

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 December 2010

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery, Allan Kaufmann, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, David Allam and Jazz Dhillon.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meg Hirani (Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Richard Philips (Planning, Environment & Community Services) Sarah White (Legal Advisor) Nav Johal (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Shirely Harper-O'neill and Councillor Ray Graham</p>	
69.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Councillor David Payne was absent from the meeting.</p>	Action by
70.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Meg Hirani, Team Leader, declared a personal and prejudicial interest for items 11. Mr Hirani left the room for this item.</p>	Action by
71.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was agreed that the minutes from 7th December 2010 were deferred to the next meeting on 11th January 2011.</p>	Action by
72.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
73.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items parked part 2 were considered in private.</p>	Action by

74.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 104 ABBOTSBURY GARDENS, EASTCOTE 67398/APP/2010/2562 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 1 one-bedroom, single storey detached dwelling with new crossover to front and associated parking and amenity space (Outline application with some matters reserved.)</p> <p>67398/APP/2010/2562</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection 1 one-bedroom, single storey detached dwelling with new crossover to front and associated parking and amenity space on the rear garden area of 104 Abbotsbury Gardens, which has a frontage to Lowlands Road.</p> <p>The officer report stated the proposal would appear as a stand alone bungalow and due to its siting and position, it was considered that the proposal would result in a development which would appear out of context in relation to the surrounding design and pattern of existing residential development, resulting in a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the streetscene. It was also considered that should the application receive consent it would set an undesirable precedent for other proposals in the vicinity of a similar nature, which the Council would find difficult to resist.</p> <p>Due to the inadequate internal floor space that would be provided, the proposal would be detrimental to the amenities of the future occupiers of the development. The proposed dwelling also failed to meet lifetime Homes standards. Accordingly the application was recommended for refusal.</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"> • Lead petitioner Ms Lesley Crowcroft presented the petition on behalf of the petitioners who had signed the petition objecting to the application. • The area was known for its large garden space and historic context. • This application was contrary to London Plans as already stated in the officer's report. • It was a back land development and the floor area of the application was considerably smaller than what was required. • An appeal on an application on this site had recently been dismissed. • The application was not in line with the local distinctness and character of the area. • There was a giant oak tree in the area which needed to be considered in a tree survey. This had not been carried out. • The application, if it was approved, would destroy the character 	Action by
-----	--	-----------

	<p>of the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single dwelling would not make that much difference to the housing in the area. <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for refusal and were concerned that further proposals may arise if this was granted.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report and addendum.</p>	
75.	<p>LAND AT REAR AND FORMING PART OF 63, 65 & 67 LOWLANDS ROAD, EASTCOTE 56032/APP/2010/2111 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a five-bedroom detached bungalow, including three bedrooms in roofspace, with associated parking and landscaping.</p> <p>56032/APP/2010/2111</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a five-bedroom detached bungalow at the land rear and forming part of 63, 65 and 67 Lowlands Road. The officer report stated the proposal was for a single detached bungalow (with habitable roof space).</p> <p>Whilst the development would comply with relevant Council Standards relating to internal living space and external amenity space, it was considered that the proposal would be out of keeping with the surrounding pattern of residential development, resulting in a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area.</p> <p>It was also considered that should the application receive consent it would set an undesirable precedent for other proposals in the vicinity of a similar nature, which the Council would find difficult resist. In addition, to these considerations, given that a legal agreement at this stage had not been offered or secured, and due to the shortfall of places in nurseries/schools/educational facilities serving the area the proposal was considered to be contrary to relevant UDP Saved Policies September 2007, London Plan and national policies.</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"> • Lead petitioner Ms Lesley Crowcroft presented the petition on behalf of the petitioners who had signed the petition objecting to the application. 	Action by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms Crowcroft had spoken several times on this matter during the last 10 years. • It was stated that the applicant only owned the one property, so 1/3 of the proposed development land. • That the applicant had appealed on this site and numerous other sites, unsuccessfully. • That this current application had made no attempt to get life time home assurance. • Ms Crowcroft questioned the lighting in the bedrooms, stating that 3 double bedrooms only had roof lights and that this would not adequate. That a request for dormers windows may come if the application was approved. • She asked Committee to uphold the officer's report and recommendations. <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members asked for clarification on the bedroom lighting. Officers stated that there were windows for the bedrooms in the plans, and not just the roof lights. Members also asked about life time home assurance. Officers stated that the size of the property was sufficient and with internal changes that it could be made to fit. Members commented on garden grabbing and that this sort of application was what the legislation was designed to prevent.</p> <p>Members commented on the numerous applications that had been submitted on this site. They asked officers if they could turn away any further applications. Officers and the Committee's Legal Advisor stated that this matter went to appeal and the decision was upheld by the Inspector the Council could now turn away further applications for a 2-year period. The Legal Advisor stated that there were requirements in legislation regarding this that needed to be fulfilled before this could occur. The legislation framework allowed the Council to reject further applications for a 2-year period. This was assuming the inspectorate supported this decision.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer's report and addendum.</p>	
76.	<p>LAND ADJACENT TO AND FORMING PART OF 30 HARVEY ROAD, RUISLIP 67335/APP/2010/2355 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 2 x two-bedroom, two storey and 1 x one-bedroom, single storey dwellings with semi-linked lobby and associated parking and amenity space.</p> <p>67335/APP/2010/2355</p>	Action by

