

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

11 March 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 Haggar, Allan Kauffman, Carol Melvin, John Oswell (Opposition Lead), Jagjit Singh and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: 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) and James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
143.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
144.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
145.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting dated 17 February 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
146.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
147.	<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 – 10 were marked Part I and would be considered in public and items 11 and 12 were marked Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
148.	<p>50 NEWNHAM AVENUE, RUISLIP - 70191/APP/2021/174 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Single storey side/rear extension, canopy structure above existing side entrance door and external alterations to the property, following demolition of existing outbuilding (Revised description)</p>

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that party wall matters were not planning considerations as they were covered by other legislation. Members heard that the proposed 3.6m extension was in accordance with Local Plan guidance and would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The application site was situated in Flood Zone 1 and in a critical drainage area therefore there was a small risk of flooding; however, the footprint was limited and would not exacerbate the flood risk.

A written submission from the lead petitioner was read out to the Committee objecting to the application. Key points included:

- The petitioner had requested that the WC, utility room and kitchen be sited to the rear of the extension leaving the dining room in its original place; planning officers had not taken this into consideration;
- The internal design would directly affect the lead petitioner – this was a planning matter not a party wall matter;
- The proposed WC location and utility room plumbing and drainage would affect the party wall;
- The proposed design would impact on the next-door neighbour in terms of noise, damp, fire and ventilation;
- The drains could potentially block and there was the risk of rodents entering both properties;
- There would be a social issue as noise would emanate from the utility / WC room and kitchen;
- The drains would run along the party wall.

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

- The proposed scheme had been designed to be sensitive to neighbouring occupiers and follow the Council's design policies;
- The scale, form and materials would work well with the existing house;
- The roof form would be sensitive to the existing roof shape;
- The character of the existing house and the wider area would be preserved;
- The scheme sought to enhance the internal layout of the house;
- The proposed extension had been reduced in depth to 3.6m to comply with Council policies;
- There would be no harmful impact on the garden spaces or habitable room windows to the neighbours – the garden space retained would be well above the 60sqm required at around 120sqm;
- The objections raised many points which were not material planning considerations and were covered by separate legislation;
- Flood risk was the only material issue raised by the objector – Council officers had concluded that there would be no additional flood risks from the extension and that the risk of flooding in the area was low;
- The proposed works were to accommodate a growing family – not to be used as an HMO or to maximise development value.

Members noted that it would be possible to provide services without the involvement of party wall legislation.

The Committee was pleased to note that the applicant had worked with planning officers to produce a proposal which was sympathetic to the neighbour's property and

complied with Local Plan guidance. Members suggested that perhaps more soundproofing could be included to help minimise noise and address some of the petitioner's concerns.

Members noted that it should be possible for the applicant to utilise the existing input point for water and exit point for waste; a new set of drains would not be required.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

149. **169 JOEL STREET, EASTCOTE - 22642/APP/2020/3181** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a part one, part two and part three-storey building comprising 9 flats (3 x 1-bed, 5 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed) with 4 parking spaces.

Officers introduced the application noting that the proposed development would constitute an overdevelopment of the site with inadequate parking provision and substandard accommodation. Members heard that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site, the street scene and the wider setting and would result in a perceived loss of privacy to both the neighbouring properties.

The Committee was advised that it had been necessary to include reason for refusal no.6 as 29 objections had been received, many of which had referred to parking stress. 4 spaces for 9 flats was considered to be inadequate.

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

- Potentially 25-30 people could be living in the proposed flats with only 4 parking spaces. Parking was already problematic in the area and this would exacerbate the problem;
- Buses and emergency services regularly utilised the street. The added congestion that 25-30 new occupants could create would add to overcrowding along the road;
- Gym classes were held at the nursery on Joel Street Farm. Gym class users parked on both sides of the road three evenings per week, making it difficult to access driveways and safely cross the road;
- There were three schools off Joel Street creating further traffic congestion at peak times;
- Outside peak hours, the speed at which traffic travelled along the road was a cause for concern and vehicles had been hit when parked on Joel Street. This could become more prevalent as the new development would increase the number of cars parked on the road. Cars had also been broken into when parked along the road;
- Balconies on the second and third floors of the proposed development would overlook gardens on Joel Street and Middleton Drive thereby breaching the privacy of residents. The three-storey property would potentially lead to a loss of light / overshadowing;
- The new development would put a strain on local amenities and cause increased noise and disturbance;
- Many local residents objected to the scheme and the Residents' Association

were against the proposal.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the proposed development would not breach the 10% rule.

