

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 June 2011

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery, Allan Kaufmann, Carol Melvin, Dominic Gilham, Pat Jackson, David Allam and Jazz Dhillon.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meg Hirani (Team Leader) Manmohan Ranger (Traffic Team) Rory Stracey (Legal Advisor) Nav Johal (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor's Andrew Retter and Jonathon Bianco</p>	
186.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Michael Markham, David Payne and John Morgan gave their apologies. Councillors Dominic Gilham and Pat Jackson were present as substitutes.</p>	Action by
187.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Bianco who was present as a Ward Councillor for item 8, Harlyn School, declared and personal and prejudicial interest in relation to this item. He remained in the room and spoke as a Ward Councillor.</p>	Action by
188.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28TH APRIL 2011 & 12TH MAY 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held 28 April 2011 and 12 May 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	Action by
189.	<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
190.	<p>LAND TO REAR OF 94-96 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD 66134/APP/2011/294 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>	Action by

Three storey detached building comprising 6, two-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space and installation of 2 vehicular crossovers, involving demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a replacement garage.

66134/APP/2011/294

This application sought permission for a three storey block comprising of 6 two-bedroom flats and a replacement garage on rear garden land accessed from Ashurst Close.

The proposal would have involved the loss of garden land, a number of trees and landscaping which contributed to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Part of which was within the Old Northwood Area of Special Local Character. The proposed block would have failed to sit comfortably on its plot, would of had an excessive density and appeared unduly cramped and bulky. Its modern design would not have harmonised with the architectural quality of the surrounding buildings.

Furthermore, the proposal would not have provided adequate off-street parking and no contributions had been offered at this stage towards additional education facilities.

Had an appeal not been lodged against non-determination, the application would have been refused for the above reasons.

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:

- Mr Sabel spoke on behalf of the petitioners who signed the petition objecting to the application.
- The petitioner spoke about the officer's report and that it strongly recommended refusal of the application.
- They were objecting to the level of development proposed, this area was too small for the level of development
- Most of the residents who signed the petition lived in Ashurst Close and close to the proposed development.
- The area was a densely populated area which lacked a central park.
- It was a small attractive area which was mainly occupied by elderly residents.
- Contract gardeners were employed to ensure the area was well maintained.
- The petitioners agreed with the reports comments regarding trees and that it formed a critical attractive boundary.
- There was a tree preservation order and if the application was approved it would nullify the order, and the height of the building would exceed the trees.
- The proposal would result in driving hazards. The entrance to the proposed garages would be hazardous.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There would be a lack of parking space. The plans allowed provision for 6 spaces but the petitioners felt there would be an additional 12 spaces that would be required. • It was already a congested road and more cars would increase this congestion. • The reputation of Northwood as an attractive area would be at risk if this application was approved. <p>The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Members agreed that PPS3 was designed for this kind of application. They agreed with petitioners that this application was being shoe-horned into a space that was too small.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That had an appeal for non-determination not been lodged, the application would have been refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
191.	<p>LAND TO REAR OF 94-96 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD 66134/APP/2011/296 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Three storey detached building comprising 6, two-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space and installation of 2, vehicular crossovers, involving demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a replacement garage (Duplicate Application)</p> <p>66134/APP/2011/296</p> <p>This item was discussed with item 6 as it was a duplicate application.</p> <p>The leader petitioner, Mr Sabel, spoke on behalf of the petitioners in item 6 with regard to this item. The agent or applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The application was recommended for refusal for the reasons stated in the officers report and as discussed in the previous item.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by
192.	<p>HARLYN SCHOOL, TOLCARNE DRIVE, PINNER 8883/APP/2011/941 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p>	Action by

Installation of a temporary mobile double classroom for a period of 3 years.

8883/APP/2011/941

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of a mobile double classroom unit at Harlyn Primary School, for a temporary period of three years. The additional classroom spaces were required to accommodate the growing number of pupils at the school.

The Education Act 1996 states that Local Authorities have a duty to educate children within their administrative area. The Hillingdon Primary Capital Schools Programme was part of the Council's legal requirement to meet the educational needs of the borough.

In recent years the borough had seen a rise in birth rates up to 2008 and the trend had continued through 2009 and 2010. This growth in the birth rate, combined with net in-migration and new large scale housing developments in the borough had meant that there was a significant need for additional primary school classrooms across the borough.

The longer term strategy would be to provide permanent accommodation as part of the programme to meet existing and future needs. However, in the interim period an urgent need for additional classrooms had been identified to meet demand for September 2011.

The proposal fully complied with the aims of UDP Policy R10, which sought to encourage educational facilities in the Borough and, accordingly, the principle of the development was considered to be acceptable.

Given its temporary nature, it was not considered that the proposed double classroom would have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the school or the surrounding area. The proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential units and no objections had been raised on traffic grounds, provided appropriate mitigation measures could be put in place.

The proposal was considered to comply with relevant UDP and London Plan policies and, accordingly, approval was recommended.

