

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 July 2011

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chair) Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Carol Melvin David Payne Lynne Allen</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning, Consumer Protection, Sport &amp; Green Spaces) Meg Hirani (Team Leader) Syed Shah (Traffic Team) Nikki Deol (Legal Advisor) Nav Johal (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Catherine Dann and Shirley Harper-O'Neill</p>	
207.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Councillors Michael Markham, John Morgan and Jazz Dhillon gave their apologies. Councillors Ray Graham, Pat Jackson and Lynne Allen were present as substitutes.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
208.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a personal interest in relation to item 10, 26 Acre Way. He remained in the room for this item.</p> <p>Councillor Shirley Harper-O'Neill who was present declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to item 10 and left the room for the duration of this item.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
209.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 23 JUNE 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held 23 June 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
210.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>

211.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items marked part 2 were considered in private.</p>	Action by
212.	<p><b>HIGHGROVE HOUSE, EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP 10622/APP/2010/1822</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Variation of Condition 3 / Minor material amendment to planning permission ref: 10622/APP/2009/2504 dated 11/02/2010: Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwelling houses and associated works (time extension of planning permission ref: 10622/APP/2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007) to allow alterations to the siting and design of the two blocks of mews housing (Retrospective application).</b></p> <p>Members recalled planning and listed building applications on this site for the refurbishment and conversion of Highgrove House to provide 12 residential units and the erection of 4 two-bedroomed mews houses with associated amenity space, off-street parking and landscaping, involving the demolition of the stable building.</p> <p>Permission was originally granted at the North Planning Committee meeting on the 09/01/07 (refs.10622/APP/2006/2490 and 2491) and time limit extensions were granted at its meeting on the 04/02/10 (refs. 10622/APP/2010/2504 and 2506). Works had commenced on site, including work on the mews houses with their revised siting, the subject of this application.</p> <p>This application as originally submitted was for a revised siting and design of the mews housing. It has since come to light that the original plans submitted were inaccurate in terms of the siting of the adjoining properties in Kent Gardens. Accurate plans have now been submitted. Furthermore, this application sought to up-date the details which have now been approved in connection with the conditions attached to the renewed planning permission (ref. 10622/APP/2009/2504).</p> <p>It was considered that as the revised siting of the mews housing did not bring the blocks any nearer to the listed Highgrove House and the alterations to their design were not extensive and were acceptable, its setting would not be adversely affected. For similar reasons, the alterations would not materially harm the amenities of future residents on the site. In terms of the impact upon adjoining residents on Kent Gardens, it was considered that the revised siting and design of the mews housing would have a neutral impact, and with the planting of a laurel hedge on the boundary, possibly a reduced impact in terms of the existing planning permission as was approved.</p>	Action by

A site visit was carried out by Members on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> July. The application was subject to 10 letters and 2 petitions.

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 petitioners:

- Mr Larkin spoke on behalf of the petitioners who signed the petition objecting to the application.
- The lead petitioner lived at lived at 27 Kent Gardens and stated that the residents were in support of the petition which objected to the intrusion that would be caused by this application.
- The petition had the support of MP Nick Hurd, Cllr Bruce Baker and local associations.
- The petitioner stated that the plans were inaccurate and the development was built on the wrong place.
- That the application was on a site that was already over developed and this was against planning guidelines. There was not enough space to develop on this site.
- The revised sitings of Block A would be 6/7metres from the nearest property. The back windows of existing properties would show buildings in direct line of sight.
- The development would reduce the quality of living for the people who were living in the area.
- The developers were illegally removing trees from the area. These were boundary trees that were originally planted to be a screen.
- The application would result in an increase in the level of noise in the area and decrease the value of their homes.
- The Council had a duty to look after residents and not looking after profit gaining developers.
- Petitioners asked that Block A be demolished and the trees that were illegally removed be replanted.
- Mrs Crowcroft spoke on behalf of the second petition that was presented to Committee.
- There were many areas of concern and the overriding concern was the future living of residents.
- A previous application in January 2007 went to Committee and this report contained incorrect information from officers.
- That had the correct positioning been shown in the original plan then the application would not have been approved.
- The plans should not be accepted as the guidelines for the minimum distance were not followed by developers.
- The petitioner stated that the residents should not suffer and their standard of living would reduce.
- The application, if approved, could result in localised flooding. This was another reason to refuse the application.
- That trees had been removed by developers without permission and they had started building without permission.
- Mrs Crowcroft asked Committee that they should consider recommending that Block A be demolished.

