

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

7 December 2010

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



	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Edward Lavery (Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Alan Kauffam, Pat Jackson, Carol Melvin and David Payne</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Meg Hirani (Planning and Enforcement) Manmohan Ranger (Planning and Enforcement) Rory Stracey (Legal Services) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Henry Higgins and Councillor Richard Barnes</p>	
52.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr Michael Markham with Cllr Pat Jackson substituting and also Cllr Jazz Dhillon with no substitute.</p>	
53.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor David Payne declared a prejudicial interest in items 6, 7, 8 and 9 –RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove, Ruislip by virtue of having been involved as a Ward Councillor of the application site. Councillor Payne withdrew from the room and did not take part in the decision of the applications.</p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a non-prejudicial interest in items 10, 11 and 12 'Former Kings Arms Garage Site, Rickmansworth Road, Harefield' as he knew the petitioner.</p>	
54.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
55.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None</p>	

56.	<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>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1.</p>	
57.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2010/1094</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>At the start of the item, the Chairman explained that the five petitions which had been submitted enabled a representative of the petitioners to speak on agenda Items 6, 7 and 8 in three cases and on items 6 and 7 in 2 cases. All these items were related. The Agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners were informed that that they had the right to address the Committee up to three times (should their petition apply to items 6, 7 and 8 and twice when it related to items 6 and 7). The petitioners waived this right and chose to speak on Item 6 only.</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the amendments in the Addendum and summarised the letter in support of local residents which had been received from a Ward Councillor. Officers also referred to a further letter which had been received from Nick Hurd MP in support of local residents.</p> <p>A representative of the five petitions received in objection to the application addressed the Committee. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would adversely affect the privacy of residents due to the increased amounts of overlooking (especially from blocks C,D and W). In some cases due to land rises, the first floors of some developments would overlook the bedrooms of opposite properties.</li> <li>• The proposal did not incorporate sufficient amenity space</li> <li>• The proposal was an over development of the site</li> <li>• The proposal did not include a sufficient number of footpaths and so there was a danger to pedestrian safety</li> <li>• The proposal was out of keeping with Eastcote and Hillingdon</li> <li>• The design was out of keeping with the street scene</li> <li>• The infrastructure of Eastcote was already at breaking point and there were already significant pressures on local services such as schools and medical facilities</li> <li>• The proposal lacked sufficient car parking spaces. Relatives and visitors would be forced to park on adjacent local roads</li> <li>• The height and scale of proposal was out of keeping with the southern half of the development</li> <li>• The application would increase roof heights and so the design would become more visually intrusive</li> <li>• The proposal would increase traffic congestion on local roads</li> <li>• The proposal would adversely affect the special character of old Eastcote</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overdevelopment of the site would cause access problems for service vehicles, such as refuse collection and emergency services.</li> <li>• The proposal would not comply with government guidance which had reduced the number of units from 50 to 30 per hectare.</li> <li>• The developers had not worked in partnership with the community during the consultation period.</li> <li>• The proposal would cause drainage difficulties</li> </ul> <p>In discussing the application, Members agreed the development site was already full and any additional development would have significant impact on amenity space. In relation to car parking facilities, Members agreed that the proposal did not have sufficient capacity for visitors, which would lead to additional parking in surrounding roads. When summarising the discussions, the Chairman drew the petitioner's attention to reason for refusal 3 which specifically related to '<i>an unacceptable loss of residential amenity</i>'.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report and Addendum.</b></p>	
58.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2010/1099</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the amendments in the Addendum.</p> <p>The petitioners chose not to speak on this item.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report and Addendum and for the addition of Block T to the list of plots to reason for refusal 4.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
59.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2010/1100</b> (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the amendments in the Addendum.</p> <p>The petitioners chose not to speak on this item.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report and Addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

