

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

17 February 2021

Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggart, Allan Kauffman, Carol Melvin, John Oswald (Opposition Lead), Jagjit Singh and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Desmond Adumekwe (Enforcement Manager), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager), James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
127.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
128.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared an interest in agenda item 6 as she had been involved with different planning applications at the property in the past. Councillor Melvin left the meeting and did not participate in the discussion or voting for this item.</p>
129.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING DATED 28 JANUARY 2021 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 28 January 2021 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
130.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
131.	<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 1 – 13 were marked Part I and would be considered in public and items 14 – 16 were marked Part II and would be considered in private.</p>

Two storey rear extension and enlargement of habitable roofspace to include 2 rear dormers, 3 side rooflights, central roof lantern and alterations to elevations.

Officers introduced the report and advised Members that 7 responses to public consultations and a petition in objection to the application had been received. The Committee heard that the original property had previously been extended to the rear to include a 4.25m deep single storey extension and a 5.5m deep two storey flat roofed extension. The proposal would incorporate these and further extend to the rear, giving a two-storey rear extension of between 2.3m and 9.85m in depth. A further flat roofed ground floor extension of 4.5m in depth and 3.35m in height was proposed.

Members were informed that the Conservation Officer had raised strong objections to the proposal indicating that the proposed rear additions would be disproportionately large in relation to the original house. The development would fail to enhance the appearance of Northwood Town Centre Conservation Area.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners objecting to the application. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would create an excessively large extension with a massive 70% increase in internal floor area;
- The design was simplistic, overwhelming, out-of-place, insensitive to its setting and an over-development with an excessively large extension;
- The development would result in a 3-storey house that lent itself to subdivision into flats or an HMO;
- The excessive bulk, depth and height would impact negatively on the gap views between numbers 16, 18 and 18A;
- The proposed 3-storey development would have an adverse impact on adjacent properties and would contravene Hillingdon Policies DMH1 and DMHB11;
- The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of 14, 18 and 18A in terms of overdominance, loss of light and outlook;
- The application failed to meet the standards set out in Hillingdon Council's Conservation Areas policy;
- Extensive habitable accommodation was proposed at 3rd floor roof level – to comply with structural and thermal insulation requirements, the existing roof would need to be demolished or substantially re-configured which would change the character of the original building;
- There was no Design and Access Statement which was unacceptable;
- Trees or hedges would need to be removed or pruned which would be detrimental to established wildlife;
- The proposal did not respect the property's original plan of the house therefore did not accord with Hillingdon's planning policies;
- The proposed 3-storey extension would be overly large and incongruous and would be an intrusive addition to the property;
- The design failed to respect and harmonise with the architectural character of the original dwelling, the group of 3 houses of which it formed part, the street scene and the wider Northwood Town Conservation Area.

Members agreed that the proposal constituted an unacceptable over-development of the site. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed with 6 votes in favour of refusing the application. Councillor Melvin had

declared an interest therefore did not vote on this item and Councillor Yarrow had been unable to access the meeting at this point.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

133. **4 WOODSIDE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 73105/APP/2020/3521** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Erection of a garden shed to rear.

Officers presented the application which sought planning permission for the erection of a garden shed.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners objecting to the application. Key points included:

- Planning conditions were not being complied with - petitioners enquired why the applicant was being allowed to ignore conditions at will and had not followed the process to appeal any conditions considered to be unfair;
- The Inspector had specified conditions that, in order to protect the character and appearance of the Area of Special Local Character, trees and bushes marked on the application were to be retained or replaced and there were to be no garages, sheds or other outbuildings. All these conditions were being ignored by the applicant who had felled a healthy mature apple tree in order to replace it with a shed;
- The plastic shed did not enhance existing landscaping, trees, biodiversity or other natural feature of merit as was required by the Council's Trees and Landscaping policy;
- The application site was within an Area of Special Local Character (the Gatehill Estate). Cabinet had adopted a document in which Council officers had outlined the characteristics and features of the Gatehill Estate. One of those defining characteristics was "the gaps between houses allowing views of mature trees in the rear gardens from the street." The Inspector had wished to protect the character of the area but the Committee was being asked to believe that the view of a plastic shed was the same as the view of a mature apple tree;
- Some previous work had been carried out without consent and the applicants now sought to overturn conditions set out by the Planning Inspectorate.

