

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 September 2011

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Payne John Morgan</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Nikki Deol and Nav Johal</p> <p>Also Present: Councillors Jonathan Bianco and Andrew Retter</p>	
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	Action by
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kaufmann declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to item 6, South Ruislip Years Centre, and left the room for the duration of this item.</p>	Action by
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 AUGUST 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>These were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	Action by
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
5.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items marked part 2 were considered in private. Item 14 was considered in private and all</p>	Action by

	<p>members of the press and public left the room for the duration of this item.</p>	
<p>6.</p>	<p>SOUTH RUISLIP EARLY YEARS CENTRE - PLOT 2, ACOL CRESCENT, RUISLIP (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kaufmann declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to this item and left the room for the duration of this item.</p> <p>Erection of a part two, part three storey block comprising 7, one-bedroom and 5, two-bedroom flats, together with associated car parking and landscaping (involving demolition of existing buildings).</p> <p>67607/APP/2011/1122</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a part two, part 3 storey building to accommodate 7 one bedroom and 5 two bedroom flats. The proposal included parking for 13 cars, secure cycle spaces and landscaped amenity areas and would involve the demolition of the existing single storey building, last occupied by South Ruislip Early Years Centre, which had recently been relocated to Queens Walk, Ruislip.</p> <p>The site was now vacant for redevelopment and there were no plans to provide an alternative community use at the site. None of the current facilities that used the site were being displaced due to the proposed development.</p> <p>Refusal of the proposed scheme would therefore not lead to the continued use of a community facility. There were therefore no objections in principle to the loss of the previous community use and the redevelopment of this site for residential purposes.</p> <p>14 letters of objection had been received, raising concerns primarily on the grounds of loss of sunlight, loss of outlook, increased traffic congestion, impact on the street scene, lack of parking and loss of privacy. A petition had also been received requesting that any replacement building should have fewer dwellings and be no higher than 2 storeys.</p> <p>The scheme had been revised to address residents concerns, reducing the number of dwellings by one and the height of the building to 2 storeys adjacent to Bourne Court to the east.</p> <p>It was considered that the layout, siting and scale of the development was compatible with surrounding built form and would respect the established character of the area. There would be no material loss of residential amenity to surrounding occupiers and highway and pedestrian impacts were considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>The application was therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions and a S106 Agreement/Statement of Intent.</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<p>Members felt this was a good development and had no issues with it.</p> <p>The recommendation for approved was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p>	
7.	<p>22 PAVILION WAY, RUISLIP (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing detached store to rear, erection of single storey side/rear extension and alteration to first floor side elevation</p> <p>17423/APP/2011/57</p> <p>Deferred on 4th August 2011 for further information on the accuracy of the submitted plans and an overshadowing assessment.</p> <p>The application site was located on the north side of Pavilion Way and comprises a two storey semi-detached property finished in red brick, with white render and white UPVC windows and a wooden door. The property had a detached garage to the rear which was used as a store, an area of hardstanding to the front and had been extended to the rear with a single storey extension. A loft conversion involving the formation of a gable end and the construction of a rear dormer had recently been undertaken as Permitted Development.</p> <p>The street scene was residential in character and appearance and the application site was within the developed area as identified in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>This petition had been previously heard at the Planning Committee meeting on 4 August 2011 and the plans had since been amended. The petitioners had emailed to state that they no longer objected to the application as the issues had been clarified.</p> <p>The size of the extension had been reduced. The overshadowing diagram showed that there would be very little overshadowing to adjoining properties. The highways engineer had carried out a site visit to check the issues regarding parking standards.</p> <p>The recommendation for approved was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda and addendum.</p>	Action by

