

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 August 2010

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), Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Michael Markham, Carol Melvin and David Payne</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Charles Francis (Democratic Services) Matthew Duigan (Planning officer) James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Keith Lancaster (Legal Advisor)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Philip Corthorne and Councillor Richard Lewis</p>	
24.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Anita MacDonald substitute Cllr Jazz Dhillon</p>	
25.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Allan Kauffman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 of the agenda. Cllr Kauffman left the room for this item.</p>	
26.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
27.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Item 14 - Enforcement report was considered in private.</p>	
28.	<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 item 14 in Agenda B was considered in private.</p>	

<p>29.</p>	<p><b>SOUTH RUISLIP LIBRARY, PLOT A, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 67080/APP/2010/1419</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Members agreed it was good to improve Council library facilities but were disappointed that the scheme did not include any social housing. However, the Committee accepted that there were sound financial reasons why this was so.</p> <p>In response to a number of concerns, officers explained that the application site was located near playing fields and not the green belt and that following a parking management exercise, 20 car parking spaces was the maximum number of spaces the scheme could accommodate.</p> <p>Members asked about the florist shop included within the proposal and were informed that condition 47 – <i>use of retail unit</i>, set out the Class A1 usage of the 11 m<sup>2</sup> retail unit.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being out to the vote, approval was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as set out in the officers report and the following amendments in the Addendum:</b></p> <p><b>Replace the wording (no change to the REASON) of Condition 6 with the following:</b></p> <p><b><i>'No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment, gates and balcony screening to be erected. The approved details shall be installed and completed before the development is occupied and shall be permanently retained for so long as the development remains in existence.'</i></b></p> <p><b>Replace the wording (no change to the REASON) of condition 25 as follows:</b></p> <p><b><i>'Development shall not begin until a scheme for the allocation and designation of one parking space to each of the residential units, for their sole use, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the parking spaces shall be allocated and provided for the use of those residential units only for so long as the development remains in existence'.</i></b></p> <p><b>Delete Condition 30, (Children's play area security).</b></p> <p><b>Delete Condition 31, (Full details of children's play area)</b></p> <p><b>Amend condition 44 by replacing the words:</b></p> <p><b>'[insert number of charging points]' with the number '2'.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>
------------	---	--

<p>30.</p>	<p><b>RAF WEST RUISLIP, HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM - 38402/APP/2007/1072</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that the applicant had requested the agreements be amended in order to allow a small level of occupation prior to Substantial Completion of the highway works and this was necessary to ensure the scheme was deliverable.</p> <p>Members were concerned about the timescales for the completion of the highways works and asked for an informative to be added to ensure the applicant could not return to the Committee at a future date with further requests which might delay the implementation of the scheme.</p> <p>In response to concerns about the likely impact on the local road network, the Highways Engineer explained that the works would not have a material impact on the operations of the highway network.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being out to the vote, approval was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as set out in the officers report, the Addendum and the following informative:</b></p> <p><i><b>‘You are advised that while agreement has been given to occupation of a small number of units prior to completion of off site highways works, given concerns relating highway safety, further such applications to vary the legal agreement are unlikely to be supported’.</b></i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>
<p>31.</p>	<p><b>RAF WEST RUISLIP, HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM - 38402/APP/2010/248</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was unanimously agreed.</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>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>
<p>32.</p>	<p><b>LAND AT 30-32 CHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 13800/APP/2010/623</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution representatives of the petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would increase local traffic due to the anticipated number of visitors, ambulance movements and service vehicles.</li> <li>• The proposal would create a parking problem in Reginald and Roy roads.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to traffic and parking problems, road safety problems would be created as Chester Road is the only access road to Reginald and Roy Roads to Green Lane.</li> <li>• The area was originally conceived as a social housing development. Over time, the character of the estate has changed and increased car ownership has made it increasingly more difficult to park.</li> <li>• It is unrealistic that most visitors to the proposal would use public transport as the Tube station is a long walk away.</li> <li>• The influx of 60 elderly and infirm residents to the area would have a profound effect on local General Practitioner services and increase waiting times for local residents.</li> <li>• The proposal would increase air pollution (from vehicles) and noise pollution (from vehicles / kitchen noise).</li> <li>• A quiet and peaceful neighbourhood which forms part of the Old Northwood Area of Special Character would be destroyed.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor was present and addressed the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ward Councillor supported and endorsed the petitioner's views.</li> <li>• The proposal would be over-dominant and would not be in keeping with the local area.</li> <li>• Visitors to the proposal would cause local parking problems.</li> <li>• The proposal would be an intrusion into the lives of local residents.</li> </ul> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as set out in the officer's report and the additional informative in the Addendum:</b></p> <p><i>'You are advised that any resubmission of this application should be accompanied by details and plans which demonstrate that appropriately located, sized, secure and covered storage for refuse and recycling facilities would be provided'.</i></p>	
33.	<p><b>REAR OF 54 SWAKELEYS DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 53998/APP/2010/854 (Agenda Item 10)</b></p> <p>At the beginning of the item the Chairman explained that the petition in objection to the application had been withdrawn and so there were no speaking rights on the item.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report and addendum and amending Condition 24 by</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>

	<b>deleting the words ‘where possible’.</b>	
34.	<p><b>FORMER MILL WORKS, BURY STREET, RUISLIP - 6157/APP/2010/1383</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the constitution a Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application.</p> <p>Points raised by the Ward councillor included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would not reflect the pattern of development within the Conservation Area</li> <li>• The proposed gates would be out of keeping with the surroundings and fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members were referred to a letter and photographs provided by the agent which had been circulated before the meeting and noted the request for the item to be deferred.</p> <p>During the course of their discussions, Members agreed that the proposal was out of keeping with the character of the area and would have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and surrounding street scene.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was unanimously 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>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>
35.	<p><b>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>None</p>	
36.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>None</p>	
37.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT - PART 2</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that Officer’s recommendation be enforced. On being put to the vote, enforcement action was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – It was agreed that the Officer’s recommendation be enforced, subject to the amendment of section 1.6 of the recommendation and replacing '3 months' with '6 months'.</b></p>	<p>Matthew Duigan &amp; James Rodger</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.17 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.

---