The agent made the following points:

- The agent stated that a lot of the objections that were put forward were put based on siting of house blocks as they were.
- The architects appointed found some mistakes, some of which were mentioned by officers, in the original plans.
- There was a need to change the floor plan to change perimeters.
- They had spoken to conservation officers and planners about anomalies, who suggested that they make another application.
- The revised plans increased the development from one side, and decreased another.
- The agents had looked at ways of mitigating the impact to neighbouring homes.
- The agent agreed that they would replant trees to make a screen.
- That the distances between the nearest existing home and house block had increased.
- That this application had set out to mitigate the problems of the original approval.
- It was stated that the original plans were made up by the Council.

Ward Councillor Catherine Dann was present and spoke as a Ward Councillor. The following points were raised:

- Councillor Dann spoke on behalf of her Ward Councillors, including Cllr Baker.
- The petitions had highlighted several issues for the Committee to consider.
- Cllr Dann attended the site visit that was attended by Members and she found it very distressing to go into a person's home and be able to see enormous brick wall partially built.
- Trees had been removed and this impacted residents.
- There was a lot of anger and distress locally as a result of the application.
- Petitioners had given many reasons why this application should be removed and demolished.

Members discussed the complex and difficult application. This was an existing application that the developers wished to have varied. The 2007 plans were clearly incorrect and planning permission was granted on these plans. Members wished for clarification on whether the original planning permission was legitimate. That if Members refused the variation would the original plans still stand.

The Committee's legal advisor stated that the question of whether the plans invalidated the permission was a matter of fact and degree and this had been found to be the position through case law and was a complex area of law. The original application and planning permission remained intact. As the errors had been identified outside of the redline plan. The planning permission for 2007 had been implemented, and would still stand as long as they built out to the original plans which were agreed by the Council and should be considered the fall back position should the application for variation be approved.

	<p>Other avenues were discussed by Members and Officers including any possible enforcement action and action against the original architect for providing false information. This was not for the Planning Committee to consider and could be investigated further. The Committee agreed that this error needed addressing.</p> <p>The error was noted in March 2011 and a temporary stop notice was served on 14 April 2011.</p> <p>Members noted the concerns of the residents with regard to this application and that the report was for a minor variation to the application. Members considered the various options available to them and they discussed the issues around flooding and boundary trees.</p> <p>Members wished to confirm that the 2007 was absolutely valid before reaching a decision on this application. Members discussed the option of getting external Counsel's opinion on the 2007 application.</p> <p>It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote unanimously agreed to defer the decision pending the receipt of Counsel's advice on the 2007 application. The questions to be asked of Counsel to be delegated to the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED - Deferred to seek counsels opinion on the legality of the 2007 permission.</b></p>	
213.	<p><b>LAND AT 216 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE, 6331/APP/2010/2411</b> <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p><b>Erection of a part three storey, part four storey building comprising a ground floor Class A1 (Retail) unit and 3, one-bedroom flats and 8, two-bedroom flats above with first floor rear roof garden and third floor terrace on front elevation</b></p> <p>This application sought planning permission for a new four storey building on the vacant site. It would comprise a new convenience store covering most of the ground floor and 3 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom flats above. The scheme would be car free.</p> <p>The proposed usage was acceptable in policy terms and the scheme would benefit the town centre in terms of bringing a vacant prominent town centre site back into productive use. The scheme had been revised in terms of the building's siting and design and it was considered to present a satisfactory appearance on Field End Road, which respected the scale and harmonised with surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The proposal was not considered to harm the setting of the Grade II listed Eastcote Underground Station sited on the opposite side of the road. The proposed building would not be detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residents.</p> <p>One of the flats was below the minimum unit size advocated by design guidance, but the shortfall was minimal and would not justify</p>	Action by

a refusal of the scheme. The amenity space proposed was considered acceptable in this town centre location.

With regards to noise, the Council's Environmental Health Officer advised that adequate safeguards and attenuation measures would ensure that an adequate residential environment was achieved.

Since the scheme has been amended to include a lift to all residential floors, the Council's Access Officer advised that the scheme was acceptable.

