

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

16th March 2010

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Published on:

Come into effect on: Immediately



<p>1.</p>	<p>Members Present:</p> <p>Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) Michael Markham Liz Kemp John Oswell David Payne Peter Curling</p> <p>Apologies:</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Anita MacDonald and Carol Melvin with Councillors Peter Curling and Liz Kemp substituting.</p> <p>Officers Present:</p> <p>James Rodger, Richard Phillips, Syed Shah, Sarah White and Charles Francis.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Declarations of Interest:</p> <p>None</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>Minutes:</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 23rd February 2010 and 10th March 2010 were not available</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Exclusion of the Press and Public:</p> <p>It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public with the exception of Item 11 – an urgent Enforcement report which was considered in PART II</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>Consideration of Reports:</p> <p>Reports were considered as set out below:</p>

6.	<p>HAREFIELD HOSPITAL HILL END ROAD HAREFIELD MIDDLESEX</p> <p>Retention and continued use, for a further period of two years, of single storey temporary ward building with access link to main building (previous planning permission ref.9011/APP/2006/2843.)</p> <p>9011/APP/2009/2546</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
7.	<p>94 GLEBE AVENUE ICKENHAM</p> <p>Change of use from Class A1 (Shops) to Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services.)</p> <p>54202/APP/2009/2171</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
8.	<p>121 HERLWYN AVENUE RUISLIP</p> <p>Retention of part and demolition of part of unauthorised side and rear extension and change to roof profile</p> <p>65165/APP/2010/158</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution representatives of petition received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is out of character with the surrounding area • The roof extension is ugly and the raised height of the roof is not in keeping with local properties • (The extension) is an unsympathetic addition • The visual impact of the development (due to its varying 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

proportions) on the surrounding area

- The flat roof is out of scale and the roof line is too high
- The development is overly dominant and intrusive
- The property looks unattractive especially when viewed from Roxbourne Way
- What state are the foundations of the property and have services (electricity, gas and water supplies / sewage) been correctly installed?
- The development does not overcome the reasons for refusal
- What is the point of an applicant being required to seek planning consent if they develop a property as they choose?
- Where is the Duty of Care?

Points raised by the applicant included:

- The conversion work had been delegated to a local advisor who was allegedly an expert
- The applicant was unaware that the development 'had gone wrong' and further building works had continued without their knowledge
- The applicant had contacted a local Ward Councillor for advice but had not received a response
- The applicant had trusted the builders but had been let down
- When the applicant was aware of the problems they had sought urgent advice from a local architect and was advised to partially remove the extension
- Contrary to reports, the applicant only intends to live in the property and not to use it for business purposes
- The applicant urgently needs to rectify this matter otherwise they will be homeless

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- The objections raised by the petitioners were supported.
- This is an illegal structure and should be demolished
- The development is discordant and overly dominant
- The new dormer window exceeds the permitted development
- Concerns about the foundations and whether these were checked?
- If the development were permitted, this would be a travesty and the Local Authority would be seen as a 'pushover'

Members accepted that this was a highly emotive application but reiterated that the matter would have to be decided in line with planning policy.

	<p>Having listened to the various concerns members felt that the proposed development was out of character with the area, obtrusive and over-dominant. Members were particularly surprised that building work had continued despite an enforcement notice having been issued. Members felt that the development was contrary to Planning Policies BE13 and BE15.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be overturned and Refused for the reasons set out in the report and Addendum sheet with an additional reason for refusal as detailed below:</p> <p><i>'The proposed single storey side and rear extension, by reason of its size, siting, bulk and height, would fail to harmonise with the scale and proportions of the existing bungalow, furthermore it is considered that it would appear as an over-dominant feature on this prominent corner site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies BE13 and BE15 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).'</i></p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>GIRL GUIDING, WILLOW TREE CENTRE BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH HAREFIELD</p> <p>Replacement of extant planning permission ref.50910/APP/2006/2991,dated 03-04-2007 (Erection of two single storey detached buildings for (i) training for adult youth leaders and young people including those with special needs and (ii) maintenance shed for mechanical equipment (health and safety requirements) and provision of two additional disabled car parking spaces for people with disabilities</p> <p>50910/APP/2010/152</p> <p>With reference to the floor plan provided, Members highlighted that there was a possibility that disabled users might become trapped between doorways (training room 2 doorway to crew room doorway) and asked whether the crew room doorway could be moved right to avoid this possibility.</p> <p>After considering this concern the recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to changes set out in the Addendum and additional condition set out below:</p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the details shown on Drawing. No. 2A received on 4th February 2010, prior to the commencement of works on site, a revised floor plan of the training building shall</i></p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p><i>be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority that shows the re-siting of the volunteer crew room internal door so that its opening circle avoids that of the disabled toilet on the opposite side of the corridor. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved revised details.</i></p> <p>REASON To ensure that adequate facilities are provided for people with disabilities in accordance with Policy R16 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and London Plan (February 2008) Policies 3A.13, 3A.17 and 4B.5.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, the Addendum sheet and additional condition set out above.</p>	
10.	<p>56 MANOR WAY RUISLIP</p> <p>Boundary wall to side and rear (Retrospective application.)</p> <p>19650/APP/2009/2604</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
11.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</p> <p>The recommendation that no further action be taken was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed. 2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned. 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
	<p>Meeting closed at: 20:05 p.m.</p> <p>Next meetings: - Next ordinary meeting 6 April 2010</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 are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.