Planning permission was sought for the erection of 2 x two-bedroom, two storey and 1 x one-bedroom, single storey dwellings with semi-linked lobby and associated parking and amenity space on the land adjacent to and forming part of 30 Harvey Road. The officer report stated the proposal was to develop the side and rear garden of a ground floor maisonette to provide a pair of semi-detached two-bedroom houses and a linked one-bedroom bungalow on this prominent corner plot.

It was considered that although the proposal would satisfy the recommended density guidelines contained within the London Plan, it would appear unduly cramped in relation to the spacious character of this part of Harvey Road and would appear incongruous within the street scene. The proposal failed to provide sufficient internal floor space for the bungalow, adequate amenity space for the occupiers of the residential properties and involved the provision of off-street car parking from the side access road which had restricted access due to it being bollarded.

Also, no provision had been made at this stage to ensure that the scheme would make adequate provision to secure an appropriate contribution towards education facilities.

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:

- Ms Caroline Wood spoke on behalf of the petitioners who had signed the petition objecting to the application.
- Ms Wood lived in property 30a and moved into the area because of the spacious sizes of the homes, the garden space and how the street looked.
- The bollards were put there for a reason, and cars could not get through because of their existence on the road.
- Motorbikes currently parked behind the area where car parking was proposed for, this meant that spaces were left available for cars to park.
- The development seemed like it was being squeezed in and was out of character with the area and also contrary to planning policies.
- The property, if developed, would be erected against her garden. This would mean she would overlook this property, along with other residents nearby.
- There were similar spaces on the road and there was a risk that more applications would be received by the Council if this was approved.
- The views of trees and green area would be restricted for residents if this application was approved.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Ward Councillor Shirley Harper-O'Neill addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Councillor Harper-O’Neill was in full support of the petition and the officer report on this application. • The application was detrimental to the visual character of the area. • The proposed bungalow had insufficient floor space. • That the suggested parking would cause issues, in particular with regards to the bollards that were currently there. • The area was unique and almost like the countryside. That this development would take away from this if it was approved. <p>Members were in full support of the officer’s recommendation, and it was commented that the area was an oasis. Members stated that the plans and application were of a very poor quality. That it would detract from the openness of the area and the application was over-developed.</p> <p>Members questioned officers on whether the bollards could be removed. Officers commented that this would go to the traffic department who would consider why they were put there and the safety measures. The history would also be looked at before the department took a view on whether they could or could not be removed. The Legal Advisor commented that removal of the bollards was outside of the remit of Planning Committee and that this would be a Cabinet Member Decision for Planning, Transportation and Recycling. Members asked that if the removal of the bollards was requested that this issue should be directed as soon as possible to the Cabinet Member.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report and addendum.</p>	
77.	<p>41 FRITHWOOD AVENUE NORTHWOOD - 1891/APP/2010/1465 <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p>Part two, two and a half and three storey detached building with habitable roofspace and basement level comprising 2 four-bedroom and 4 three bedroom flats with basement parking and landscaping, involving demolition of existing dwelling.</p> <p>1891/APP/2010/1465</p> <p>Planning permission was sought to erect a part two, part two and a half, part three-storey block of 2 x four-bedroom and 4 x three-bedroom flats with basement parking and habitable accommodation and associated landscaping. An appeal for non-determination had been submitted.</p> <p>The officer report stated that this application followed on from two previous applications on this site for flatted redevelopment which had both been refused. The first was also dismissed at appeal. Although</p>	Action by

not previously refused for resulting in a further over-concentration of flats in the road, the latest officer survey indicated that Frithwood Avenue already breached the 10% HDAS guidance figure.

