

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 October 2011

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) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Michael Markham Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Peter Curling</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah White and Nav Johal</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby (item 24) and Councillor Philip Corthorne (item 14)</p>	
30.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Jazz Dhillon sent his apologies, and Councillor Peter Curling was present as a substitute.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
31.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
32.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2011 &amp; 4 OCTOBER 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>These were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
33.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
34.	<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>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items marked part 2 were considered in private. There were no part 2 items to consider.</p>	<b>Action by</b>

35.	<p><b>URGENT ITEM: 36-38 CHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD 50613/APP/2011/397</b> (<i>Agenda Item 24</i>)</p> <p><b>Changes to rear elevation, windows to include wider rear doors. (Application for non-material amendment following grant of appeal decision ref: APP/R5510/A/06/2008833/NWF dated 27/07/2006; Erection of 24-bedroom care home with refurbishment and alterations to no.34 Chester Road and associated parking, involving the demolition of nos.36 and 38 Chester Road)</b></p> <p>In the absence of the application providing a full description of the amendments sought, comprehensive floor plans of all the floors affected and elevation drawings showing the full extent of the amendments shown on plan, the Local Planning Authority was unable to consider the full extent and impact of the proposed amendments. As such, the application failed to demonstrate that the amendments were non-material and would not be harmful to the appearance of the building, the street scene and the amenities of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposal was thus contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>2 objection letters and a petition in objection to the application had been received by the Council.</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"> <li>• Mrs Bridger spoke on behalf of the petition submitted to the Council.</li> <li>• She explained that the plans produced by the applicant were not the same as the request for the changes.</li> <li>• The plans showed that there would be no dining room, the existing lounges would be combined, the patio doors would be blocked and there would be an increase in noise as a result of the changes proposed.</li> <li>• That the side elevation was not shown in the drawings from the applicant.</li> <li>• There were privacy issues to consider. The distance away was less than 3 metres and there would be overlooking onto neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The petitioner stated that neither window was glazed; this was a requirement of the original planning permission granted.</li> <li>• She asked that the size of the windows be looked into. That the windows overlooked neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• That there was no mention of the lift shaft protruding in the report.</li> </ul> <p>The agent was not present.</p> <p>Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby was present and spoke as a Ward</p>	Action by
-----	---	-----------

	<p>Councillor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr Seaman-Digby stated that the officer report was quite comprehensive and the petitioner had highlighted most of the issues of concern.</li> <li>• There were quite a number of issues which were problematic in this application.</li> <li>• Cllr Seaman-Digby stressed that the Council needed to do everything it could for the flagrant disregard for planning process.</li> <li>• He asked that officers, on behalf of residents, with legal assistance, did everything they could to put a stop to this.</li> <li>• He was happy with the officer recommendation of a refusal and stated that the Council needed to be on the front foot with the time consuming applications in regard to this property.</li> <li>• The Ward Cllr asked that officers looked at the site in detail and looked into as there were possible public safety concerns.</li> </ul> <p>Members stated that it was evident from the officer report that not enough information was provided by the applicant on the changes proposed.</p> <p>Enforcement was an issue that could be discussed outside of this meeting and the Committee agreed that officers should pursue this as required.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as per the agenda.</b></p>	
36.	<p><b>HIGHGROVE HOUSE, EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP</b>  <b>10622/APP/2010/1822</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>DEFERRED ON 14th July 2011 FOR FURTHER INFORMATION</p> <p><b>Variation of Condition 3 - Minor material amendment to planning permission ref: 10622/APP/2009/2504 dated 11/02/2010: Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwelling houses and associated works (time extension of planning permission ref: 10622/APP/ 2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007) to allow alterations to the siting and design of the two blocks of mews housing (Retrospective application).</b></p> <p>Members recalled planning and listed building applications on this site for the refurbishment and conversion of Highgrove House to provide 12 residential units and the erection of 4 two-bedroomed mews houses with associated amenity space, off-street parking and landscaping, involving the demolition of the stable building. This item had been deferred to obtain legal opinion from Counsel.</p> <p>This application as originally submitted was for a revised siting and</p>	Action by

design of the mews housing. It had since come to light that the original plans submitted were inaccurate in terms of the siting of the adjoining properties in Kent Gardens. Accurate plans had now been submitted. Furthermore, this application sought to up-date the details which had now been approved in connection with the conditions attached to the renewed planning permission (ref. 10622/APP/2009/2504).