Members sought clarification regarding the points raised by the lead petitioner. It was explained that, under normal circumstances, planning permission would not be required in order to erect a shed. In this case it was needed as permitted development rights had been removed at the property. Members heard that it was important to be proportionate when making decisions – the application was for a small garden shed. It was regrettable that a small tree had been removed to make room for the shed but a degree of proportionality was essential in terms of what the Council would pursue.

Members enquired whether it would be possible to add a condition in relation to the replacement of the tree which had been felled. It was confirmed that the garden was small therefore it was not deemed reasonable to request this. In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that, although the site lay within a critical drainage area, the shed would have no impact on drainage.

Councillors observed that it was unfortunate that a tree had been lost and felt a wooden shed would have been more in keeping with the area; however, it was recognised that this was not a matter for the Committee. No further concerns were

raised.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 7 votes in favour. One Councillor abstained as he had been experiencing technical difficulties and had missed part of the discussion of the item.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

134. **THE SIX BELLS PUBLIC HOUSE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, RUISLIP - 14387/APP/2020/4126** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Proposed barn extension to provide an extended dining area at ground floor and 8 no. guest rooms at first floor, adding a guest house use to the existing public house/restaurant to create a mixed use (Sui Generis), with associated works and landscaping.

The Committee agreed to consider items 8 and 9 collectively as they related to the same application site. Officers presented the report noting that the proposed development was considered to pose 'less than substantial harm' to the setting of the Grade II Listed Building.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners in support of the application (item 8). Key points highlighted included:

- The Six Bells Inn on Ducks Hill Road was one of the older buildings in the Borough, built around 1810, on the northern edge of Ruislip;
- It had served the community as a pub and inn for over 200 years but had closed in 2015. Three years later it had been re-opened by Richard Arens as a bar and restaurant;
- The site was on the edge of the Green Belt. Mr Arens had obtained special planning permission to demolish some of the outbuildings and replace them with a dining hall. The new hall was to be in the local barn style with walls of mixed wood, brick and render and a tall gabled roof;
- Before building work could commence, Covid-19 had brought everything to a halt. Mr Arens had recognised the need to diversify therefore had decided to restore the accommodation aspect of the Six Bells by adding bedrooms, including a specially adapted room for disabled guests. Ruislip was not well served for accommodation so the additional facility was welcome;
- The dining hall / inn was well set back from the road and from neighbouring properties. Very little additional land was used by the proposal;
- Since the previous application had been rejected, Mr Arens had worked with Hillingdon planning officers to address the concerns raised and had produced modified plans with reduced roof height and length of the new hall so it does not overtop the Grade II-listed part of the building;
- Many of the signatories of the petition were immediate neighbours of the Six Bells. The Ruislip Residents' Association had agreed to support the application as being in the best interests of the community and the Chairman of Ruislip Woods Management Advisory Group had raised no objections.

Members noted that a previous application had been refused and enquired why the current application was deemed to be acceptable and how it differed from the original. It was confirmed that very special circumstances applied in this cases and, on balance, the proposed development was considered to provide public benefits to outweigh the harm posed. The Committee heard that the previous application had been for a larger

development with 10 bedrooms proposed. In the new application, the length of the proposed structure had been reduced by approximately 4m and it was starting to become more subservient to the main pub building. Officers felt the proposed development was large but approvable.

Members welcomed the new proposal noting that it was smaller and an improvement on the previous one. Clarification was sought regarding alterations to the door as set out on page 61 of the agenda pack; it was noted that the door had been altered from a 3 panel door to a modern 4 panel door – apparently without authorisation. Members sought reassurance that no further amendments to the application would be allowed without prior consent being given. It was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to expand Condition 6 (agenda item 9) to tighten the list of building conditions to be adhered to.

Members welcomed the application and observed that the development would be good for both the pub and the surrounding area. The Committee was pleased to note that the local Residents' Association was also in favour of the proposal. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to expand Condition 6 (agenda item 9) so as to tighten up the list of building conditions to be adhered to; and**
- 2) That the application be approved.**

135. THE SIX BELLS PUBLIC HOUSE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, RUISLIP - 14387/APP/2020/4128 (Agenda Item 9)

Proposed barn extension to provide an extended dining area at ground floor and 8 no. guest rooms at first floor (Application for Listed Building Consent).