8.	<p>LAND R/O 17-21 THE CLOSE, EASTCOTE (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey detached building with additional level in roofspace for use as Class B1 Office.</p> <p>11448/APP/2011/238</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a two storey building with a second floor within the roof void. The proposed development was larger in size, scale and bulk, compared to the previous scheme approved on appeal and was considered to result in an over dominant and visually intrusive form of development and would result in overlooking and loss of privacy.</p> <p>The application site comprises land to the rear of 17 to 21 The Close, Eastcote. The site area was approximately 350m² and fronts onto an access lane that runs along the rear of shops that front Field End Road. The access lane also provided access to two large public car parks, which were accessed from either Abbotsbury Gardens to the north and North View to the south. The site was located almost adjacent to the smaller of the two car parks.</p> <p>The surrounding area contained a range of land uses, with the Eastcote Minor Town Centre, immediately to the west (including part of the access lane), a public car park to the north, which was also within the Eastcote Town Centre, and residential uses to the south (fronting North View), and to the east (fronting The Close). The Eastcote (Morford Way) Conservation Area boundary lies close to the western boundary of the site.</p> <p>The application site lies within the developed area as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).</p> <p>29 adjoining owner/occupiers had been consulted and the application had been advertised as a development that affects the character and appearance of the adjoining Eastcote/Morford Way Conservation Area. 4 letters of objection and a petition with 33 signatories had been received</p> <p>Members requested clarification on who was responsible for the road way. Officers would check this. If it was a private road then responsibility would lie with the occupier.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms Sarah West spoke on behalf of petitioners. • The petitioner wished to re-iterate the objection. • The application was over dominant and visually dominant. 	Action by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plans were substantially different to those in the original plans. • The proposed footprint of the application was an increase of 42%. • The proposed height of the application was an increase of 55%. • It was 1.5metres from the boundary line. • Subsistence issues could occur. • There could be an impact on flood and water in the area. • The existing road was in poor condition and was narrow. There were concerns regarding access for emergency vehicles. 2 cars could not pass at the same time and it was difficult for buggies and wheelchairs. • There was no demand in Eastcote for additional office space and the benefits to residents for such a development was very limited. <p>The agent was not present.</p> <p>Members stated they supported the officer report and recommendation on this application. The size and height of the application was concerning for Members. They felt the applicant was pushing planning to see how far they could go. That the case made by petitioners was first class.</p> <p>Members asked officers if any costs (s.106) could be recovered for repairing the road. Officers explained that highways had been looked at in the previous appeal by the Inspector.</p> <p>Members agreed that plenty of office space had already existed in the area.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.</p>	
9.	<p>EASTCOTE LAWN TENNIS CLUB, KADUNA CLOSE, EASTCOTE <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>Porch to front, installation of decking and fencing to side/front, installation of ramp to front and alterations to side of existing club house.</p> <p>52580/APP/2011/1462</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a brick built porch extension to the front of the club house, together with the installation of decking to the front and side of the building, to be partly enclosed by a 1.5m to 1.8m high fence and new soft landscaping.</p>	Action by

The proposed development was acceptable in design and amenity terms and would not result in any significant increase in activity on the site that would be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding properties.

This application related to the Eastcote tennis clubhouse building located on the south east side of Kaduna Close at the end of the cul de sac. The club house was a detached building located to the north west of the Imada Health Club building, near to the access with Kaduna Close.

To the north east lies the tennis courts, with a residential block to the north and a pair of semi-detached houses to the north west, both fronting Kaduna Close. To the east lie parking spaces for club patrons.

The surrounding area was residential in character and appearance and the application site lies within the Eastcote Village Conservation Area, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007). The site was also subject to Tree Preservation Order Nos 20 and 278.

28 adjoining owner/occupiers and the Eastcote Residents Association had been consulted. The application had also been advertised as a development that affects the character and appearance of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area.

In response 1 letter of objection had been received. Objections were raised in relation to the club's intention to increase membership and have functions which will put more demand on parking in the area, the development fails to provide an assessment of existing and proposed parking demand, the identified parking spaces shown on the plans are incorrect and not under the applicants ownership, increased parking over the years has caused problems, previous applications by the objector have been refused on parking grounds and so the same rules should be applied in this instance, the fence would obscure the adjoining business from view, and there would be noise and nuisance arising from the use of the decking.

2 petitions had also been submitted objecting to the application on the grounds of intensification of use, increased parking, noise pollution and loss of privacy.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- Ms Dasgupta spoke on behalf of petitioners; she was an owner of Imada.
- It was highlighted that there were existing parking issues in the area. That cars were being parked in the Imada car park and these people were using the Tennis club.