Members observed that the proposal constituted overdevelopment, did not meet the Council standards and was not in keeping with the surrounding area.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

150. **33 WIELAND ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 14787/APP/2020/3531** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Part two, part three-storey rear extension, subterranean garage/services and storage room, structural underpinning, external remodelling including new roof construction.

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. It was noted that a petition in objection to the proposal with 61 signatories had been received. A petition with 46 signatures in support of the application had also been received. Members heard that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the ASLC. The Tree and Landscape Officer had expressed concern regarding the removal of a tree protected by a TPO and the loss of other B grade trees. The Committee was advised that the proposed subterranean development was in a critical drainage area and no basement impact / flood risk assessments had been submitted.

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

- The proposed development would transform the traditional Arts and Crafts based property into a style of property which would be totally unique on the estate. Large full height windows over 3 storeys would completely alter the look of the original property and introduce new features into the ASLC;
- Photographs of properties had been submitted to the Council by the applicants – many of the photos were not Gatehill properties and were therefore irrelevant. The applicant had been unable to provide any photographs of estate properties with similar features to what they were proposing as none existed;
- Petitioners objected to the felling of a healthy TPO tree which could be seen from a great distance around the estate. The tree made a significant contribution to the sylvan character of the estate and the ambience and amenity provided. The suggestion to replace this tree with 2-metre high silver birch trees dotted around the site was ludicrous;
- The land in the area sloped steeply and the road at the bottom of the hill had flooded on several occasions;
- The proposed staircase to the basement would abut the neighbour's supporting wall and create a weak low spot for the ground and surface water seepage;
- A site-specific assessment of the ground and surface water movement within the site was essential;
- The application would have a detrimental effect on the original house, the street scene, the neighbouring property and the amenity of residents.

A written submission from the applicant was read out to the Committee. Key points included:

- Previous planning consents were material to the application and, while the development plan had evolved, the principles of planning policy remained much the same and supported the principle of development;
- The Conservation Officer had not expressed an outright objection to the scheme commenting that, whilst there were some concerns from a historic environment perspective, the quality of the contemporary design and the improvements in sustainability and efficiency of the building should not be dismissed;
- The ASLC was characterised by an eclectic housing mix and extensions were acceptable in principle. The case officer had advised that the proposed development sat well on the plot and had raised no objection regarding the proposed build footprint;
- The proposed scheme respected adjacent boundaries and would not have a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light, overshadowing, overlooking or loss of privacy;
- The applicant had held extensive discussions with the local authority prior to submission of the application and no overwhelming objections had been raised on the matter of design;
- The loss of the TPO tree should not impact the principle of the development. There was no risk to any retained trees on the rear boundary;
- Had the case officer requested it, a flood risk report would have been provided. Advice had been sought from a consultant prior to submission of the application who had advised that the site was a low flood risk therefore a formal assessment was unlikely to be required. The matter of drainage could be addressed by means of a condition;
- Considering the existence of other contemporary designs in Hillingdon's ASLCs, the development should be deemed to be acceptable.

Written submissions from Ward Councillor Jonathan Bianco and Ward Councillor Duncan Flynn were read out to the Committee. Councillor Bianco objected to the scheme and shared residents' concerns. He also expressed concern regarding the abuse of the petition scheme noting that many of those who had signed the petition in support of the application did not live in the local area. Councillor Flynn also objected to the proposed development expressing concerns regarding its design and scale and observing that the loss of a TPO trees was unnecessary and undesirable.