This agenda item was discussed in tandem with agenda item 8.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to expand Condition 6 so as to tighten up the list of building conditions to be adhered to; and**
- 2) That the application be approved.**

136. 188 BURY STREET, RUISLIP - 8697/APP/2020/3622 (Agenda Item 10)

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 x 4 bed dwelling houses with associated parking spaces and external works.

Officers introduced the application noting that the proposed dwellings would be detached and would have a 2m separation gap between each dwelling. The first two dwellings would follow the established building line of 186 Bury Street. The remaining two dwellings would be set forward of this building line by approximately 4m.

Members welcomed the application stating that it was good to see a development of 4 bed family houses with gardens; this type of dwelling was sought after in the Borough.

The Committee sought clarification regarding drainage arrangements at the site noting that the area was prone to flooding. It was confirmed that adequate drainage had been provided for as set out in Condition 8. In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that each home would be furnished with one active charging point for electric vehicles.

Members welcomed the proposal and raised no further concerns.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

137. **PYLON FARM, NEW YEAR GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD - 12579/APP/2020/2742**
(Agenda Item 11)

Demolition of existing outbuildings and construction of single replacement outbuilding.

Officers introduced the application informing Members that the proposal was for the demolition of a small group of existing farm buildings and the construction of a single replacement building. It was noted that a similar application had been refused planning permission under delegated powers on 22/5/20 as it was considered that the application lacked detail in terms of the intended use of the building in relation to Green Belt policy and other supporting information. The additional clarification and information had now been provided with the new application and it was considered that the reasons for refusal of the previous application had been overcome. The Committee heard that the new outbuilding would occupy a similar site to the demolished buildings which were in a poor state of repair. It was considered that the proposed development would not materially impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The application was recommended for approval.

In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was confirmed that the caravan currently on site would be removed. It was further confirmed that conditions relating to the removal of asbestos had been included on page 135 of the agenda pack.

The Committee raised no further concerns or queries. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

138. **MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 3807/APP/2020/4265**
(Agenda Item 12)

Construction of 1.5m wide gravel footpath around lawn perimeter and through the centre of the woodland belt to south of lawn, to include two access ramps with handrails.

The Committee agreed that this was a straightforward application therefore no presentation was required. Members raised no queries or concerns and were happy to endorse the officer's recommendation for approval.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

139. **THE OLDE NORTHWOOD PH, 142 PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 73773/APP/2020/3002** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Conversion of public house to residential use to provide 4 self-contained flats including habitable roofspace and roof terrace, demolition of existing garages and rear element and the erection of 2 x two storey dwellings with habitable roofspace including parking and amenity space and external works.

Officers presented the application noting that planning approval for the demolition of the existing public house and erection of a part 3-storey, part 2-storey building to provide 9 flats had been approved in January 2020. Members were informed that the current application had the benefit of retaining the original pub exterior. It was felt that the proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the Area of Special Local Character. It was considered that the proposal would not significantly impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and would provide adequate living accommodation, amenity space and parking provision. Officers highlighted a slight error on page 178 of the agenda pack – it was noted that Condition 4, point 2.d should read ‘Car Parking Layouts (including demonstration that **20%** of all parking spaces are served by electrical charging points)’. The application was recommended for approval.

Members were pleased to note that the attractive exterior of the building was to be maintained. The Committee sought clarification regarding the amenity space to be provided and enquired whether this would be adequate. It was confirmed that the gardens for the two new dwellings were slightly below the Council’s amenity standards; however, it was noted that a football ground, golf course and other amenity spaces were nearby and easily accessible. A nearby outdoor gym was also planned.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that six car parking spaces would be provided – one for each flat and one for each dwelling. The Highways Officer confirmed that the developer would be required to provide a car parking allocation plan.

Members raised no further concerns and commented that this was a good proposal. The officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

140. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 14*)

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer’s report, was agreed; and,**
- 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 and 7** of Part 1 of

	<p>Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
141.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and, 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
142.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and, 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.30 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Telephone 01895 250636 or email: democratic@hillington.gov.uk. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers,

the Press and Members of the Public.

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making; however, these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.