It was considered that as the revised siting of the mews housing did not bring the blocks any nearer to the listed Highgrove House and the alterations to their design were not extensive and were acceptable, its setting would not be adversely affected. For similar reasons, the alterations would not materially harm the amenities of future residents on the site.

In terms of the impact upon adjoining residents on Kent Gardens, it was considered that the revised siting and design of the mews housing would have a neutral impact, and with the planting of a laurel hedge on the boundary, possibly a reduced impact in terms of the existing planning permission as approved. The application was recommended for approval.

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 Andrew Larkin spoke on behalf of the petition submitted to the Council.
- He believed the wrong questions were asked by officers when obtaining legal opinion.
- That commonsense had been lost, and he hoped that the Committee would see sense and did not approve the application.
- The petitioner stated that Councillors had visited the site themselves and asked whether the Council had the power to reject the 2007 permission granted.
- That if the Council could today give retrospective planning then they should have the power to take away planning permission.
- The petitioners felt the development should be demolished.
- Mr Larkin quoted Councillors who had previously expressed their dissatisfaction at the approval of the original plans.
- He stated that if the Council did not make a mistake originally then there would not be a need to be present to make a decision on the application at the meeting.
- He hoped that the Council had the strength, will and power to reject the application.
- The petitioner stated that if the Council could not be governed by its own rules then what hope was there for residents.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Brian Meyer spoke on behalf of the application.
- He referred to Counsel's opinion that was obtained and contained in the officer's report to Committee. That the

	<p>implemented planning was valid and was unlikely to be quashed by court.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If permission was not granted today then the applicant had the option to go to appeal, alternatively demolish what had been built and build it as per the original application which was agreed.</li> <li>• The applicant stated that the application that was being considered by Committee was better for residents than the previous.</li> </ul> <p>Members believed that they had asked the correct questions to Counsel, and Members had the QC's opinion which they had to take into consideration. The guidance that they had received was very clear. The 2007 permission was capable of being implemented and could not be removed.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that Counsels opinion which was sought by the Council. It was wrong to imply that the original planning permission breached Council policy.</p> <p>Members considered whether what was being proposed by the developer was better, the same, or worse than the original application. Despite any errors that could have been made the 2007 application could not be overturned and was not consideration for Members at the meeting.</p> <p>Members felt empathy for residents and felt frustrated for them, but they stressed that if they were to refuse permission on the application for consideration then the developers would have the option to go back to the 2007 application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority of 5 in favour and 2 against. Cllrs' Payne and Melvin recorded their vote against the application.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	
37.	<p><b>THE SWAN PUBLIC HOUSE, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD, 18239/APP/2011/1586</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing two-storey detached building (Application for Conservation Area Consent).</b></p> <p>This was an application for conservation area consent to demolish the two storey detached building on site known as the Swan Public House.</p> <p>The application site was located on the eastern edge of the Harefield Village centre, directly opposite the village green and pond. It was sited on the south western side of Breakspear Road North, some 70m to the east of its junction with High Street and was roughly rectangular in shape, tapering towards the rear with a 24m frontage and an overall depth of 42m. The site comprises a detached two-storey building,</p>	<b>Action by</b>

which was formerly in use as a public house known as The Swan, but was vacant and the site boarded up. The main elevation of the building was set back from the front boundary of the site by approximately 3.3m to 4.0m and this area was used for car parking which appeared to have involved overhanging of the public footway.

The extent of consultation carried out on this scheme and the responses received were detailed on the planning application ref. 3877/APP/2010/2200, which was being reported to this committee. The comments raised by the petitioners and the individual responses mainly involved planning issues and were not particularly relevant to this application for conservation area consent.

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 Jeremy Williamson spoke on behalf of the petition submitted to the Council.
- Most of those that signed the petition were against the design and impact on the village of the application.
- The documents produced by the Council stated what the residents felt very well.
- The siting, design and bulk were what they were objecting too.
- The rear of the proposed building would project a long way.
- The privacy and view would effect neighbouring gardens.
- The lead petitioner stated that they had no objection to a change of use, but the objection was to the style of the building proposed.
- The artist impression showed width of proposal was contrary to the street scene.
- There would be a great deal of over-looking on adjoining on neighbouring gardens.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Bill MacLeod noted corrections on the officer presentation: there were no rooms proposed for the roof in the application submitted.
- He also stated that there would be no balcony at the rear.
- The existing building was not a statutory listed building.
- The building had been extended and modified very poorly over the years.
- The petition made no reference to conservation area.
- The agent questioned the points raised about the width of the proposal.
- The building on the site would no longer be domestic in scale.
- The questions raised about the roof panels were misplaced; in the future solar panels could be built onto the roof.
- The size and style of the proposal was an acceptable replacement. The density was marginally over.
- The replacement building was well designed and had a positive impact on the street scene.