There were no petitioners present at the meeting.

The applicant or agent was not present at the meeting.

Ward Councillors' Andrew Retter and Jonathon Bianco were present and spoke as Ward Councillors.

Ward Councillor Andrew Retter addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- Councillor Retter had spoken to the lead petitioner and she was concerned that the work had already started on the site before the application had been heard by the Planning Committee.

- Residents believed that a decision should be made before any work could commence.
- This was a problematic road, which had a lot of congestion and there had been previous petitions submitted to the Council regarding this. This included a petition regarding the local test centre which was in the area.
- Councillor Retter spoke about how previous experience had shown that a temporary classroom which was meant to be there for 3 years has in the past stayed on site for many years.
- That the Council needs to ensure that temporary classrooms stay as temporary and that long term measures were put in place.
- Councillor Retter asked that the Planning Department liaise with the Education Department with regard to voluntary codes of practice. That the Education Department speak to the school about parents travelling to and from the school.
- Some parents parked in front of peoples' driveways and that this was hazardous in a road where there were a lot of elderly residents who may need to leave in an emergency.
- Councillor Retter was in favour of the officer recommendation because of the educational needs but the concerns of the residents needed to be heard.

Ward Councillor Jonathon Bianco addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- Councillor Bianco understood the need for more places at schools due to the increase in the number of school age children in the borough.
- He stated that Harlyn School already had 5 temporary classrooms and that it could do with permanent classrooms for the future.
- That the main issues with residents was the traffic and congestion. There were a lot of cars parked on the road, which often left a single carriageway for cars to drive through.
- The parking issue had been looked at in the past and the possibility of a controlled parking zone. This was not implemented as the majority of residents were not in favour of a cpz.
- Councillor Bianco stated there should be a greater emphasis on the green travel plan. That schools needed to be persuaded to speak to parents about leaving their cars at home to help assist with the parking and congestion issues.
- Councillor Bianco agreed that the development was needed for the educational reasons as stated in the officers report.

Members spoke about the concerns regarding temporary classrooms and that how in the future a more permanent solution would be ideal. Members recognised that these issues with classrooms was a problem across the country, not just this Borough.

Members spoke about any possible loss in playground area and that it was a concern if they were increasing the number of children but reducing the play area. Officers confirmed that the standards for

	<p>playgrounds would be maintained with this proposed development.</p> <p>Members discussed the green travel plan and the 3 month period for the implementation of this. It was noted that the current travel plans showed a shift towards more 'green travel' and that Hillingdon was top of the list in London for this.</p> <p>Members stated that the schools should be talking to parents at pick up and drop off times about their travel to assist with the parking and congestion issues.</p> <p>Members agreed that the parking and congestion issues discussed were not strong enough to object to this application, and that the need for the school places was a greater issue.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Consumer Protection, Sport and Green Spaces to approve the application, subject to no objections being received from Sport England, and the conditions and informatives as set out in the officer's report.</p>	
193.	<p>GLEBE PRIMARY SCHOOL, SUSSEX ROAD, ICKENHAM 8004/APP/2011/932 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Installation of temporary mobile double classroom for a period of 3 years.</p> <p>8004/APP/2011/932</p> <p>This application sought full planning permission for the erection of a mobile double classroom unit at Glebe Primary School, for a temporary period of three years. The additional classroom spaces were required to accommodate the growing number of pupils at the school.</p> <p>The Education Act 1996 states that Local Authorities have a duty to educate children within their administrative area. The Hillingdon Primary Capital Schools Programme was part of the Council's legal requirement to meet the educational needs of the borough.</p> <p>In recent years the borough had seen a rise in birth rates up to 2008 and the trend had continued through 2009 and 2010. This growth in the birth rate, combined with net in-migration and new large scale housing developments in the borough had meant that there was now a significant need for additional primary school classrooms across the borough.</p> <p>The longer term strategy would be to provide permanent accommodation as part of the programme to meet existing and future needs. However, in the interim period an urgent need for additional</p>	Action by

	<p>classrooms had been identified to meet demand for September 2011.</p> <p>The proposal fully complied with the aims of UDP Policy R10, which sought to encourage educational facilities in the borough and, accordingly, the principle of the development was considered to be acceptable. Given its temporary nature, it was not considered that the proposed double classroom would have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the school or the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposal would not have any detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring residential units and no objections had been raised on traffic grounds, provided appropriate mitigation measures could be put in place.</p> <p>The proposal was considered to comply with relevant UDP and London Plan policies and, accordingly, approval was recommended.</p> <p>Members discussed the comment made by Sport For England regarding the playing field. Officers confirmed that the application was on the field but did not take away any part of the playing pitch.</p> <p>Members had noted that work had started on this site and this was the risk that developers took and would not effect the decision they had to make.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
194.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be agreed as per the report.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>The Enforcement Report was unanimously agreed by the Committee.</p>	Action by
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.50 pm.</p>	

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.