Whilst some improvements had been made, the overall scale of the building was still inappropriate for the site and the building represented an incongruous and cramped form of development on the site and resulted in an excessive loss of garden land. Given the siting of a number of ground and first floor bedroom windows, these rooms would not have had an adequate outlook and the proposal would not have afforded adequate amenity for its occupiers.

Inadequate tree information had been submitted to allow a proper assessment of the scheme and the access and refuse arrangements would prejudice highway and pedestrian safety. Also, as no S106 Agreement had been offered at this stage, the scheme failed to make appropriate provision for additional educational facilities.

Therefore, had an appeal for non-determination not had been lodged, the scheme would have been refused for the reasons identified and set out in more detail in the report.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting. Councillor Ray Graham spoke on behalf on the petitioners.

Points raised by the petitioner:

- Councillor Graham stated that Ward Councillors were in support of this petition and spoke on behalf of the residents who had signed the petition objecting to the application.
- This was the third application by this developer on this site in the last 2 years. One of which was appealed, and refused on appeal.
- It was stated that the applicants were not prepared to wait for determination.
- The application was vastly over-large and that the plans submitted were completely unacceptable. That developers would simply tweak other plans and applications rather than taking all factors into consideration when submitting plans.
- That people chose to live in such locations due to the openness, nice gardens and views – the local ambience.
- That the plans were scarce in regards to tree protection.
- That there was no offer of contribution to school fees.
- Councillor Ray Graham congratulated officers on their report and asked the Committee to uphold the views of the residents.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Members had concerns about the parking facilities and stated that they accepted the officer's recommendation to refuse this application. The decisions were based on planning law, and that the site already had considerable development. This application was too much for that site, it included 20 bedrooms on the application.

	<p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
78.	<p>LONDON BOROUGH OF EALING (SKLPC COMMUNITY CENTRE AND SPORTS GROUND, INDIA GARDENS, NORTHOLT) 39704/APP/2010/2599 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Use of existing community facility building as a mixed use comprising indoor market/community facility for a temporary period of expiring April 2011 (Amended Description) (Consultation by Ealing Council).</p> <p>39704/APP/2010/2599</p> <p>Ealing Council seeks comments from this Council on a planning application for the use of an existing community facility building as a mixed use comprising indoor market/community facility for a temporary period expiry April 2011. The officer report related to the request from the London Borough of Ealing for observations and comments in relation to the planning application it had received. The issue for consideration by the North Planning Committee was the impact of the proposed development on the London Borough of Hillingdon, rather than the determination of the application itself. The use of the site for mixed use comprising indoor market/community facility was considered contrary to policies AM2 and AM7 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>Officers stated that the decision on this application would be made by the London Borough of Ealing and that the London Borough of Hillingdon would comment on this application before a decision was made.</p> <p>The development had not indicated special circumstances for this application and it would be detrimental to highways. There was inadequate information on traffic measures from the applicant. The information submitted with the application was quite sparse.</p> <p>Members commented that application would impact on the surrounding Wards of Hillingdon, including the implications of the traffic in an already busy area. The application was very close to the Polish War Memorial roundabout, where the current car boot sales had already a huge impact on the traffic.</p> <p>Members also considered the impact of the noise to residents, and the parking issues that arose through events on the site. This also had an impact on Emergency Services that may need to use Harvey Road.</p> <p>Members commented that the site was Green Belt land and that when</p>	Action by