	<p>Members noted the points made by petitioners and the agent with regard to the floors, rooms, roof and amenity space.</p> <p>Members discussed the concept of the design and whether the scheme fitted in with the community and local environment. Members agreed that it would not.</p> <p>Members felt strongly against demolishing a building over 100 years old without good reason. The building was a period building and Members felt the application would not fit in with the street scene. Members were happy to go 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><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as per the agenda and amendment to reason to take out reference to planning application.</b></p>	
38.	<p><b>THE SWAN PUBLIC HOUSE, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD, 18239/APP/2011/1588</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</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).</b></p> <p>This application was for the demolition of The Swan Public House on Breakspear Road North and erection of a two storey block comprising 6 x two-bedroom flats with parking for 8 cars in the front opposite the village green within the Harefield Village Conservation Area.</p> <p>No objections were raised to the loss of the public house use. Although the existing building was not statutorily listed or included on the local list of buildings of architectural or historical merit, it was considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In these circumstances, it was not considered that the application provided sufficient justification as to why the building could not be retained. The proposed building was also considered to be of an inappropriate siting, bulk and design and the scheme would introduce an extensive parking area and large bin store to the front of the building which would detract from the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The scheme was also considered to result in a loss of privacy and appear unduly prominent to adjoining properties and failed to afford adequate amenities for its future occupiers. The scheme also did not make provision for an education contribution. It was recommended accordingly.</p> <p>This application was discussed with item 10.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being</p>	Action by

	<p>put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as per the agenda.</b></p>	
39.	<p><b>130 PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD, 6149/APP/2011/1742</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to Hot Food Take-away (Use Class A5) involving the installation of extractor duct to side and refuse store to rear.</b></p> <p>The application was for the change of use of the premises from a vacant A1 (retail) use to an A5 Take-away use. The proposal also included the installation of extract ducting and the provision of a bin store to the rear of the premises.</p> <p>Whilst the loss of an A1 retail use in itself could be acceptable at this location, it was considered that the siting of the bin store was inappropriate and detrimental to the amenities of the residential accommodation immediately adjacent to the proposed store. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The proposed bin store would be poorly located and would be un-neighbourly, by virtue of its size, siting and general impact on residential amenity. It would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties. As such, the proposal was contrary to Policies OE1, BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007).</p> <p>The petitioners nor the applicant/agent were present and therefore did not speak on behalf of the petition or application.</p> <p>Members spoke about the application; they were familiar with the area. Members felt it was a potential for vermin to have the bins located where it was proposed.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as per the agenda.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
40.	<p><b>24 EASTBURY ROAD, NORTHWOOD, 19305/APP/2011/1584</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of part ground floor, part first floor, part two storey side/rear extensions and extension and alteration of the roof, including a new rear gable, enlarged rear dormer, installation of new window on existing rear gable and five front and one rear rooflights and internal and external alterations, including the re-</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>



**location of the front entrance to allow change of use of property from day care centre (Class D1) to provide 2 three-bedroom and 3 two-bedroom flats (Class C3), including alteration of rear terraces, front ramp, bin and cycle stores and associated parking, access and landscaping (involving demolition of existing extensions, external side staircase and front ramp)**

The proposal was to erect part ground floor, part first floor and part two storey side/rear extensions, extend and alter the roof to include a new rear gable, installation of new window on existing rear gable, enlarged rear dormer and installation of five front and one rear rooflights and internal and external alterations to allow the change of use of the property from day care (Class D1) to 2 three-bedroom and 3 two-bedroom flats (Class C3) within the Northwood/Frithwood Conservation Area.