As the site had no rear access, servicing and deliveries would be at the front of the store. Works to the highway included a new loading/unloading bay that would be available to surrounding retail units, remodelling of the adjoining lay-by to provide three additional on-street parking spaces and the area to the front of the store would be paved and two new trees and seating provided and the area would be dedicated to the Council. The Council's Highway Officer advised that delivery arrangements were acceptable; subject to control of delivery times to avoid peak hours and that the car free scheme was acceptable. Although no disabled car parking space was provided, given the constraints on site and the scale of the development proposed, no objection was raised.

An Affordable Homes Viability Assessment demonstrated that the scheme would not be viable if such housing was included having regard to other s106 commitments. It was considered that the scheme did provide a full range of S106 contributions. It was recommended for approval.

Members discussed the traffic and parking implications of the application. Members were concerned that the application offered no parking spaces. They discussed the option of underground parking and issues that may arise from deliveries to this site. It was noted that this site did not have rear access so deliveries would be made through the front. It was discussed that refuse would be collected from the front of the site.

The surrounding areas had controlled parking zones (cpz) and Members discussed where the new residents and also shoppers would park when using the facilities and those that lived in the flats above the proposed store.

The size of the amenity was discussed and Members agreed that this was well below the usual guidance. Members accepted that this was a Town Centre space and also noted that there was no contribution towards Green Spaces.

Officers explained to Members that it was proposed that deliveries to the store would be consolidated. That if the bay's outside the store was being occupied the agent had said the delivery van would come back later rather than wait on the road for space. An s.106 legal agreement could be put in place to enforce how deliveries were carried out to the store. The deliveries could be restricted to timings. Officers stated that

	<p>the deliveries proposed would not be more than 1 hour a day in total for this application.</p> <p>Members discussed how the area was notorious difficult area for highways and traffic. That drainage was also an issue that the Committee needed to consider. Members noted that there was not a dedicated disabled parking space for a person living in the proposed development.</p> <p>Members believed that for various reasons including parking, amenity space, delivery, traffic they could not accept the proposal as it was presented. They agreed this was a prime site that would benefit from enhancement, but that the application was an over-development of the site.</p> <p>Members believed that the applications needed some changes, but agreed the idea in principle would be a positive enhancement to the area.</p> <p>Members discussed the policy reasons in regard to this application and believed it was contrary to policies AM14, AM15 and BE23. Members agreed to overturn the officer recommendation.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation overturned and application REFUSED on the grounds of lack of parking/disabled parking and inadequate amenity space. Exact wording to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour lead.</b></p>	
214.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP 10189/APP/2011/1119</b> <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p><b>Erection of a glazed conservatory at Plot 296. (Amendment to reserved matters approval ref: 10189/APP/2007/3046 dated 31/03/2008 – residential development)</b></p> <p>This report related to an application that sought variations to the layout and design of the alternative access reserved matters scheme (ref: 10189/APP/2007/3046), for the former RAF Eastcote site, which was approved on 31 March 2008. The amendments would allow a rear conservatory on plot 296, which was located centrally in the northern portion of the site.</p> <p>It was considered that in terms of design and layout, the inclusion of the conservatory would respect the character of the local area and not detract from the internal character of the development.</p> <p>It was also considered that the inclusion of a conservatory to this plot would not have had an adverse impact on the amenities of surrounding residents in terms of loss of privacy, outlook, daylight or sunlight. The remaining external amenity area of this plot would be considered sufficient to meet the needs of future occupiers.</p>	Action by

	<p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report</b></p>	
215.	<p><b>12 EASTBURY ROAD, NORTHWOOD, 1901/APP/2011/174</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of part first floor rear/side extension, alterations to rear elevation to include removal of single storey rear roof, installation of ramps to West elevation and East elevation and external staircase to side.</b></p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a part two storey part first floor side extension, ground floor rear infill extension and provision of external first escape staircase.</p> <p>The application property was an attractive 'Arts &amp; Crafts' style building which forms a group with 10, 14 and 16 Eastbury Road, which were on the local list.</p> <p>The proposed part first floor side/rear extension was not considered to harmonise with the character, proportions and appearance of the main building and would be detrimental to the appearance of the surrounding area and the character and appearance of the Northwood/Frithwood Conservation Area. The proposal would not harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties.</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 petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mrs Herrning spoke on behalf of the petitioners who signed the petition objecting to the application.</li> <li>• She stated that the reasons given by petitioners at the North Planning Committee last year on an application on this site all still applied.</li> <li>• The lead petitioner had lived at no.14 for a number of years and wished that the area would stay an attractive area. She believed it was a conservation area and should be maintained.</li> <li>• Malcolm Ruddock, Northwood Association, emailed his comments and he would actively oppose any further development on the site.</li> <li>• The staircase on the site was a concern for any emergency access and any new proposed staircase needed to consider this.</li> <li>• The proposed application would obstruct the sunlight and there would be an increase in the noise levels for neighbours.</li> <li>• Currently during the day time the noise levels were loud. Loud screaming could be heard as well as bad language.</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>



