

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 September 2010

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

|     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
|     | <p><b>Committee Members Present:</b><br/>Councillors John Hensley (Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Tim Barker, Jazz Dhillion, Ray Graham, Carol Melvin and Michael White.</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b><br/>Jales Tippell (Head of Major Initiatives, Strategic Planning and Transportation)<br/>Meg Hirani (Team Leader)<br/>Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer)<br/>Keith Lancaster (Legal Advisor)<br/>Nav Johal (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b><br/>Councillors Brian Crowe, Philip Corthorne, Douglas Mills, Susan O'Brien and John Riley.</p> |  |
| 24. | <p><b>ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Hensley was elected Chairman.</p>  | <b>Action by</b>                                   |
| 25. | <p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Councillor's Eddie Lavery, Alan Kauffmann, Michael Markham and David Payne.</p>   | <b>Action by</b>                                   |
| 26. | <p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Raymond Graham declared a personal and prejudicial interest for items 9 &amp; 10. Cllr Graham left the room for these items.</p>  | <b>Action by</b>                                   |
| 27. | <p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The minutes were deferred to the next North Planning Committee meeting on the 5<sup>th</sup> October 2010 as only 2 members at the meeting were present who attended the meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> August 2010.</p>  | <b>Action by</b><br><br><b>Democratic Services</b> |
| 28. | <p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>  | <b>Action by</b>                                   |
| 29. | <p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS</b></p>   | <b>Action by</b>                                   |

|     |  |           |
|-----|--|-----------|
|     | <p><b>MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items parked part 2 were considered in private.</p>  |           |
| 30. | <p><b>LAND TO REAR OF 51 AND 53 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 66982/APP/2010/1004</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of 2 five-bedroom, two storey detached dwellings with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space.</b></p> <p>66982/APP/2010/1004</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of two, 5 bedroom detached houses in the back gardens of nos. 51 and 53 Pembroke Road. The officer report stated proposal would not harm the residential amenities of nearby properties and a satisfactory residential environment would be achieved for future occupiers of the new houses. However, the proposed development was considered to be detrimental to the form, plan layout and character of the local area.</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 petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr David Hood stated that 94 petitioners had signed the petition objecting to the application.</li> <li>• This was the 3<sup>rd</sup> time in 4 years the lead petitioner had addressed the Committee on a similar development.</li> <li>• The area was an agricultural society, until the arrival of the Metropolitan Line. With outside parks, open spaces and most important, gardens, which were a homeowner's pride and joy.</li> <li>• That the gardens were a large and very important part of Ruislip homes. It was a very green suburb. The petitioners wished to protest against 'garden grabbing'.</li> <li>• The application was totally overbearing and out of keeping with the surroundings.</li> <li>• The lead petitioners house and garden joined the proposed development area and he had lived there on and off his whole life.</li> <li>• That the proposal to build 2 very large 5 bedroom houses was out of keep with the surrounding areas.</li> <li>• The lead petitioner spoke about the Government and Mayor of London, both wanted to put a stop to garden grabbing.</li> </ul> <p>Points raised by the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the officer report acknowledged that the proposal would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers or nearby properties and that it would of achieved a satisfactory residential environment for future occupiers of the new houses.</li> <li>• The applicant confirmed he would enter into a legal agreement</li> </ul> | Action by |

to pay for additional school places in the area and would be happy for this requirement to be covered by a planning condition.

- He would be happy to accept a planning condition that include that the access point be reduced to 5m in width.
- That the owners of several properties in the area were in support of the application.
- The applicant was disappointed that the officer report did not acknowledge the support for the application in more detail.
- It was noted that the character of the area was varied, with homes of varying designs. The applicant acknowledged that most of the buildings in the area were two-storey detached houses which was why he was proposing to build two, two-storey detached houses.
- That the proposed development would leave over 70% of the present gardens as green space. The impact on neighbours and street scene would be minimal.
- The proposed development would harmonise with the character and the appearance of the area and preserve its local distinctiveness.