Internal and external works included the re-location of the front door in the front elevation, alterations to the existing terraced areas at the rear, new front access ramp and provision of bin and cycle stores at the side of the property. Parking for 6 vehicles, including a disabled space would be provided on the existing hardstanding area at the front of the property, accessed by means of a new central vehicular crossover, and associated landscaping. Works also involved demolition of the existing extensions, removal of external side staircase and front ramp.

There were no objections in principle to the loss of the day care facility with provision being made elsewhere in the borough and given this former more intensive use of the site, no objections were raised to the principle of providing flats on the site.

The extensions were considered to be appropriate to the size and scale of the building and their design would match existing features and harmonise with the character of the building. The scheme took adequate account of its impact upon existing trees on site. As such, the proposal would maintain and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The scheme would not adversely affect the amenities of surrounding residential properties and would afford appropriate residential accommodation for future occupiers. Parking and access arrangements were considered acceptable. It was recommended for approval.

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 Mark Ryder spoke on behalf of the petition submitted.
- He stated that many of the 40 strong petitioners could not attend the meeting as it was during half term.
- The petitioners welcomed the change to the application.
- The main concerns of the petitioners were traffic, parking and privacy.

- Mr Ryder estimated that the around 17 people would be living there and this would exceed the 6 cars allocated.
- They would be forced to park on an already busy road.
- It was a dangerous 5 junction road.
- The application would mean that residents existing parking would be reduced on the road.
- The petitioner asked that Committee visited the site themselves to see the traffic and parking problems.
- The petitioner felt that the windows proposed had implications on the privacy of neighbours. The windows were more intrusive than that previously and another neighbouring application could not use the windows proposed.
- Northwood Residents Association strongly objected to the application.
- The application went against policy and the petitioner wished that their objections be noted.
- The petitions suggested alternatives of a single family development or a maximum of 3 flats for the site.

Members were familiar with the road and the surrounding roads. Members confirmed with officers that the proposed extension was in scale with the existing building.

Members discussed any overlooking that could exist and were satisfied that it was within guidelines.

Officers explained to Members that 7 parking spaces were being provided, this exceeded the minimum standard. One of the spaces could be used as a disabled bay and was large enough for the use.

Members were concerned about whether there was adequate space for a 7<sup>th</sup> bay as well as bin storage. Members also discussed how busy the road could get during the school run.

Officers and Members discussed any traffic implications with Members and felt that there were no additional concerns to consider.

Members stated that they were there to reject or accept the application put to them and not consider the alternatives suggested by the petitioner.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority of 5 in favour and 2 against. Cllrs' Melvin and Morgan recorded their vote against the application.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved as per the agenda amendments set out in the addendum.**

41. **PEMBROKE HOUSE, 5-9 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP, 38324/APP/2011/786** (*Agenda Item 14*)

**Action by**

**Part conversion from retail/offices (Use Class A1/B1) to 6 x two-bedroom flats and 3 x three-bedroom flats with associated parking, amenity space, cycle store and bin store, installation of balconies to front and rear, alterations to elevations, new fenestration to upper floors, demolition of existing external fire escape, alterations to existing vehicular crossover and removal of existing plant on roof.**

Planning permission was sought for the conversion of vacant offices on the first, second and third floors of a four-storey building to residential use, comprising 6 x two bedroom and 3 x three bedroom flats. There was no objection in principle to their conversion to residential use.

The scheme would not adversely affect the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers. The development would provide 13 car parking spaces, which was considered acceptable in this town centre location with good public transport accessibility. Secure cycle storage would also be provided.

Amenity space was provided in the form of a 115sq.m communal amenity area to the rear and 125sq.m of private balconies for all flats, totalling 240sq.m of amenity space. It was considered that the proposal complies with relevant Council policy and approval was recommended subject to conditions.

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 Sheppard spoke on behalf of the petitioners.
- She lived directly behind the application and stated the gardens would be completely overlooked.
- Although the application was 21metres away the balcony's proposed would look directly onto the gardens.
- The petitioner felt that the privacy issue had not been adequately addressed.
- The proposed screening on the balcony only came to waist height; people would be able to see over the top.
- The residents would feel like they would be on show.
- The Human Rights Act was mentioned in the report but was not addressed.
- A garden is a large part of family life and if the application was approved it would take this away from residents.
- Policy BE24 stated that there needed to be adequate level of privacy for neighbours.
- If the application was approved they would be sharing their lives with others.
- The current building was unattractive, but the proposed building was not in keep with the street scene which was red brick. The proposal was a yellow brick building.
- A neighbouring property had very stringent planning conditions

and the same should apply for this application.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Murray spoke on behalf of the application.
- Pembroke formed a familiar landmark on Ruislip Town Centre.
- There was a need for modernisation.
- The existing structure was unattractive and the proposal would provide a far more attractive building to the street scene.
- Financially the applicant could not afford to demolish the building and start over again.
- The application would compliment nearby retail.
- The application was compliant with policies.
- An investment of this sort should be applauded in today's economic environment.
- Most of the brickwork would be maintained.
- The balconies were there to give private amenity space to residents.

