

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 March 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

| | | |
|------|--|------------------|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Tim Barker, Jazz Dhillon and Carol Melvin.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger – Head of Planning Meg Hirani – Planning Advisor Syed Shah – Parking Services Advisor Sarah White – Legal Advisor Natasha Dogra – Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Shirley Harper O'Neill</p> | |
| 123. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr David Payne, with Cllr Tim Barker substituting. Apologies had also been received from Cllr Mike Markham.</p> | Action by |
| 124. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Carol Melvin declared a personal and prejudicial in Item 6: London School of Theology, Green Lane, Northwood. Cllr Melvin left the room while the Committee discussed this item and did not take part in the vote.</p> <p>Cllr Allan Kauffman declared a personal interest in Item 8: 37 Edwards Avenue, Ruislip. Cllr Kauffman left the room while the Committee discussed this item and did not take part in the vote.</p> | Action by |
| 125. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.</p> | Action by |
| 126. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> | Action by |

| | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| 127. | <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 Items 6 – 14 were marked Part 1 and would be considered in public. Item 15 was confirmed as Part 2 and would be considered in Private.</p> | Action by |
| 128. | <p>LONDON SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD 10112/APP/2010/2915 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Application for a new planning permission to replace extant planning permission ref: 10112/APP/2009/ 707 dated 14/07/2009: Erection of two storey teaching block to north west side of existing building (Phase 1) and new chapel and foyer to south east side of existing building (Phase 2) (Works involve the partial demolition of existing buildings) (Part outline application - Phase 2.)</p> <p>Officers presented the report to Members, and directed Members to the addendum sheet. There were no petitions in support or in objection to this application. 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 |
| 129. | <p>135 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE 5910/APP/2010/2346 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Application for variation of condition 6 (hours of operation) of planning permission ref: 5910/C/96/ 0074 dated 15/01/1996: Change of use from Class A1 (Shop) to Class A3 (Food and Drink.)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application had received overwhelming support in the form of petition signatories and letters of support. • The Environmental Protection Unit had not submitted any objections and did not oppose the application • The application was in accordance with the Council’s Supplementary Planning Document and Development Plan • Refusing the application would breach the Human Rights of the applicant • The neighbouring properties had not objected to the application, and some had even signed the petition in support. | Action by |

| | | |
|------|---|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main aim of the application was to provide a food outlet for late night visitors to the area or those who had left nearby pubs and bars. • The workforce were recruited from Eastcote and supported the application <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The Committee asked Officer to clarify the Human Rights aspect of the application. Legal Officers advised that information had been sought from the Borough Solicitor and application had received a fair hearing and the Committee must take into account the Human Rights Act as it set out the Right to Respect for Family Life and Right to the Protection of a Property. Officers could not advise on licensing issues, as they fell outside of the Planning Committee’s remit.</p> <p>Officers also clarified that if the business had been trading for over 10 years they must prove this by applying for a Certificate of Lawful Use.</p> <p>Members felt that they knew the area well and there was no need for a food outlet to be open until 2.00 am. Extended opening hours may attract late night anti-social behaviour and cause noise nuisance in the area. Members pointed out that although local neighbours had signed the supporting petition there was no guarantee that they would live there forever; a very late night food outlet may deter people from moving into this area in the future.</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> | |
| 130. | <p>FOOTWAY ADJACENT TO AUTOCENTRE NORTHWOOD, PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD 67084/APP/2011/136 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Installation of a 13.8m high telecommunications pole, associated equipment cabinet and ancillary developments works (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</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 mast would create unnecessary street furniture on an already busy street. • A danger would be posed to pedestrians who may need to step onto the carriageway to avoid the mast and cabinets. • Future applications for masts should only be permitted in a specific area away from humans, to minimise the health effects | Action by |