- The petitioner urged the Committee to uphold the planning department's advice to refuse the application.
- Mrs Nuttall stated that residents supported Mrs Herrnings petition for refusal.
- The site was already over-developed and that residents were already troubled by the noise from the nursing home. Complaints had been made numerous times about this. The nursing home staff were not cooperative and told residents to take the matter up with Hillingdon Council.
- That in 1988 the then Director of Planning said that the site had reached its maximum development levels.
- The footprint of the site was already too big.
- The resident's basic human rights were in being breached.
- The petitioner also stated that the owner of the nursing home had ignored the planning application.

The agent made the following points:

- The agent stated that they had been instructed on the current application. The previous application had been done by different architects.
- The agents did not understand why it had been necessary to contradict the conservation officer's recommendation which gave approval for this application.
- A lot of the objections had been replied to by the agents directly to the individuals who gave objections.
- This application was for 1 additional bedroom, which would make current residents lives easier and would bring them up to speed with their needs.
- It would provide local needed community care.
- They had received Quality Care Commission Star Award.
- The application was not for commercial gain but to upgrade and meet the standard requirements.
- A 2 bedroom development which was well within requirements was approved, and there was a very large hedge which gave privacy.
- Agents believed that the matter had been blown out of proportion and they hoped that the Planning Committee would overturn the officer recommendation in light of all the correspondence that had been sent.
- They stated that the agents had adhered to all government and Council legislation.

Members sought clarification from the agent on whether the works to the site had already commenced. Officers confirmed that there were no unauthorised extensions as far as they were aware.

Members asked whether the agents could upgrade without planning approval. The agents replied that they could not. That the number of occupants would remain the same, they wished to go from 20 to 21 bedrooms and that it was mixed double and single rooms.

Officers commented that this was a much improved scheme then what was originally submitted, that they were working towards approvals.

	<p>The reasons given for refusal by officers were valid and that the Committee had the final report which containing the facts for the final steps of determining an application.</p> <p>Members were unsure of the reasons for refusal. Officers commented that the site was in a conservation area and was a listed building. There was the visual impact to consider.</p> <p>Members discussed the site and commented that there needed to be a limit to the size of the site.</p> <p>Members also discussed the option of a site visit before reaching any decision as they felt they did not have sufficient information to make a decision. That the officer report did not contain enough information on any potential over-development of the site for them to make a decision.</p> <p>The recommendation for a deferral pending a site visit was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be deferred for a site visit.</b></p>	
216.	<p><b>26 ACRE WAY, NORTHWOOD 67605/APP/2011/358</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Retention of a single storey detached outbuilding to rear</b></p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a personal interest in relation to this item. He remained in the room for this item.</p> <p>Councillor Shirley Harper-O'Neill who was present declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to this item and left the room for the duration of this item.</p> <p>The application site was located on the south east side of Acre Way and comprised a two storey end of terrace house which had not been extended with an outbuilding at the bottom of the rear garden, the subject of this application.</p> <p>The attached house, 28 Acre Way lies to the north east and had an outbuilding at the bottom of the rear garden. To the south west lies 24 Acre Way, a two storey end of terrace property set behind the front wall of the application property. To the rear lies a footpath and driveway of Jupiter Court, a residential apartment block.</p> <p>The street scene was residential in character and appearance, comprising blocks of two storey terraced houses and the application site lies within the developed area, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the retention of an outbuilding at the bottom of the rear garden. The outbuilding was set adjacent to the</p>	<b>Action by</b>

side boundary with 28 Acre Way and along the rear boundary with Jupiter Court, and measure 5m wide, 5m deep and finished with an off-centre ridged roof 2.3m high at eaves level and 3.2m high at its highest point. The outbuilding had a window facing the application property, a door and window facing south west, and a door which opens out onto a footpath associated with Jupiter Court. The structure comprises timber elevations, with UPVC windows and a felt finished roof.