Councillor Philip Corthorne was present and spoke as a Ward Councillor:

- Cllr Corthorne spoke in support of the petitioners.
- The building did need improvement.
- The area was a conservation area.
- There would likely to be an impact on parking on adjoining roads, and people would be unlikely to follow pattern of there being less drivers.
- There was the impact of residential amenities and residents being overlooked to consider.
- The Ward Cllr challenged the level of amenity space stated on the application and that the proposed balconies could be considered amenity space.
- The area was already heavily congested with traffic issues.
- The Ward Cllr asked that the Committee looked at mitigating the effects on residents.

Officers explained to Members that the appearance issue was subjective, and the privacy issues raised were considered acceptable as the distance between the application and neighbouring gardens were far enough.

The Legal Officer explained that although Article 8 of the Human Rights Act was not specifically mentioned in the report, that the report contained comments in relation to impact and neighbours. The Legal Officer was satisfied that Article 8 was not breached.

Members discussed the points raised by the petitioners, Ward Councillor and agent. There were lots of issues to consider but they were not wholly against the application. Members discussed the option of a site visit.

Members were concerned that the balconies would look outwards and onto residents gardens and the overlooking. Members appreciated that the distance was a factor but had to consider how they would feel if

	<p>they were a resident in the area. They did not feel comfortable with the balcony on that height of the building.</p> <p>Also they did not agree with the idea that removing parking spaces would result in a reduction of cars.</p> <p>Members discussed whether the issue of overlooking would still exist if there were no balconies and just windows instead.</p> <p>Members also discussed the exterior design and felt there was an opportunity to do better with the appearance. Members did not have any issues with the office block being converted into residential flats. The concern was the appearance and Members asked if officers and the applicant could work together on improving this and the issue with balconies. Members suggested obscure glass could be an alternative to consider.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be deferred to seek amendments involving removal of balconies and revisions to treatment of front/rear elevations.</b></p>	
42.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 66 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM, 49805/APP/2011/1811</b> (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p><b>Two storey 5-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space, involving installation of vehicular crossover.</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a two storey building with habitable accommodation in the roof space, comprising 1 x 5-bedroom dwelling, together with parking to the front, access drive and associated landscaping.</p> <p>It was considered that the overall layout, density and design would result in a form of development which would harmonise with the surrounding area and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The proposal would not detract from the amenities of adjoining occupiers and would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupiers.</p> <p>Members applauded the application as all refusal reasons had been addressed.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
43.	<p><b>UNIT 3, RUISLIP RETAIL PARK, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP, 43510/APP/2011/1343</b> (<i>Agenda Item 20</i>)</p>	<b>Action by</b>

**Variation of condition 6, (to remove restrictions on the sales of goods), of planning permission ref. 43510/APP/2010/1979 dated 10/02/2011: Construction of a 1,810 sq.m mezzanine within Unit 3, Ruislip Retail Park.**

The application sought to amend condition 6 of Planning Permission 43510/APP/2010/1979, to remove the restriction on the sale of fancy goods as it relates to the mezzanine floor of unit 3, Ruislip Retail Park.

This mezzanine floor space was recently granted planning permission on 10/2/2011, but had not yet been implemented. This proposal had been submitted in conjunction with another application, also on this agenda, which seeks to relax a similar condition on the type of goods that can be sold from the original unit, by removing any reference to 'fancy goods' (Condition 11 of planning permission ref: 43510/APP/2000/2485). The unit had been vacant for two and a half years and the relaxation of the conditions was intended to facilitate bringing the unit back into economic use, through the widening of the range of goods permitted to be sold, to allow it to be occupied by interested retailers.

It was considered that sufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the vitality or viability of nearby Town Centres in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth, relevant UDP and London Plan policies.

