

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 April 2012

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan Dominic Gilham Tim Barker Raymond Graham</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (NorthTeam Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Traffic Engineer) Sarah White (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Philip Corthorne Councillor Brian Crowe Councillor John Riley</p>	
160.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Allan Kauffman, Michael Markham and David Payne. Councillors Dominic Gilham, Tim Barker and Ray Graham were in attendance as substitutes.</p>	
161.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a personal prejudicial interest in Item 8, 19 Grove Road, Northwood, as it was in her ward and both the applicant and petitioner (in objection) were known to her. Councillor Melvin left the Committee room for the duration of this item.</p>	
162.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - TO FOLLOW</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2012 circulated after the agenda papers had been despatched were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	

163.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
164.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>All items were considered in public.</p>	
165.	<p><b>120 BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH, ICKENHAM - 13019/APP/2011/3019</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>120 Breakspear Road South, Ickenham - 13019/APP/2011/3019</b></p> <p><b>Alterations to dormer windows (Retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum. In doing so, it was noted that since the agenda had been published, a petition containing 220 signatures in support of the application had been received.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution, a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application had the full support of all the immediate neighbours as well as residents living in the local area.</li> <li>• The proposed dormer windows were a significant improvement compared to the box-like appearance of the originals.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The parapet roof had been added to enhance the appearance of the dormer windows. This has also enabled the roof to be insulated.</li> <li>• Local neighbours were delighted with the appearance of the dormer windows</li> <li>• The applicant had taken and followed the advice provided by the Planning Department and had been advised that the windows would be recommended for approval. Therefore, they were shocked to learn that the final report recommended refusal.</li> <li>• Reference was made to an email from the Planning Department to the applicant which suggested it was likely that the dormer windows would be approved.</li> </ul> <p>Officers clarified that in some cases, the officer view could change when the item was discussed by senior officers and in this particular case, the final recommendation of the case officer was for refusal.</p> <p>In discussing the application, Members agreed that the dormer</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>windows had always been out of keeping with the design of the dwelling and by refusing the application, the Committee would be making a decision on something that already existed which local residents supported.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the recommendation for refusal be overturned and application approved with no conditions.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application APPROVED with no conditions.</b></p>	
166.	<p><b>LAND R/O ST MATHEWS CHURCH, FORGE LANE, NORTHWOOD - 62125/APP/2012/281</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Land R/O St Mathews Church, Forge Lane, Northwood - 62125/APP/2012/281</b></p> <p><b>3 x two storey, 2-bed, terraced dwellings with habitable roofspace to include associated parking and amenity space involving the demolition of existing garage lock up</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum.</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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed design would be over dominant due to its size, scale and bulk.</li> <li>• The proposed design would result in loss of light to immediate neighbours.</li> <li>• The proposed development would affect the privacy of local residents by overlooking.</li> <li>• The proposed design failed to provide sufficient off-street parking spaces for the three houses and would create a parking pressure.</li> <li>• The proposed design did not provide sufficient amenity space for the future occupiers.</li> <li>• Forge Street was a narrow road and had limited access for this scale of development.</li> </ul> <p>The agent / applicant did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that attempting to squeeze further development onto the site would be a mistake. Room sizes would be small and there would be a lack of amenity to the new residents.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	
<p>167.</p>	<p><b>19 GROVE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 27846/APP/2012/226</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>19 Grove Road, Northwood - 27846/APP/2012/226</b></p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey rear extension incorporating a basement level, single storey side/front extension, front porch, conversion of roofspace for habitable use with 2 rear, 2 side, and 3 front rooflights and 3 skylights involving alterations to existing elevations and patio, stairwell and lightwell to the rear</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum. In doing so, it was noted that since the agenda had been published, two petitions in support of the application had been received.</p> <p>The Chairman acknowledged that as this item had multiple petitions in support, he had decided to exercise his discretion whereby the applicant did not have an automatic right to speak for 5 minutes per petition and he was limited to 10 minutes speaking time overall (5 minutes in response to the petition in objection and 5 minutes for his two petitions in support).</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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development was a severe over development of the site</li> <li>• The proposed development would be out of keeping with the street scene.</li> <li>• The eastward backing homes already suffered from rainwater flooding and the proposed development would increase the local flood risk.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in a loss of privacy.</li> </ul> <p>The representative of the applicant raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would be sympathetic to the area</li> <li>• The basement development was not intrusive to the applicant’s neighbours.</li> <li>• It was material that number 21 Grove Road had been granted planning permission for a basement which was approximately double the size of this application.</li> <li>• The fear of flooding was unfounded.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant (speaking in relation to their petitions in support) raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would add to the attractiveness of the road, would not interfere with the street scene and was in</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>keeping with the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar applications had been made and no objections were raised by neighbours</li> <li>• Number 21 Grove Road has a basement under their complete house as well as a very large elevated terrace.</li> <li>• The Thames Water flood map showed no risk of flooding and groundwater was very low.</li> <li>• The addition of a basement did not add to mass bulk.</li> <li>• From a street scene there is no impact, as the work is below ground and there was no increase in roof height, overshadowing or indeed mass bulk.</li> <li>• There was no increase in the property footprint, no impact to overlooking neighbours and no impact to the street scene.</li> </ul> <p>No Ward Councillors attended.</p> <p>Referring to the Addendum, the Head of Planning explained that the comment ‘the ward councillors support the officer’s report for the above application’ was a direct quote from an email from one and not all the ward councillors.</p> <p>In discussing the application, Members noted that a similar proposal had been approved at 21 Grove Road and on this basis the majority of the Committee agreed the application should be approved.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with five votes in favour with one against.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report.</b></p>	
168.	<p><b>R/O 64-66 HALLOWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 2200/APP/2011/2927</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>R/O 64-66 Hallowell Road, Northwood - 2200/APP/2011/2927</b></p> <p><b>Change of use of the existing ancillary outbuilding to 4 x 1- bed residential care units, to include alterations to elevation</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which concerned a change of use.</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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal (if agreed) would set a precedent for back garden development and was development by stealth.</li> <li>• The proposal was an over development of the site</li> <li>• The proposal would result in the loss of amenities (noise, light, use of services, parking);</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in the loss of privacy to gardens</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would result in increased noise and disturbance to near by neighbours</li> </ul> <p>A representative of the applicant attended the meeting and made the following points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments have not been made in the full knowledge of what the activities of the care home will entail.</li> <li>• The proposed development will enable a small community care facility to be built.</li> <li>• The proposed development will not have an adverse on local car parking.</li> <li>• The applicant had worked with the Council during the pre-application phase and had sought to address the concerns raised by officers.</li> <li>• The proposed development will protect the amenity of local residents and those in the local area.</li> <li>• The proposed development will create a more sedate use of the primary property.</li> </ul> <p>In response to a question about the likely age groups which would use the proposed development, the Committee learnt that most residents would be aged 80 or over. The representative of the applicant explained that the intention was to be able to provide all round care.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about the access route between the proposal and the primary property and the practicalities of providing care and answering calls for assistance especially in periods of foul weather. On balance, the Committee agreed this was a complicated site and a decision should be deferred until a site visit had taken place.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that the application be deferred for a site visit.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred for a site visit.</b></p>	
169.	<p><b>5 POPLARS CLOSE, RUISLIP - 61775/APP/2011/1204</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>5 Poplars Close, Ruislip - 61775/APP/2011/1204</b></p> <p><b>Single storey side/rear extension - Deferred from North Committee 21 Feb 2012</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum. It was noted that since the publication of the agenda, a petition in objection to the proposal had been received. This new petition ensured a representative of the petitioners could address this subsequent meeting after the item had been deferred in February 2012 (when they last spoke at committee).</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><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

