of excessive scale, massing and inappropriate design and siting, would result in a prominent, visually

imposing, dominant and obtrusive form of development in the street scene;

2. the development would also result in a significant reduction of the openness of the application site, and would appear cramped at odds with the open and spacious form of development in Hill Close. The proposal therefore fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the South Hill Avenue Conservation Area and the Area of Special Character, contrary to Policies 7.4B, 7.6B and 7.8 of The London Plan (2015), Core Policies CS1B and CS1D of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM6 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), the adopted Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (2010) and the Harrow on the Hill SPD: Appendix 4(E): South Hill Avenue Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2008)".

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

The Committee received representations from an objector, Alan Evans of Harrow on the Hill Trust, and from a representative of the applicant, Roger Pidgeon.

**DECISION: GRANTED** planning permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to condition(s).

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Nitin Parekh and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.*

## **2/02 - 28 PARK DRIVE, RAYNERS LANE, HARROW**

**REFERENCE:** P/4947/15

**DESCRIPTION:** Redevelopment To Provide A Two Storey Dwelling; Parking; Boundary Fence; Landscaping And Bin / Cycle Storage

Following questions and comments from Members, an officer advised that:

- the scheme, which was for a single family dwelling house, was fully compliant with the requirements of Buildings' Regulations. Some of the proposed features such as an accessible entrance, were part of planning policy requirements in relation to 'lifetime homes';
- condition 7 in the Addendum set out any permitted development rights in relation to the property and confirmed that it would not be possible to change its use to an HMO (house of multiple occupancy) without the consent of the Planning Authority. If, the property were converted to an

HMO, then the Council could use enforcement powers against the unauthorised use.

The Committee, being mindful of any possible future request to convert the property to an HMO, requested that the following be noted in the minutes with regard to the property:

The condition restricting permitted development rights should not be withdrawn to ensure that the site was not overdeveloped in the future.

A Member proposed refusal on the following grounds:

1. The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of excessive scale and bulk and the removal of an important feature of the street scene, would harm the character of the road and the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to policies DM1 of the Local Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and 7.6 of the London Plan.

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

The Committee received representations from an objector Neil Treadway, a resident, and Councillor Janet Mote.

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions.

*The Committee wished it to be recorded that the decision to grant the application was by a majority of votes.*

*Councillors Keith Ferry, Graham Henson, Nitin Parekh and Anne Whitehead voted for the application.*

*Councillors June Baxter, Stephen Greek and Pritesh Patel voted against the application.*

## **2/03 - 62-64 KENTON ROAD, HARROW**

**REFERENCE:** P/4426/15

**DESCRIPTION:** Redevelopment To Provide A Four Storey Building For A Thirty-Three Roomed House Of Multiple Occupation (HMO) With Amenity Space, Parking, Landscaping And Bin / Cycle Storage

**DECISION: GRANTED** permission for the development described in the application and submitted plans, subject to conditions, and as amended by the addendum.

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

**203. 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 7.33 pm).

(Signed) COUNCILLOR KEITH FERRY  
Chair