- This resulted in people coming to visit Imada thinking there was no parking for the facility.
- The road where the facilities were was a residential road, so there were issues regarding residential parking to consider.
- The application was contrary to Council policy.
- That the tennis club members parked in an obstructive manner. That if the application resulted in additional people using the tennis club then this would worsen the parking problems that already existed.
- The application was harmful and detrimental to the area.
- If a fence was built then it would ruin the atmosphere of the round window area of Imada.
- It was already noisy in the patio area; the application would increase the noise levels.
- The increase in the social aspect of the development would increase the noise and parking problems.
- The petitioners were concerned for the future as it was an area that was rejuvenated from a derelict site.
- It was not in keep with the ambiance of the area.
- The lead petitioner stated she was surprised that officers had recommended this application for approval in the report.
- She stated that there were serious effects to consider.
- Mr Fernandez spoke on behalf of the second petition; he was an owner of Imada.
- He believed that inaccurate information was submitted by the applicants. The plans shown to committee showed land that was owned by Imada that was being used as parking for the Tennis Club.
- Socialising late in the evening would cause noise disturbance.
- The restaurant users at Imada could not dine and enjoy.
- The enclosure would make it look like a prison camp.
- There were parking implications to consider.
- The 19 car park spaces stated in the report were incorrect. The Tennis Club had 14. 3 of the spaces belonged to Imada, which the Tennis Club users could not use. The remaining 2 spaces were Council owned.
- They claimed this was a legal invalid application.
- The application would result in an increase in on-street parking.
- The Tennis Club could not provide the additional parking space for additional customers.
- The petitioner asked that the Committee withdraw the application as it was legally invalid or reject it.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mrs Corbett spoke on behalf of the application.
- The main objection from Imada was parking. There were 14 spaces and the remaining 5 were on the public highway, none belonged to Imada.
- Over the number of years that the Tennis Club had been there residents had not complained about any parking issues.
- There was no noise concerns, many of the Tennis Club users would be wearing rubber shoes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total number of full membership that was allowed at the Club was 180, they presently had 120. • The Tennis Club did wish to increase activity on the site but did not intend of hosting for huge parties. Unlike Imada which advertised that they could host for 160 people. <p>Members asked officers if there would be any additional noise from the decking that would affect residents. Officers explained that the nearest property was 18metres away.</p> <p>Members asked for clarification on the land ownership and parking issues discussed by petitioners and Officers clarified the land which was owned by the Tennis Club.</p> <p>Members also discussed issues raised regarding the fencing proposed and any obstruction in the view discussed by petitioners.</p> <p>Members commented on the parking issue and said this was an issue between the Tennis club and Imada to resolve. It was not an issue for discussion with the application presented to them.</p> <p>Members felt that it was an appropriate design, the urban designer was happy with the application and that there would be no significant change to the usage of the site from the application.</p> <p>Members were happy with the officer report and recommendation.</p> <p>The recommendation for approved was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p>	
10.	<p>41 RAISINS HILL, PINNER (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and conversion of existing integral garage and store into habitable space involving the installation of 2 rear rooflight and 1 front rooflight.</p> <p>64909/APP/2011/1165</p> <p>The application site was located on the west side of Raisins Hill and comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a fully hipped roof and bay window detail to both the front and rear elevations. An original attached garage with store room behind was located on the north west elevation. The garage was set 0.6m from the boundary with the adjacent property no.43 and flush with the front elevation of the main house. The house was set back 8m from the road with a 5m wide front driveway and lawned area with hedge separating the site from the adjoining semi (No.39). A 22m garden runs to the rear. The adjoining property, No.39, had recently carried out a hip to gable</p>	Action by

loft conversion with rear dormer, under permitted development, and was currently completing a single storey side, front and rear extension approved in September 2010. The street scene was residential in character and appearance and the application site lies within the Developed Area, as identified in the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

Planning permission was sought to demolish the existing garage and store to the side and construct a two storey side extension and a part two storey/part single storey rear extension.

To the rear, the proposed single storey extension would measure 3.6m deep with a 3m high flat roof. The two storey element would commence 3.1m from the boundary with the adjoining property (No.39) and measure 2.6m deep. The two storey extension would measure 4.9m wide projecting out from the side elevation by 1.5m, stopping 1m away from the boundary with No.43 and wrapping around the side elevation stopping 1m short of the front elevation of the house. To the side of the house, the roof of the proposed two storey extension would be at 0.5m below the ridge.