60.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2010/1901</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Officers drew the Committee's attention to changes in the Addendum.</p> <p>The Committee noted that only 3 of the 6 plots complied with the Council's guidance on amenity space and having taken the measurements into consideration, the Committee decided to overturn the officer recommendation.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval with the amendments on the Addendum was overturned. It was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed that the application be refused for the following reason:</p> <p><i>The proposal would result in the reduction of private amenity space available to the dwellings below a level which is considered acceptable for the size of dwellings proposed, particularly in relation to plots 222, 223 and 260. As a result a cramped appearance would arise, with inadequate amenity space for the dwellings to the detriment of the amenity of future occupiers. The proposal would, therefore, be contrary to policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Layouts.</i></p> <p><b>Resolved – That the officer recommendation be overturned and the application be refused</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
61.	<p><b>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE SITE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2010/2200</b> (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>At the start of the item, the Chairman explained that the petitions which had been submitted enabled a representative of the petitioners to speak on agenda Items 10, 11 and 12 which were all related. If the petitioners did so, then the agent would have a right to reply on each occasion. The petitioners waived this right and chose to speak on Item 10 only.</p> <p>A representative of the two petitions received in objection to the application addressed the Committee. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The officer recommendations for refusal were supported.</li> <li>• Harefield village was already very congested and the number of deliveries required would cause traffic problems</li> <li>• There was a need to protect the historic village centre, the landscape and 'the pace of life' in Harefield</li> <li>• If Tesco were to operate in Harefield, it would overpower local small traders</li> <li>• The design, scale and setting of the proposal was out of character with the village</li> <li>• The proposal was an overdevelopment of the site in terms of</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

scale and mass

- The proposed number of parking spaces would be inadequate for the site and 4 of the 6 parking spaces would need to be closed when deliveries took place
- The proposal would encourage vehicles to park on the pavement and there would be a danger to pedestrian safety
- Concerns were raised about the tidiness of the site should the proposal be approved
- The proposed development would be about four times the size of other local businesses

Points raised by the agent:

- One of the reasons for refusal related to the high levels of management intervention required when deliveries took place. The applicant had addressed these concerns and agreed to use lorries no larger than 8 metres.
- Deliveries would only take place within the site rather than on the kerb side.
- There would only need to be two delivery vehicles on site occasionally
- When deliveries took place, four parking spaces would not need to be closed and residential car parking spaces would not be affected.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and raised the following points:

- The agent was thanked for acknowledging that two delivery vehicles would need to be on site.
- Recent road works had required a single lane of traffic to be used and this had highlighted the levels of congestion in Harefield. The anticipated number of deliveries for the proposal would exacerbate this situation.
- This was the third or fourth time the application had been considered by Committee and as such was deemed to be an abuse of resources (to try and drive the application through).

Members asked officers for further clarification about the number of parking spaces. Officers explained that the proposal included residential car parking spaces but did not include parking spaces for retail use. It was noted that the Inspector had not highlighted the lack of parking to be an issue in this case.

In response to a query about the tidiness of the site, officers explained that a section 215 notice could be served when there was very serious impact on the street scene. However, as the current impact was limited it would not be appropriate in this case.

Members referred to the agent's comments concerning the occasional use of two delivery vehicles and concluded that due to the scale of the operation, the applicant could not guarantee vehicle controls (over the numbers required) over the long term. Members agreed with the petitioners that pedestrian safety would be affected if the proposal was agreed.

	<p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	
62.	<p><b>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE SITE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2010/2201</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
63.	<p><b>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE SITE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2010/2204</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
64.	<p><b>LAND FPO 11 HOYLAKE GARDENS, RUISLIP - 66856/APP/2010/2169</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>The application had been withdrawn by the applicant.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
65.	<p><b>176 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 6277/APP/2010/2161</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
66.	<p><b>LAND AT GRAND UNION CANAL BANK, SPRINGWELL FARM, SPRINGWELL LANE, HAREFIELD - 67241/APP/2010/1939</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
67.	<p><b>42 VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 38038/APP/2010/2179</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

	<p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
68.	<p><b>RAF NORTHOLT, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 189/APP/2010/2585</b> <i>(Agenda Item 17)</i></p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer's report.</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 8.55 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.