

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

22 February 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Edward Lavery (Chairman), Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Jazz Dhillon, Michael Markham, David Payne and Brian Stead.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger – Head of Planning Meg Hirani – Planning Advisor Nikki Deol – Legal Advisor Natasha Dogra – Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Andrew Retter (Items 10 – 13)</p>	
108.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr Carol Melvin, Cllr Brian Stead substituted.</p>	Action by
109.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>From the public gallery Cllr Andrew Retter declared a personal interest in item 10 “Haydon School, Wiltshire Lane, Eastcote”, as his son attended the school. Cllr Retter did not speak, vote on or discuss this item with the Committee.</p>	Action by
110.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	Action by
111.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been identified as urgent or in advance of the meeting.</p>	Action by
112.	<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>It was confirmed that all items on the agenda were marked Part 1 and were considered in public</p>	Action by

113.	<p>SOUTHBOURNE DAY CENTRE, 161 ELLIOT AVENUE, RUISLIP 66033/APP/2010/2523 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>This application was withdrawn by the Applicant prior to the meeting. This application was not discussed by the Committee.</p>	Action by
114.	<p>LAND ADJOINING 12 GLADSDALE DRIVE, 65761/APP/2010/2707 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey detached one-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space</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"> • The style of the development was out of character with the surrounding dwellings • The development would create a less sustainable community • The development would destroy the harmony of the cul-de-sac • The application would not be balanced with the other dwellings in the cul-de-sac. <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members agreed that the application was out of character with the area and believed the proposal to appear cramped and squashed.</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>	Action by
115.	<p>56 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 4496/APP/2009/2765 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Two storey six-bedroom detached dwelling with basement level and habitable roofspace with detached garage to front, involving the demolition of existing dwelling.</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"> • The style of the development was out of character with the 	Action by

	<p>surrounding dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size and site of proposal were overdeveloped and were detrimental to the street scene. • Petitioners believed there was an issue with overshadowing on neighbouring properties. • Should the proposal be approved it would create a precedent for future developments in the area. <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members believed it would be dangerous to turn down the application when the surrounding dwellings were already large in size.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for approval.</p> <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.</p>	
116.	<p>19 GROVE ROAD, NORTHWOOD 27846/APP/2010/2916 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey side/front extension, front porch, alterations to existing elevations and conversion of roofspace for habitable use with 2 rear, 2 side, and 3 front rooflights and 3 skylights.</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"> • The objectors were concerned and disappointed with the proposed application • The depth of application and the roof space were too large for the site and would appear out of character with the surrounding dwellings • The extension would be over-dominant on the street • The proposal failed to meet Council requirements <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution three representatives of the three petitions received in support of the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street was not in a conservation area and residents were therefore able to propose changes to their properties, within reason • The street scene has changed since the houses were first built 	Action by

	<p>and would continue to change in the future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning requirements had been adhered to by the applicants • The increases roof space did include a substantial increase in space but the crown roof part was not a substantial increase and would not have had an impact on neighbouring properties. • Many neighbouring properties had very large over ground and underground extensions. • The original HIP roof had been retained on either side of the property <p>The applicant was present and addressed the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many of the residents on the street had been consulted and signed petitions supporting the application ▪ Three letters of support had also been submitted to the Council ▪ The applicant had held discussion with neighbours regarding the proposed extension ▪ There were no issues with overlooking from the dwelling. <p>Members agreed that the applicant had done enough to satisfy the Council's planning policies and the proposed application met Council requirements. The Committee agreed that the proposed application was no worse than other sites on the street which were much larger and grossly over-developed. Members said the proposal was therefore not out of character with the surrounding dwellings and there was no justification of refusal.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for approval.</p> <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.</p>	
117.	<p>HAYDON SCHOOL, WILTSHIRE LANE, EASTCOTE, 9556/APP/2010/2490 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Details in compliance with condition 4 (fence colour) of planning permission ref: 9556/APP/2010/1370 dated 06/08/2010: Installation of mesh fence and automatically locking gate and new window to existing elevation.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal was invited to but did not address the Committee.</p> <p>Members were in agreement over the new installation of mesh fencing and the colour of the fence.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for approval.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the</p>	Action by

	<p>application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum.</p>	
118.	<p>41 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE 64909/APP/2010/2668 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Part two storey, part single storey side extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension with 1 rooflight, single storey front extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use with 1 front and 1 rear rooflight, involving demolition of existing integral garage and store.</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"> • The style of the development was out of character with the surrounding dwellings • The symmetry of the pair of houses had already been damaged by earlier decisions. • The proposal exacerbated the symmetrical imbalance and neither house was in harmony with the street scene. <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution the agent was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the agent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The only loss of light was from secondary windows. ▪ The property would create a balance in the street scene. <p>A Ward Councillor was present and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed site failed to harmonise with the surrounding area • The application was unsymmetrical and therefore did not harmonise with the surrounding area. • Car parking arrangements were inadequate <p>Members asked Officers whether car parking spaced were adequate, to which Officers said they were satisfied with the proposed parking arrangements.</p> <p>Members agreed that they could not make a decision without visiting the area and witnessing the dwelling for themselves. The Committee agreed that the symmetry of the roof could only be judged if they were to visit the site and look at neighbouring dwellings</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be deferred until a site visit had taken place.</p> <p>Resolved –</p>	Action by

	That the application be deferred until a site visit had taken place by the Committee.	
119.	<p>ST JOHN'S SCHOOL, POTTER STREET HILL, NORTHWOOD 10795/APP/2011/91 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>The Head of Planning had advised that due to a large influx of correspondence and numerous petitions since the Committee agenda was published the decision was taken to withdraw this application from the agenda. The Committee did not discuss this application.</p>	Action by
120.	<p>BREAKSPEAR HOUSE, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD 7610/APP/2010/2608 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Application for alterations to the previously approved scheme for the residential units 1-4 of the enabling development (previously approved within scheme ref: 7610/APP/2002/1816 dated 28/01/2008 for the conversion of the existing Breakspear House to 10 flats, the erection of 7 dwellings and erection of single storey extension to Lower Lodge, incorporating conversion of existing house to 9 flats, erection of 8 dwellings and erection of a two storey extension to Lower Lodge, single storey extension to Upper Lodge together with surface level and underground parking) involving alterations in the internal residential room layouts and the design and layout of the rear gardens.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for approval.</p> <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.</p>	Action by
121.	<p>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
122.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.45 pm.	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Natasha Dogra on 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.