	<p>objecting to this application it should be reminded that the area should be used for what Green Belt land was intended for. The Committee were concerned with the various activities that occurred in this area and asked if it was possible that the London Borough of Ealing consult them on any future applications for this area.</p> <p>Officers stated to Members that Hillingdon was the highway authority for this site and that if Ealing were to ignore their advice they would need good reason too. It was also commented that this area was too small for the application to go to the Mayor's Office and that they recommended consultation with TFL.</p> <p>Members concerns regarding this application were strongly noted. It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the officers recommendations were agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the London Borough of Ealing be informed that the London Borough of Hillingdon raised an objection to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) The applicant had failed to submit adequate information to demonstrate that acceptable traffic management measures would be in place to manage the safe and free flow of vehicular traffic as it enters and exits from the site and whether the traffic associated with the development would cause congestion on the adjoining highway network. The development was therefore considered likely to be detrimental to highway safety and is contrary to Policy AM7 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>2) The proposal would result in a materially greater impact and an unacceptable intensification of use (than the existing authorised uses) of the site and as such was inappropriate development in the Green Belt for which no case of very special circumstances had been demonstrated. The proposal was therefore considered to be contrary to Policy OL1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007, London Plan Policy 3D.9 (Consolidate with Alterations since 2004), and Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts.</p> <p>3) That Officers ask the London Borough of Ealing to consult with Hillingdon on any future applications on this site.</p>	
79.	<p>CIVIC AMENITY SITE, NEW YEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD 8232/APP/2010/2538 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Construction of a building for weatherproof storage of road salt with associated landscaping.</p>	Action by

8232/APP/2010/2538

Planning permission was sought for the redevelopment of the north-eastern part of the Civic Amenity Site for a new salt dome to provide weatherproof storage of road salt for the gritting of roads during winter. Planning permission was granted in 2008 for the development of the existing Civic Amenity Site (ref: 8232/APP/2008/564) and again in early 2010 for the construction of a new salt dome and refurbishment of facilities (ref: 8232/APP/2009/2225 and 8232/APP/2009/2224 respectively). None of the extant consents had been implemented.

This application was a new application proposing a new arrangement to the salt dome in terms of size and location. It was also proposed to extend the north-eastern boundary of the site, by way of land-take of 252sqm of the neighbouring Council owned land to provide for additional landscape screening. Whilst the proposed works relate to only a portion of the wider site, the redline boundary covers the wider site so Highways implications, being access to the site and internal circulation, could be considered.

This increase in footprint and height to the previously approved salt dome was required to meet an increase in salt storage requirements. The revised location was required to fit within the parameters of the site.

As per the previous permission, the proposed structure would comprise a low reinforced concrete wall with a wooden superstructure above, clad with bitumen roofing shingles, coloured slate grey. The revised dome size would mean an increase in capacity of 1830 metric tonnes and would represent the minimum capacity necessary to store the amount of salt required for heavy usage to deal with snow and ice on the Borough's road network.

The salt dome was a new structure and it was acknowledged that it would be difficult to screen in the first few years after completion. It was considered that over time, as the proposed landscaping matures, the visual impacts of the structure were unlikely to be of significant detriment to the character of the area, or the perception of openness of the Green Belt.

Civic amenity sites such as this facility were not normally considered appropriate in a Green Belt location and the proposal did not conform to the types of development allowed by local and national Green Belt policy. However, the proposal sought rationalisation and enhancement of existing and consented facilities within a long established civic amenity site, which was considered to be the best location within the north of the Borough for the provision of an improved winter maintenance facility and specifically a salt dome.

Subject to the suggested conditions, it was considered that there would be no material loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and there would be no detrimental impact on the surrounding nature conservation sites. The risk of flooding would be minimised and the quality of the water environment would be protected.

	<p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet.</p>	
80.	<p>40 THE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD 13554/APP/2010/1491 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>2 five-bedroom detached dwellings with basement and habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front, involving demolition of existing detached dwelling.</p> <p>13554/APP/2010/1491</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of two, 5 bedroom detached houses with associated parking and landscaping. The officer report stated that the proposed houses would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers and sufficient off-street parking has been provided. However, by reason of their size, siting, bulk, design and appearance, the proposed houses would represent an incongruous and visually intrusive form of development which would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.</p> <p>Members commented on the small gaps between properties and the alien designs submitted with the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by
81.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be deferred and the applicant have another opportunity to respond to officers.</p> <p>Resolved –</p>	Action by

	That enforcement action is deferred and a letter from the Legal Department be sent before any enforcement action be agreed.	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.30 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.