It was not considered that the expansion in the range of goods sold at the site would give rise to any significant additional traffic generation which would be detrimental to the operation of the highway network. Subject to conditions, the existing car parking and servicing facilities for the retail park would be retained for use by the proposed unit and would continue to meet the needs of the proposed unit and retail park as a whole.

There were no external amendments. As such the unit would remain in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would not result in any detrimental impacts on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, subject to conditions.

Accordingly, approval was recommended to relax the existing planning condition as proposed, subject to the imposition of all other conditions originally imposed, which were still relevant and capable of being discharged.

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 agenda.**

<p>44.</p>	<p><b>UNIT 3, RUISLIP RETAIL PARK, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP, 43510/APP/2011/1344</b> (<i>Agenda Item 21</i>)</p> <p><b>Variation of condition 11 (to remove restrictions on the sales of fancy goods) of planning permission Ref: 43510/APP/2000/2485 dated 14/03/2003: (Refurbishment of existing retail units, with new cladding on all elevations, new covered walkway on northern frontage (facing Victoria Road) and changes to service arrangements and car parking with enhanced frontage landscaping, incorporating disused service road.</b></p> <p>The application sought to amend condition 11 of Planning Permission 43510/APP/2000/2485 to allow for the sale of fancy goods as it relates to unit 3, in order to expand the acceptable range of goods.</p> <p>It was considered that sufficient information had been provided to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the vitality or viability of nearby Town Centres in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth, relevant UDP and London Plan policies.</p> <p>It was not considered that the expansion in the range of goods sold at the site would give rise to any significant additional traffic generation which would be detrimental to the operation of the highway network. Subject to conditions, the existing car parking and servicing facilities for the retail park would be retained for use by the proposed unit and would continue to meet the needs of the proposed unit and retail park as a whole.</p> <p>There were no external amendments. As such the unit would remain in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would not result in any detrimental impacts on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, subject to conditions.</p> <p>Accordingly, approval was recommended to relax the existing planning condition as proposed, subject to the imposition of all other conditions originally imposed, which were still relevant and capable of being discharged.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
<p>45.</p>	<p><b>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP, 10189/APP/2011/1724</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Replacement of one 5 Bedroom dwelling (type 2000 D) with an alternative 5 bedroom dwelling at plot 314. (Amendment to reserved matters approval ref: 10189/APP/2007/3046 dated 31/03/2008)</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

	<p>This report related to an application seeking variations to the layout and design of the alternative access reserved matters scheme (ref: 10189/APP/2007/3046), for the former RAF Eastcote site, which was approved on 31 March 2008. The amendments would allow for a larger 5 bedroom detached dwelling than originally approved on plot 314.</p> <p>This plot was located in the north east corner of the northern section of the former RAF Eastcote site. The amendments to this plot, in terms of the layout, design and landscaping was in general accordance with the reserved matters approval. It was considered that the proposal would respect the character of the local area and not detract from the internal character of the development.</p> <p>The larger dwelling on this plot would not have an adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding residents in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, daylight or sunlight. The remaining external amenity area of this plot was considered sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers, whilst the development would not prejudice the implementation of the approved landscaping scheme, including the retention of existing trees. Approval was recommended accordingly.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	
46.	<p><b>PYLON FARM, NEWYEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD, 12579/APP/2011/1991 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>Variation of condition 1 of planning permission ref: 12579/APP/2006/673 dated 18/08/2006 to allow continued use of the land as an organic composting site. (Section 73 application)</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the continued use of land at Pylon Farm as an organic composting site for a further temporary period of 12 months. Composting was a form of industrial use which was not normally considered appropriate in a Green Belt location.</p> <p>However, as Council policy aimed to increase green waste recycling in line with the Government's Waste Strategy, it was considered that there were special circumstances to justify the continued use at this location, to the extent that the harm on the openness of the Green Belt had been outweighed. Therefore, even though the application was contrary to Saved Policy OL1 of the UDP, approval was recommended.</p> <p>The activities would not be visually intrusive, increase the built up nature of the site, or harm the openness of the area, while the proposal was considered acceptable on highway safety grounds. Therefore approval was recommended.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p>	Action by