The petitioner made the following points:

- The proposed development would be over dominant and an over development of the site.
- The plans were of poor quality and poor design
- The useable size of rear garden had been reduced by a very large brick outbuilding built in 2008 at the bottom of the rear garden. The plans of the garden size indicate the garden was bigger than it actually was and plan fails to show the outbuilding.
- The irregular shape on the plot would be incompatible with surroundings and conservation area status;
- The roof of the proposal would reduce daylight to No. 7 Poplars Close and add to a hemming in effect to No. 7 Poplars Close;
- The proposal would extend well beyond existing building line and would not maintain existing spaces between properties.
- The proposed design would significantly reduce amenity space and lead to a terracing effect.

The agent or applicant did not attend the meeting.

All three ward Councillors were in attendance and one ward Councillor spoke. The following points were raised:

- The proposed development was totally unacceptable
- The officer report was incorrect as the dwelling contained 5 bedrooms and not 4 as stipulated in the report.
- The proposed development would create parking problems
- The proposed development would have a significant visual impact
- The proposed development would lead to further loss of amenity as the site had been a building site for several years

In discussing the application, the Chairman and Labour Lead confirmed they had both attended a site visit to assess the application. Officers were asked whether there were any right to light issues arising from the application and the Committee were informed that this was not an issue. When discussing the likely visual impact of the proposal, it was noted that the height of the single storey extension would be lower than the height of the next door fence line.

The Committee raised concerns about the development evolving into a home of multiple occupation and enquired whether a condition could be imposed to safeguard against this possibility. The Committee also expressed concerns about the number of external flues as shown in the photographs contained in the officer presentation. In both cases, officers confirmed that conditions could be introduced to address these concerns.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

**Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report subject to the addition of two further conditions relating to occupation as a single family dwelling only and details of any**

	external flue to be submitted (to the Planning Department for approval).	
170.	<p><b>214 WHITBY ROAD, RUISLIP - 35710/APP/2012/171</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>214 Whitby Road, Ruislip - 35710/APP/2012/171</b></p> <p><b>Change of use of ground floor from retail (Use Class A1) to dental surgery (Use Class D1).</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
171.	<p><b>THE SWAN PH, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 18239/APP/2012/242</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>The Swan PH, Breakspear Road North, Harefield - 18239/APP/2012/242</b></p> <p><b>Two storey detached building to contain 6, two-bedroom, self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space and alterations to existing vehicle crossover to front, (involving demolition of existing building). (Resubmission)</b></p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. In discussing the application, the Committee noted that since the Addendum had been published the applicant had contacted the Council with further information about the use of a geogrid membrane which sought to address the outstanding arborial issues concerning the application.</p> <p>Referring to the officer report, the Committee questioned how architectural features of the building could be retained if the building was approved for demolition. Officers clarified this condition related to removal and retention of the Swan motif from the existing building and the requirement for this to be integrated into frontage of the proposed development.</p> <p>In relation to the protected ash tree highlighted in the report, officers confirmed that a non standard condition could be used to ensure this was protected and not damaged during the construction phase.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum subject to issues relating to trees being satisfactorily resolved (with the final decision delegated to the Head of Planning).</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>



172.	<p><b>THE SWAN PH, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 18239/APP/2012/244</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>The Swan PH, Breakspear Road North, Harefield - 18239/APP/2012/244</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of existing two-storey detached building (Application for Conservation Area Consent) (Resubmission)</b></p> <p>Following discussions arising from item 12, application 18239/APP/2012/242, the recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
173.	<p><b>S 106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT TO 31 DECEMBER 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Members received a report updating them on the current position in relation to S106 agreements.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the report be noted.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.05 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.