42 adjoining owner/occupiers and the Northwood Hills Residents Association have been consulted. 1 letter of objection and a petition with 26 signatories had been received.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting. There was no petitioner present on behalf of the petition.

A petition was received in support of the proposal by the agent, who was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the agent/petitioner:

- The building was a half complete project as they were told to stop as someone from Juniper Court complained. This was the reason the building looked in the state that it was.
- The agents did not want to continue any further building work in case they were told they could not.
- 2 weeks ago the agent received information of a petition against the application.
- The rear access was not being used.
- The agents wished for clarification on whether they could continue building as the half built project had been left for 2/3 years.
- They were told to stop building by Housing, after commencing works in January 2008 and stopped around 6 months later.
- The agent informed Committee is was a concrete base and timber frame.
- They did not think they would need planning permission as other properties nearby had similar buildings.
- The agent wished to use this building as a storage shed for his tools, he was a carpenter by trade.

Members asked whether the Housing department had been contacted for input and this was a Council Tenant. Officers informed Members that they were aware and that this was not an issue that the Planning Committee needed to discuss for determination of the application.

Officers confirmed that they had received the planning application on February 2011.

Members discussed the planning history in the area and neighbouring property. Officers confirmed that there was no planning history on the neighbouring property and that this would be investigated.

	<p>Members discussed that the size and height of the development was not an issue but that officers were concerned that the visual impact of the development was the issue. Members felt that the visual impact as shown to them in the report was of a half built development. The visual impact of the development could be different once it was completely developed.</p> <p>Members discussed any potential noise disturbance that could be caused if the development was used as a work shop.</p> <p>Members felt that subject to the development being completed with appropriate materials, in a timely manner and the rear car park not being used that the development could be considered an acceptable garden shed or for storage.</p> <p>Officers explained to Members that they could put time conditions on the development, 1 month for clarification, a further month for details on how to prevent rear access; and following these details a further 3 months for completion.</p> <p>Members discussed the policy reasons in regard to this application and believed it was not contrary to policies B13 &amp; 19. Members agreed an outline of conditions and overturn the officer recommendation.</p> <p>The recommendation for overturning the officer recommendation and approving the application was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation overturned and application APPROVED. Details of conditions to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour lead.</b></p>	
217.	<p><b>RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP 10189/APP/2007/3383</b> (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p><b>Redevelopment for residential purposes at density of up to 50 Dwellings per hectare, including affordable housing, live work unites, a community facilities and open space.</b></p> <p>This report seeked approval for a deed of variation to the s106 Agreement attached to the outline planning permission for the redevelopment of the former RAF site for residential purposes. The deed of variation would allow flexibility in providing a more sympathetic pathway to be constructed through the adjoining Highgrove Nature Reserve and outdoor sports facilities.</p> <p>It was also requested that the remainder of the obligation relating to the Nature Reserve be spent in an alternative way to that of hedgerow removal as this hedgerow had already been removed. It was proposed to use these funds to purchase plant and machinery to assist with the maintenance and improvement of the nature reserve and its surrounding area.</p>	Action by