In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was confirmed that a flood report was required but applicants / agents did not always submit them. Officers requested the information but, if not received, this could not be dealt with by means of a condition. In the case of a basement, a basement impact assessment should be provided.

In response to further enquiries from the Committee, it was confirmed that it was not possible to verify if the photos submitted as evidence were of properties on the Gatehill Estate as no addresses had been provided.

Members noted that they objected to the proposed scheme. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

Erection of a three-storey building comprising a dental surgery and 7 residential units (6 no. 1-bed units and 1 no. 2-bed unit), car and cycle parking and associated works, temporary permission for the siting of a modular building to the rear of the site for use as a dental surgery during the demolition of the existing dental surgery and construction of the proposed dental surgery.

Officers introduced the application observing that the proposed development, by reason of its overall size, scale and bulk, would result in an incongruous form of development that would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the site, the street scene and the wider area. It was noted that the proposed development would lead to the loss of a family sized residential unit and, by reason of the unit mix, failed to provide sufficient family sized units, as required by the latest information on housing need.

A written submission on behalf of the applicant was read out to the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The development had been found to be acceptable in terms of privacy and parking provision;
- Pre-application advice had been sought prior to submission of the application and the application submitted was in line with officer's comments;
- Had they been advised earlier of the concerns regarding the size/scale and unit mix, the application could have been amended accordingly;
- A deferral was requested to enable the applicant / agent to amend the plans to address the issues of concern to officers and petitioners;
- To address concerns re. the unit mix, the application scheme could be altered to provide 3 x 1-bed units, 2 x 2-bed units and 1 x 3-bed unit;
- An alternative system to reduce the lift overrun was proposed – this was based on a glass box and would significantly reduce the size, scale and bulk of the enclosure and would have a less intrusive design. This would also address the perception of height raised as an issue by petitioners;
- The newly proposed 2-bed flats would have a smaller footprint than the 3 1-bed flats in the current application. This change would allow a setback of at least 3m to the second floor at the rear;
- The proposed changes to the mix and lift over run would materially reduce the size and scale of the building so that it better related to the character and appearance of the area.

A written submission from Ward Councillor Steve Tuckwell in objection to the scheme was read out to the Committee. Key points included:

- The development fell short of several national and local planning policies;
- Councillor Tuckwell agreed with the content of the petition supported by 31 local residents which was based on sound reasons for objection – the height impact on the area, overlooking and privacy concerns, parking stress and failure to provide family housing;
- A three-storey building with a 4th four-storey clad structure would create an over dominant building on a prominent corner plot which would adversely impact the street scene and character and appearance of the area;
- There was a shortfall in amenity space against policy standards.

Members noted that there was another large apartment block opposite the application site and a further 109 flats being built close by. It was felt that the proposed

development was an overdevelopment of this prominent corner site.

In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was confirmed that, during the pre-application advice process, concerns had been raised regarding the size and scale of the proposed development and the unit mix. These had not been addressed in the application.

The Committee commented that it was not possible to consider the agent's revised proposal at this stage. 3-bed family properties were needed in the Borough and the applicant / agent would need to submit a modified application to address the reasons for refusal. The exact amenity space to be provided for the flats would also need to be clarified.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

152. **11 SANDY LODGE WAY, NORTHWOOD - 16948/APP/2020/3623** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Erection of a two-storey building with habitable roofspace to create 3 x 2-bed self-contained flats and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flat with forecourt car parking, cycle parking, new vehicular access and amenity space following demolition of existing dwelling.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members heard that the principle of a flatted development at the site had already been established through the granting of planning permission under a previous application. It was considered that the new proposal had satisfactorily addressed the previous grounds for refusal. The Committee was informed that it would not have a negative impact on the visual amenity of the site or the surrounding area and would not result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity to neighbouring occupiers. It was felt that the proposal would provide adequate parking spaces and the proposed crossover would not prejudice pedestrian or highway safety.

Members were happy with the proposal and raised no objections. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

153. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 11*)

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 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.
154.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</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>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Telephone 01895 250185 or email epenny@hillingdon.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.