24 neighbouring properties and the Northwood Hills Residents Association had been consulted. 16 individual letters and a petition with 46 signatories had been received objecting to the proposal

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- Mr Winscom spoke on behalf of the petitioners.
- He spoke about the history of the application which had been discussed previously.
- A previous application had been rejected and on appeal.
- The new application was basically the same as previous so residents had signed a new petition.
- The dark alleyway would have an effect on residents and the application would have an effect on the neighbouring garden.
- It was a significant and overbearing development.
- The petitioner raised points that were brought up in the planning inspectors report.
- It was detrimental to the appearance of dwellings and character of the area.
- It failed to harmonise with the street scene.
- The garden scene was particularly important to note.
- Petitioners felt that the application should be rejected as there was no real change to the original application.
- It was conflicting to policy.
- Petitioners urged the Committee to reject the application.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Shah spoke on behalf of the applicant.

- His clients brought the house as a family home, it was growing family.
- The extension to the front and side was in keep with the existing street scene.
- The development would not harm the frontage.
- There were no previous issues.
- There rear width projections were in-line with policy.
- The adjoining neighbour had no objection to the application.
- The house needed severe overhaul.
- There was no intention to divide the house into flats or have multiple occupants. The development was for a family home.

Councillor Andrew Retter was present and spoke as a Ward Councillor:

- Councillor Retter asked the Committee to consider how they would feel if this application was to be built on their own street or own back yard.
- He stated that the adjoining neighbour did sign the petition objecting to the application.
- He understood that people did need to extend property but people needed to consider the area and harmonise.
- He disagreed with the officer report that this application harmonised with existing street scene.
- It did not compliment the area.
- Members should take into consideration the light aspect, which would have a detrimental effect on neighbours.
- Car parking issues needed to be considered.
- Residents had petitioned a number of times for a residents parking scheme.
- There were also human rights to consider for both the applicant and residents.

Members requested clarification from officers on the size and depth of the application. These were both within the requirements. The application had reduced since the appeal and the Inspector did not dismiss the appeal on this basis.

The Legal Officer stated that the Human Rights Act was relevant to planning policy and this needed to be balanced with Council policy.

Members discussed the front and street scene impact. Members noted the emotional issues regarding this application and how the petitioners felt about the application.

Members had carried out a site visit and discussed the front and rear extensions to the property.

It was noted that the last application was dismissed by the planning inspector on street scene reasons and not bulk or impact of the frontage.

Members were concerned about the detrimental impact that the application could have on neighbours.

	<p>On being put to vote Members voted by 4:3 to refuse the application with reasons relating to the impact on the adjoining occupier. The officer recommendation was overturned. Councillors Dave Allam and Jazz Dhillon wished to record this dissent at the decision.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority of 4:3. The reasons for refusal concerned the rear extension and there were concerns with its compliance with policy BE21.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused and the officers recommendation as per the agenda be overturned. Details of conditions to be agreed with the Chairman.</p>	
11.	<p>LAND AT CROWS NEST FARM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH, HAREFIELD (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Detached storage building to be used for the processing and storage of bio fuel and compost</p> <p>1113/APP/2011/1020</p> <p>The application related to the construction of a detached storage building within the curtilage of an existing waste facility in the Green Belt. It was stated that this building would be used for the processing and storage of bio fuel and compost. As the site was located in the Green Belt and waste facilities were not one of the essential uses of land and buildings which were specified as acceptable, this building and its intended use was considered inappropriate development within the Green Belt and no very special circumstances had been put forward by the applicant.</p> <p>No details had been supplied to show that the site is suitable for the proposal in terms of its proximity to the source of waste; ability to use transport sources other than road haulage; the nature of the proposed use and its scale; and the full transport impact of all collection and transfer movements and therefore fails to satisfy the criteria of Policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2011.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr Butterworth spoke on behalf of the petitioners. • During discussions with the case worker the question of Green Belt was raised. • The petitioner asked the Committee to consider that the application was within the existing area of which it sympathised with. • The compost did not compromise the Green Belt. 	Action by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application would help to preserve the five jobs that existed already. • It would help in reducing noise, and protect machinery and staff. • There would be better compost to supply, and better fuels. • It would generate renewal energy. • They were not proposing to expand the site but the application was on the existing site which was used for processing and storage of bio fuel and compost. • The application was related to better products and to secure jobs. <p>Members asked for clarification on whether composting already existed on the site. Officer explained to Members that there was unauthorised use for composting on the site and since 2002 policies had been updated. There was an emphasis on locating these sites and improving them to comply with policy. Officers accepted the use already existed on the site but Members needed to consider if the Council allowed a new build for this usage.</p> <p>Members felt they lacked sufficient evidence on whether it was justified or not. That the applicants had failed to justify to officers that this was appropriate use of Green Belt. Members agreed that it was up to the applicant to justify the usage. Members asked that this item be deferred to give the applicant an opportunity to provide this information.</p> <p>The recommendation for a deferral for additional information and justification to be provided was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be deferred for additional information and justification to be provided.</p>	
12.	<p>47 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Erection of two storey, five-bedroom, detached dwelling with conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 rear dormers and 5 rooflights involving demolition of existing dwelling.</p> <p>18371/APP/2011/1271</p> <p>This application was for the demolition of the existing house and its replacement with a larger house. The site lies within the Copse Wood Area of Special Local Character and consideration had to be given to the impact that the development has on this area, in addition to the normal planning considerations relating to the impact on the streetscene, impact on neighbours, impact on trees and vegetation and the parking and highway implications.</p> <p>The proposal was for a detached dwelling. It is considered that due to</p>	Action by