	<p>A further 12 months was sought to enable the Green Spaces team enough time to prepare and install this pathway. In addition, a further amendment to the main agreement was sought in relation to the definition of Outdoor Sports facilities, to enable greater flexibility in the spending of this contribution.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed. The deed of Variation agreed as per the agenda.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report</b></p>	
218.	<p><b>39 WENTWORTH DRIVE, EASTCOTE 7038/APP/2011/946</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey rear extension.</b></p> <p>The application site was located on the south eastern side of Wentworth Drive, a residential area of bungalows and houses. The site, No. 39, was a semi-detached bungalow that was attached to No.37 to the east and a detached bungalow, No. 41, was situated to the west.</p> <p>These bungalows were on slightly raised ground. Nos. 37 and 39 were built as a pair with rear outshoots creating a short 'L' shape, each projecting 1.75m from No. 39 and 0.68m from No.37. Both properties had also extended their properties to fill in the 'L' shape and extended further outwards. The remainder of properties on this side of the road were two storey houses, downhill as the road slopes away to the north, north east. All three bungalows had single storey rear additions of which only limited glimpses were obtained from the front. Limited rear views were gained from a gated private access road serving garages to the rear of this side of Wentworth Drive.</p> <p>The proposal was to erect a flat-roofed single storey extension to the rear. The extension would be stepped so that its smaller projection abuts the adjoining bungalow. The extension would span the entire width of the property, meeting the edges of the existing extensions and projecting out into the garden to a depth of 3.0m before stepping in by 3.21m on the boundary of No. 37 and projecting out again to a further 1.11m for a final width of 4.79m towards the boundary to No. 41. The stepping permits a 45 degree angle of sight from the middle of the patio doors to No. 37. The proposed extension would project out a distance of 2.178m from the back wall of the extension to No. 37.</p> <p>The new extension would replace an earlier extension and add to the floor area, making a total depth from the original bungalow of 6.4m where abutting the side of No. 37 and 7.1m on the side of No. 41. Both the existing and proposed side extensions would project approximately 0.7m above the existing fences. The proposed extension, at its longest, meets the rear building line of the extension to No.41.</p>	<b>Action by</b>

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 petitioners:

- Neighbours had discussed the loss of light that would result if the development was granted planning permission.
- The application was for an extension on an existing extension. This would bring the long extension in line with its neighbour at no.41 and would impact grossly on no.37.
- The 45 degree line of angle that was taken for the line of sight was taken from an incorrect position and did not show the extent of impact the development would have.
- That a planning officer had verbally agreed that the line of sight had been taken in the wrong place and the petitioner was surprised that this point had been washed over in the report.
- A considerable amount of sunlight would be lost to the neighbour's kitchen.
- The lead petitioner had helpful and constructive discussions with the applicant said that they may make another application for this site.

The agent was not present to comment on the application.

Members commented that the agent had not withdrawn the application so the Committee had a decision to make. If granted, this application would be valid for 3 years.

Members asked officers to clarify the 45 degree line of sight and discussed the number of windows. Members discussed overshadowing and accepted that there was an overshadowing issue, and loss of light for the neighbour at no.37.

Members also discussed the issues around extending on an existing extension and whether it was a case of an excessive extension. It was commented that adjoining properties had similar size extensions.

Members felt it would be appropriate to overturn the officer recommendation on the basis of overshadowing, size and bulk of the extension. That it was contrary to policies B20 and B15.

The recommendation for overturning the officer recommendation and refusing the application was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

**Resolved –**

**Recommendation overturned and application REFUSED on the grounds of size, scale and bulk out of character with the existing property and the impact on adjoining occupiers in terms of loss of light and overshadowing. Exact wording to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour lead.**

<p>219.</p>	<p><b>LAND O/S SORTING OFFICE JUNCTION EAST WAY AND PARK WAY, RUISLIP 59076/APP/2011/1406</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Replacement of existing 12.5 metre high monopole mobile phone mast with a 12.5 metre high monopole mobile phone mast, replacement equipment cabinet and ancillary works (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</b></p> <p>It was proposed to replace the existing 12.5m high monopole mobile phone mast with a monopole phone mast of the same height (including antennas), albeit with a thicker profile, incorporating three antennas. The mast would be moved by some 1.5m but still retain a back of footpath location. An existing equipment cabinet would also be replaced with a larger equipment cabinet.</p> <p>The proposed replacement telecommunications mast would have a thicker profile, which would result in the mast having a more conspicuous and intrusive impact upon the street scene as compared to the mast it replaces.</p> <p>This impact would be compounded by the larger replacement equipment cabinet. Furthermore, the search for suitable replacement sites had not been comprehensive. As such, the proposal complies with Policies BE13, BE37 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Polices (September 2007).</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed. This was a telecommunications application and the decision needed to be sent ASAP.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
<p>220.</p>	<p><b>MOUNT VERNON TREATMENT CENTRE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD 3807/APP/2011/1031</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of exhaust flues to north elevation</b></p> <p>This application sought planning permission for the alteration of the existing extract ducting on the Mount Vernon Treatment Centre, located within the Green Belt. The proposal was minor and would not harm the visual amenities of the green belt or the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

221.	<p><b>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>This report provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 31 March 2011 where the Council had received and held funds.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the Members noted the contents of the report.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.51 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.