	<p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	
47.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO COMPOST MATURATION SITE AT PYLON FARM, NEWYEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD, 12579/APP/2011/1992</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p><b>Variation of condition 2 of planning permission ref: 12579/APP/2006/1524 dated 18/08/2006 to allow the continued use of the land as an organic composting site for a period of 12 months. (Section 73).</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the continued use of the compost maturation extension area at Pylon Farm as an organic composting site for a further temporary period of 12 months. Composting was a form of industrial use which was not normally considered appropriate in a Green Belt location.</p> <p>However, as Council policy aimed to increase green waste recycling in line with the Government's Waste Strategy, it was considered that there were special circumstances to justify the continued use at this location, to the extent that the harm on the openness of the Green Belt had been outweighed. Therefore, even though the application was contrary to Saved Policy OL1 of the UDP, approval was recommended.</p> <p>The activities would not be visually intrusive, increase the built up nature of the site, or harm the openness of the area, while the proposal was considered acceptable on highway safety grounds. Therefore approval was recommended.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	Action by
48.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO COMPOST MATURATION SITE AT PYLON FARM, NEWYEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD, 12579/APP/2011/1993</b> (Agenda Item 18)</p> <p><b>Variation of condition 1 of planning permission ref 12579/APP/2007/534 dated 24/05/2007 to allow retention of the existing drainage lagoon for a period of 12 months. (Section 73 application).</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for a temporary period of 12 months for the retention and continued use of a drainage lagoon, required for operations connected with the use of land at Pylon Farm as an organic composting facility. The lagoon was located at the northern end of an extended compost maturation site. Separate planning applications to</p>	Action by

	<p>extend the use of the original and extended maturation sites were also included on this agenda.</p> <p>The retention of the lagoon for a further 12 month period would not increase the built up nature of the site, or harm the openness of the area to a detrimental degree. Although composting was a form of industrial use which was not normally considered appropriate in a Green Belt location, Council policy aimed to increase green waste recycling in line with the Government's Waste Strategy. It was considered that these were special circumstances to justify the retention and continued use of the composting facilities, of which the drainage lagoon formed an integral part, at this location, to the extent that the harm to the openness of the Green Belt hds been outweighed. Approval was therefore recommended.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	
49.	<p><b>67 EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP, 32752/APP/2011/1685</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey rear extension with 3 rooflights involving demolition of conservatory to rear.</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought to demolish the existing conservatory and construct a part two storey, part single storey rear extension. To the rear, the proposed single storey extension would measure 4m deep and would extend the full width of the dwelling and further 1.5m out to the common boundary with No. 65 infilling the area directly behind the existing garage. It would be finished with a hipped roof with a maximum height of 3.8m to the top of the roof. The roof would include 3 rooflights providing additional light to the proposed new utility room and lounge.</p> <p>The proposed two storey element would be set in from both adjoining boundaries (2.35m from No.65 and 1.1m from No. 69 Eastcote Road) and would project 3m into the rear garden measuring the width of the dwelling at 6.3m. It would be finished with a hipped roof that would be set down 1.2m from the ridge of the existing dwelling with a maximum height of 7.3m.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
50.	<p><b>106 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE, 11104/APP/2011/334</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p><b>Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to restaurant/Cafe (Use Class A3) and installation of flue to side.</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the retention of a restaurant use and the installation of an extract flue on the roof of the rear extension. The change of use did not result in the proportion of frontage in non-retail use within the secondary area exceeding 50%.</p> <p>However, it would result in a break in the retail frontage which would exceed 12m and could be construed as an over-concentration of non-shop uses, but given that these premises would also operate as a delicatessen, the proposal was considered acceptable in this instance.</p> <p>Members confirmed with Officers that any future similar applications would come to Committee. The figure was very close to 50% so there was leigh-way for Committee.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	
51.	<p><b>109 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE, 12666/APP/2011/1044</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use to from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A5 (Hot Food Take-away)</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for a take away use. The change of use did not result in the proportion of frontage in non-retail use within the secondary area exceeding 50% and it was not considered that the proposal would impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers to such an extent as to justify refusal. The proposal was therefore considered acceptable in this instance.</p> <p>The figures in this application were very close to 50% therefore the Committee had leigh-way. Any further similar applications would be considered by Committee.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
52.	<p><b>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - UP TO 30 JUNE 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 22</i>)</p> <p>This report provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 30 June 2011 where the Council had received and held funds.</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<b>Resolved – That the Members noted the contents of the report.</b>	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.00 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.