Ward Councillors Susan O'Brien and Douglas Mills addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- Councillor O'Brien was satisfied with the report comments and supported the recommendation of the report.
- She stated that this area was adjacent to a conservation area, and that it would have a detrimental effect on the environment and wildlife.
- Councillor Douglas Mills was in support of Mr Hood, lead petitioner, and the petitioners that signed the petition against the development. He agreed with Mr Hood's comments.
- He stated the inappropriateness of the proposal and the implications of building on a back garden.
- That the Government had made it clear that wanted to stop building on back gardens.
- He was pleased the way the recommendation was summarised and that it was time to draw the line and look after local residents.

Members asked for clarification on the roof height and questioned officers about waste/refuse disposal. Officers explained that the roof height would be 300mm higher than the existing building and that there was sufficient refuse space between the access points. Members also asked about the site-lines and officers were satisfied this would not be any different to what was existing.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be refused as set out in the officer's report**

**Meg Hirani**

31.

**37 HOWLETTS LANE, RUISLIP 33165/APP/2010/1011** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Action by**

Conversion of existing bungalow to two x 2 bedroom semi-detached bungalows involving alterations/extensions to existing dwelling.

33165/APP/2010/1011

Planning permission was sought for the conversion of the existing bungalow to provide a pair of semi-detached bungalows. The officer report stated that the proposal would maximise the use of the land for residential purposes and would provide adequate amenities of future occupiers. That the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and would not harm the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers.

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 petitioner:

- Mrs Hilary Fuller stated that she spoke on behalf of those that lived around the area who wished to object to the planning application.
- She stated that the planning application did not comply with several regulations. That only 1 detached property could be built on the site.
- That the application was not in keeping with the existing bungalows and street scene. That it would not blend in and it would change the character of the area.
- That the owner at no.35 was concerned about knocking down the boundary which was 1-metre from her property and the effect it would have had on her property.
- That the feature of the bungalows in the area was the difference between them. It was distinguishing and the proposed development would detract from the attractive street scene.

Points raised by the applicant:

- Mr Jim Biek stated that the planning application was made with extensive consultation on 3 occasions with officers.
- The proposal was for the existing occupier and his parents.
- The principle of sub-division was deemed acceptable by planning officers.
- The property on the road were very diverse so the proposal would of fitted in with the existing street scene.
- That the development would of maintained the building which was in a bad condition.
- There was no existing passage that passes through other houses.

Ward Councillors John Riley, Philip Corthorne and Brian Crowe addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- Councillor Riley stated that Howletts Lane was a particular type of road, with beauteous properties. Many of which were detached bungalows.

|     |  |                   |
|-----|--|-------------------|
|     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal did not form any side access and that access to the back of the property was virtually impossible for any large objects.</li> <li>• That parking would be restricted and this would have had a knock-on effect.</li> <li>• That all the properties on the street were detached and a semi-detached property would be out of character.</li> <li>• Councillor Riley supported Mrs Fuller and the residents who petitioned against this application and asked for the Committee to refuse the application. That if they did approve it they should consider additional conditions to the application.</li> <li>• Councillor Corthorne supported the petitioners and endorsed the views already expressed.</li> <li>• He felt that officers had not fully considered the area, street scene and boundary.</li> <li>• He was disappointed that his own objections were not recorded in the report, and he supported the objections of the residents and ward councillors.</li> <li>• Councillor Brian Crowe agreed largely with what had already been said.</li> <li>• He wished to emphasis the points on parking, narrowness of the roads, refuse/bins, the terrace appearance and very open nature of the road.</li> </ul> <p>Members sought further clarification on the legal matters regarding a restricted covenance. The Legal Officer advised that this was an enforcement matter between land owners and not material for planning committee considerations.</p> <p>Members questioned officers on highways issues, on the natural light and they were concerned with the amount of information they had to base their decision on.</p> <p>The Chairman advised the petitioners that if they wished to submit a petition against the new plan then it would have to be a fresh petition.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>Deferred due to insufficient information. The Committee requested further info on:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Highway crossover;</b></li> <li><b>2. Light study to demonstrate that requirements are met in bedroom 2 of both units;</b></li> <li><b>3. Light study to demonstrate that requirements are met in the kitchen;</b></li> <li><b>4. Shadowing diagrams required for the bed 2s;</b></li> <li><b>5. How ladders can be taken through the house.</b></li> <li><b>6. How will Code 3 will be met.</b></li> </ol> | <b>Meg Hirani</b> |
| 32. | <p><b>OAKHURST, 1 NORTHGATE, NORTHWOOD 30779/APP/2010/1108 - REPORT TO FOLLOW</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>1 five-bedroom two storey with basement level detached dwelling with</p>   | <b>Action by</b>  |

associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of existing detached dwelling.

30779/APP/2010/1108

This application sought permission to demolish the locally listed 'Oakhurst' and erect a 5-bedroom detached property with a similar siting, scale and design. The officer report stated that although permission had already been granted for the renovation, refurbishment and extension of Oakhurst, the applicants claimed that the property was structurally unsound and in too poor a state of repair for its renovation to be viable and a building survey had been submitted in support of the application.

The Council had produced an independent building survey that suggested that other options were available to allow the restoration of the building that could be viable. In the absence of information to demonstrate that all options for the renovation of the building had been fully explored, it was considered that the demolition of the locally listed building was unacceptable.

The detailed design of the replacement building was also not considered acceptable and as evidence of bats has been found in the roof of the building, additional surveys were required. No information had been provided as regards energy conservations and a contribution from the new building towards renewable energy. The application was recommended for refusal.

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 petitioner:

- Lesley Crowcroft spoke on behalf of the lead petitioner on both items 9 and 10.
- The petitioners supported the observations of the planning officers.
- She was at the site a few days ago and said it was in the condition of a builders yard. That at least 75 trees and shrubs had been removed before the application had come to Committee. This was not reflected in the plans submitted to Committee at the meeting.
- The petitioners felt that a new build would be totally inappropriate, that garden-grabbing could also be an issue.
- That the Council should adequately protect Oakhurst and that it would be great loss if it was demolished.
- The person who built Oakhurst and its sister building was an historic person.
- Petitioners felt that the developers had not given sufficient information to justify knocking down the building.
- The petitioners asked that the Committee upheld the officers' recommendation on both applications for Oakhurst.
- She also asked for this to go to the Planning Inspectorate.

|            |   |                          |
|------------|---|--------------------------|
|            | <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Richard Lewis sent his comments to the Committee on both items 9 and 10. He strongly opposed the application for the destruction of Oakhurst. He stated that the original planning consent was granted with the condition that Oakhurst was refurbished and retained in situ. Without the condition the original consent would not have been granted. That there were very few houses on the Copseworrd Estate that had much character and loosing Oakhurst would be a tragedy.</p> <p>Members felt that the developers had not done a good job of looking after this property. That it had been neglected and not enough information was given to justify knocking it down.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report and addendum</b></p>   | <p><b>Meg Hirani</b></p> |
| <p>33.</p> | <p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF OAKHURST, NORTHGATE, NORTHWOOD 67012/APP/2010/1107 - REPORT TO FOLLOW</b><br/><i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Erection of 1, five-bedroom two-storey with basement level, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of new vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>67012/APP/2010/1107</p> <p>The proposal was for a five bedroom detached house within the side garden of 'Oakhurst', a locally listed building. Development for two new houses had previously been granted at the rear of Oakhurst, within its extensive curtilage. The officers report stated that this scheme was at the front of the site, in a far more prominent position, adjacent to the locally listed building. It was considered that in such a position, having regard to the recent changes to PPS3 and the Mayor's guidance, the proposed house and hardstanding would be unduly detrimental to the open character and appearance of this part of the Copsewood Area of Special Local Character of which it formed a part and the setting of the locally listed building.</p> <p>Furthermore, the subdivision of the plot would be likely to result in pressure to remove or substantially reduce an impressive protected Oak to the rear of Oakhurst that the Local Planning Authority would find difficult to resist. Also, sufficient tree information on the application site had not been submitted and the scheme did not provide sufficient survey information as regards protected species and was inaccurate in terms of describing a badger sett in relation to the proposed works.</p> <p>Furthermore, no information had been submitted as regards energy conservation and a contribution towards renewable energy.</p> | <p><b>Action by</b></p>  |