	<p>the bulk, design, and roof form, the development was overly bulky in relation to its surroundings, resulting in an incongruous feature and an over-development of the site to the detriment of the street scene and the Area of Special Local Character of which it forms part.</p> <p>22 occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties had been notified of the application. One letter of representation had been received commenting that there was no objection to this application other than to understand the steps they propose to take to ensure no damage to the adjoining property, the need for a surveyor to avoid damage and to ensure that any windows that overlook the adjoining property are within the rules established by the council.</p> <p>Members thanked officers for a detailed report. This was a big house which was requesting a larger development. Members agreed with the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as per the agenda.</p>	
13.	<p>12 KEWFERRY ROAD, NORTHWOOD (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Single storey front extension.</p> <p>33988/APP/2011/684</p> <p>The application site was located within a residential area of Northwood comprising a variety of substantial two storey detached dwellings of pre and inter war design and more modern apartment buildings. The application site was located on the east side of Kewferry Road at its junction with Harrison Close and was bordered by a substantial two storey detached dwelling to the south and faces two storey detached dwellings to the west. The Holy Trinity COE Primary School was located to the southwest.</p> <p>The application site comprises an attractive two storey detached dwelling of traditional design and features a hipped roof, front two storey gable and a more recent side double garage addition. The property included front and rear gardens with a 1.8 metre high hedgerow along the front elevation with mature tree planting and hedgerows along the side and rear boundaries. The dwelling was faced with red brick to the ground floor, with white render and red clay roof tiles. The existing front porch was modest in size, open sided and an attractive feature in its own right, consisting of a flat roof, two plain arches with three decoratively unadorned pillars.</p> <p>This planning application proposed the construction of a single storey front extension to form WC/ shower room and porch. The proposed single storey hipped roof extension would measure 4.9</p>	Action by

	<p>metres in length by 1.5 metres in depth and would extend to 3.5 metres in height and would be faced with materials to match the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Members had carried out a site visit and agreed that it would not be detrimental to the street scene.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved and the officers recommendation as per the agenda be overturned with standard conditions T8, OM1, M2.</p>	
14.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be agreed as per the report.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</p>	Action by
15.	<p>KNIGHTSCOTE FARM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD, NORTH HAREFIELD (<i>Agenda Item 15a</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a new cow shed.</p> <p>4729/APP/2011/1600</p> <p>This application sought planning permission for a new open sided cow shed within an existing farm complex located within the open countryside which forms part of the Green Belt. The applicant advised that the building was needed to comply with new legislation that required a 5 month capacity for slurry storage on the farm. The shed would prevent rainwater mixing with animal waste in the feeding area and prevent seepage into the ground. There would be no increase in cattle numbers or deliveries to the farm.</p> <p>There was no objection in principal as it represents appropriate development within the Green Belt. The shed was considered to be satisfactorily related to surrounding farm buildings so that it would not extend beyond the built envelope of the existing farm complex. The design and materials of the shed also reduced its impact. The siting of the building would also not harm the setting of two Grade II Listed granaries within the farm complex. The Environment Agency initially objected to the scheme on grounds of lack of information, although they did agree that the scheme would benefit groundwater</p>	Action by

	<p>supplies in this sensitive area. They have now withdrawn their objection.</p> <p>The recommendation for approved was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.</p>	
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.50 pm.</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.