Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 October 2011

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

	Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne **LBH Officers Present**: James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (North Team Leader) Manmohan Ranger (Principal Highways Engineer) Rory Stracey (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services **Also Present:** Cllr Richard Lewis	
16.	**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** *(Agenda Item 1)* None.	
17.	**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 2)* None.	
18.	**TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 25 AUGUST 2011** *(Agenda Item 3)* Were agreed as a correct record.	
19.	**MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** *(Agenda Item 4)* None.	
20.	**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** *(Agenda Item 5)*	

	All items were considered in Public.	
21.	**39 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 67201/APP/2010/1803** *(Agenda Item 6)* The Chairman explained this item had been withdrawn from the agenda due to the late receipt of revised plans.	**Action by**
22.	**LAND AT 30-32 CHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 13800/APP/2011/1140** *(Agenda Item 7)* At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to amended conditions 6 and 21 and the following additional conditions: 24, 25, 26 and 27 as set out in the Addendum. Members were also provided with a copy of the full appeal decision as part of the Addendum. In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting: The petitioner made the following points: • Many of the signatories objected to the development at 30-32 Chester Road based on the impact of 36-38 - owing to its size and bulk in relation to surrounding properties. • The proposal would have an adverse impact on the essentially Victorian / Edwardian street scene. • If the proposal were approved, the development would house an additional 58 residents plus additional care staff. This would be the largest development on a single residential road in Northwood. • The proposed development would generate unacceptable noise levels from day to day activities at the care home. • The proposed development does not incorporate sufficient parking spaces for staff or visitors. • The proposed development would adversely affect parking locally. Events held at St Johns and St Matthews in Hallowell Road and Emmanuel in Church road already generate substantial traffic levels from play groups, mother / toddler groups, keep fit classes, funerals and other day and evening functions. • Heavy vehicles used by contractors would impede the vehicular movement of local residents. • It was highly likely that visitors would not use public transport when visiting residents and so car parking would be adversely affected. • The proposal will have an adverse effect on the quality of the life of the residents at 28 Chester Road • The plans for the proposed development appeared to be inaccurate as the gap between 28 and 32 had 'disappeared'. • The proposed development does not incorporate dedicated laundry or cooking facilities. Therefore the proposal should not be considered in isolation but with reference to the proposed developments at 34 and 36/38 Chester Road. • A number of the bedrooms within the proposed development do	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger

	not incorporate an en suite facility which contravenes modern care home standards. • The proposed development may adversely affect local drainage. The applicant or agent did not attend the meeting. A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners. The following points were made: • The proposal was out of keeping with the street scene and would fail to harmonise with an area of special character. • The size and scale of the propose development would change the residential density of the road. • The proposed development did not incorporate sufficient car parking spaces. • There was a glut of residential care homes in Northwood already and family homes needed to be protected. • The proposed development was at odds with the aims of "Localism" and if approved would show that the concerns of local people were being ignored. In discussing the application, the Committee focused on the cumulative effect of the proposal (in conjunction with the developments at 34 and 36-38 Chester Road), the comments made by the Planning Inspector and parking issues. Officers informed the Committee that while the planning application was for one unit only, it would be prudent of the Committee to take account the use/s of adjoining properties. With regard to parking issues, the Highways officer confirmed the Planning Inspector had visited that application site and had been guided by the findings of a supplementary Traffic Survey. The Committee expressed concerns about the interaction between the three buildings (30-32, 34 and 36-38 Chester Road) and enquired whether the traffic survey related to anticipated traffic levels at one site or the cumulative effect of all three. In response, the Highways Officer explained it was usual for the modelling to consider similar schemes elsewhere, but in this particular case, the modelling information appeared to relate to the 30-32 Chester Road proposal only and not all three. Members noted the proposed development did not have laundry or cooking facilities and on this basis questioned whether the proposals at 34 and 36-38 Chester Road had sufficient capacity to support those residents residing at 30-32 Chester Road. The Committee expressed concern about how services would be provided between each of the three proposed developments as the current plans did not show dedicated service thoroughfares. As the degree of interaction between the proposed developments remained unclear, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the item until a site visit had taken place and further information had been supplied by officers covering the following points: • Further information on catering and laundry arrangements	

	• Further information on anticipated staff numbers and how these figure might fluctuate a different times of the working day • The maximum number of staff on the proposed development sites (with reference to car parking facilities) • Further clarification about the outcomes of the traffic survey On the balance of the information provided, Members requested officers to arrange a site visit to inform the future decision. On being put to the vote, it was moved and seconded and agreed that a site visit be arranged. **Resolved – That the application be deferred for a site visit and further information as set out above.**	
23.	**HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 9011/APP/2011/1603** *(Agenda Item 8)* The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was agreed. **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.**	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
24.	**HAREFIELD HOSPITAL BOWLING CLUB, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 46815/APP/2010/1826** *(Agenda Item 9)* The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was agreed. **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.**	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
25.	**WILLIAM OLD CENTRE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 67902/APP/2011/1594** *(Agenda Item 10)* At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to amended condition 2 as set out in the Addendum. The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report and Addendum.**	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
26.	**LAND REAR OF NORTHWOOD BOYS CLUB, 54 HALLOWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 67999/APP/2011/2021** *(Agenda Item 11)* At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to photographs of the development site.	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger

	Officers explained that despite substantial efforts to screen the mast, its overall height meant that it would be visible from the street scene. While some concerns were raised about the sighting of the mast near a youth centre, there was general agreement this site would be less harmful than if it had been sited next to a residential property. Officers explained the Committee could refuse planning permission for telecom masts on the grounds of visual amenity but could not refuse an application on health grounds. The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with four votes in favour, one against and two abstentions **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.**	
27.	**LAND ADJACENT TO HALFORDS AND OPPOSITE 777 FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP - 67973/ADV/2011/59** *(Agenda Item 12)* The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.**	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
28.	**LAND OPPOSITE JUNCTION OF QUEENS WALK, VICTORIA ROAD RUISLIP - 67976/ADV/2011/61** *(Agenda Item 13)* The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with six votes in favour and one abstention **Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.**	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
29.	**ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1** *(Agenda Item 14)* None.	**Action by** Meg Hirani & James Rodger
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.20 pm.	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.