|            |   |                          |
|------------|---|--------------------------|
|            | <p>Finally, no S106 contribution towards an education contribution had been secured. The Planning Inspectorate to be advised that had an appeal for non-determination not been received, the application would have been refused for these reasons, together with any comments received from English Nature and the London Wildlife Trust.</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 petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lesley Crowcroft had nothing further to add from points in item 9.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Richard Lewis comments were as per item 9.</p> <p>Members asked for some guidance on the lack of tree protection for the property. Members felt that allowing to build on this would take away part of the garden of Oakhurst which could then in turn give reason to demolish Oakhurst.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as set out in the officer's report and addendum</b></p>   | <p><b>Meg Hirani</b></p> |
| <p>34.</p> | <p><b>GRASS VERGE OPPOSITE RECREATION GROUND, MOORHALL ROAD, HAREFIELD 67032/APP/2010/1845</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Installation of a 12.5m high mobile telecommunications pole and ancillary equipment cabinet (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995)</p> <p>67032/APP/2010/1845</p> <p>This application had been submitted jointly by Vodafone and O2 and sought to determine whether prior approval was required for the siting and design of an 12.5m high slim line street works 'monopole' mobile phone mast, incorporating six antennas and one ancillary equipment cabinet, measuring 1.4m x 0.44 x 1.55m high. The officer report stated that the installation was required in order to provide future 3G coverage as part of Vodafone's and O2's licence obligations.</p> <p>The applicants had searched the desired coverage area and concluded that there were no other more suitable locations available. In support of the application, the applicants had supplied copies of technical details of their search/coverage area plans and justification for their site selection.</p> <p>However, it was considered that the proposed installation would be</p> | <p><b>Action by</b></p>  |



|     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
|     | <p>visually unacceptable in this sensitive location along a busy main road, adjacent to Green Belt land and a Nature Conservation Site of Metropolitan or Borough Grade I Importance. The proposal would result in an unacceptable cumulative impact by introducing a new installation in close proximity to an existing mobile phone mast and associated equipment cabinets at this section of Moorhall Road.</p> <p>Other sites should be more thoroughly investigated. As such it was recommended that the prior approval of siting and design was required and the details of siting and design be refused.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report.</b></p> | <b>Meg Hirani</b>   |
| 35. | <p><b>96 LONG DRIVE, RUISLIP 7280/APP/2010/1418</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey rear extension.</p> <p>7280/APP/2010/1418</p> <p>The main issues for consideration related to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original house, on the surrounding area generally, and on residential amenity. Officers confirmed that they had received updated parking plans.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet. A condition be added to ensure that parking remained for as long as the development.</b></p>   | <b>Action by</b><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><b>Meg Hirani</b> |
| 36. | <p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Hensley declared a personal interest for this item.</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be taken. On being put to the vote, enforcement was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report and addendum sheet be agreed.</b></p>  | <b>Action by</b><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br><b>Meg Hirani</b> |
| 37. | <p><b>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>   | <b>Action by</b>  |

|     |  |                  |
|-----|--|------------------|
| 38. | <b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 15</i> )<br><br>None. | <b>Action by</b> |
|     | The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.15 pm.                |                  |

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.