| | | |
|------|---|------------------|
| | <p>on people.</p> <p>The applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Officers clarified that each application had to be determined on its own merits, and therefore no applications, including applications for masts would be subject to pre-determination.</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> | |
| 131. | <p>37 EDWARDS AVENUE, RUISLIP 65680/APP/2011/36 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 4 two-bedroom back to back two storey dwellings with associated parking and amenity space and installation of new vehicular crossover, involving demolition of existing detached dwelling.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a Ward Councillor was present and was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the Ward Councillor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The style of the development was out of character with the surrounding dwellings • The size and site of proposal were overdeveloped and were detrimental to the street scene. • 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>Officers clarified that the PD rights had been removed from the conditions. 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, additional conditions and addendum.</p> | Action by |

| | | |
|------|---|------------------|
| 132. | <p>41 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE 64909/APP/2010/2668 (<i>Agenda Item 10</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 application would not harmonise with the surrounding properties. • 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. • The proposed property would put pressure on the parking spaces and sewers in the road. • The applicant failed to display green notices at the application. <p>The Agent was present at the meeting and was invited to address the Committee. The following points were raised by the Agent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed side elevation would not be largely visible. ▪ The frontage had been designed with the help of Hillingdon Planning Officers to be sympathetic to the street scene. ▪ The proposed application was technically compliant but subtly different, much like surrounding dwellings in the area. ▪ The development was harmonious with adjoining properties. ▪ Although six bedrooms had been proposed the applicant would only be converting four into bedrooms. <p>Although no Ward Councillors were present one Ward Councillor had submitted comments which were read out by the Committee Chairman. The following points were raised by the Ward Councillor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal would result in an overdevelopment and would dominate the street scene. ▪ The petition in objection highlighted the concerns of neighbours regarding commuter parking in the street. <p>Members has visited the site and found other dwellings in the road to be normal sized houses. The Committee felt that just because one semi-detached house had been over-developed it did not justify the overdevelopment of another. The Committee agreed that the application would spoil a serene area, and the application should be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment, lack of set back at the front of the proposal and the detrimental effect it would have on the</p> | Action by |
|------|---|------------------|

| | | |
|------|--|------------------|
| | <p>street scene (B13, B15 and B19)</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 on the grounds of overdevelopment, lack of set back at the front of the proposal and the detrimental effect it would cause on the street scene (B13, B15 and B19)</p> | |
| 133. | <p>LAND ADJACENT TO BUS SHELTER, JUNCTION OF BURY STREET AND PLOUGH FARM CLOSE, RUISLIP 67082/APP/2011/135 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Installation of an 11.8m high telecommunications pole, associated equipment cabinet and ancillary development works (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</p> <p>Officers presented the report, and Members felt the site was in the vicinity of many locally listed buildings.</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 refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer's report.</p> | Action by |
| 134. | <p>1-8 (INCLUSIVE), BREAKSPEAR MEWS, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD 7902/APP/2009/2480 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Regularisation of building work that has already been carried out within Units 1 and 2, involving the removal of two courtyard dormers and completion of the car ports.</p> <p>Officers presented the report to Committee. Members believed the proposal would improve the look of the development.</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 |

| | | |
|------|---|------------------|
| 135. | <p>1-8 (INCLUSIVE), BREAKSPEAR MEWS, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD 7902/APP/2009/2481 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Regularisation of building work that has already been carried out within Units 1 and 2 (Application for Listed Building Consent.)</p> <p>Officers presented the report to Committee. Members believed the proposal would improve the look of the development.</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 |
| 136. | <p>138 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP 7855/APP/2010/2832 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from Retail (Class A1) to Hot Food Takeaway (Class A5)</p> <p>Officers presented the report to Members, which stated that the unit had been out of retail use since December 2010. The property had a refuse facility space towards the rear of the development. Members were concerned that another food outlet would affect the vibrancy of Ruislip High Street but since the unit had been out of use for a long period of time they decided to agree the Officer’s recommendation.</p> <p>Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for approval.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was agreed with five votes that the application be approved, with one abstaining vote.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum.</p> | Action by |
| 137. | <p>HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE ENF/148/09 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee. Members stated that the report summed up the reasons for enforcement.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the enforcement action would be taken</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That enforcement action would be taken.</p> | Action by |

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| 138. | ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>) | Action by |
| | None. | |
| 139. | ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>) | Action by |
| | None. | |
| The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.00 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.