

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

10 January 2012

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne</p>
	<p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Sarah White and Nav Johal</p>
103.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
104.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
105.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING - 6 DECEMBER 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>These were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>
106.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
107.	<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. There were no part 2 items to consider.</p>
108.	<p>LAND AT WILLOW FARM, JACKETS LANE, HAREFIELD - 57685/APP/2011/1450 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Permanent use of the land as gypsy and traveller caravan site.</p>

This application sought permanent planning permission for the use of the site as a gypsy and traveller caravan site which had previously been granted twice at appeal, on a temporary basis.

The application site comprises a 0.25ha triangular shaped field located on the southern side of Jackets Lane, approximately 700m to the south east of its junction with Northwood Road. It was located within open countryside which formed part of the Green Belt and a Countryside Conservation Area and also lies adjacent to a Nature Conservation Site of Metropolitan or Borough Grade 1 Importance.

The two previous Inspectors did not consider that this site was suitable for a permanent gypsy and traveller caravan site, the harm to the character and appearance of the Green Belt and Countryside Conservation Area being too great. They had only been prepared to grant temporary permission, mainly due to the compelling personal circumstances of the applicant and his family. The previous Inspectors were also concerned about the Local Planning Authority's lack of assessment of traveller's needs within the UDP and no alternative site's being available in the vicinity. A temporary permission would enable the Local Planning Authority to progress the LDF and for site-specific allocations to be made.

Although the personal circumstances of the applicant and, to a more limited extent his family, were still valid and there are still no alternative sites available, in considering the previous application, the last Inspector considered that the matter was finely balanced so that a 4 year temporary permission was considered acceptable so that at least the harm to the Green Belt could be restricted by limiting the duration of the use, in which time it was hoped the LDF could be progressed. The LDF has been progressed but not to the extent that specific sites have been allocated (if required). To allow a further period would be to extend the duration of the harm so that it is considered that on balance, the other factors, including the personal circumstances of the applicant and his family would no longer justify a further extension of time with a continuation of the harm.

Furthermore, although this application was described as being for the permanent use of the land as a gypsy and traveller caravan site and no operational development was described, the submitted plan did not accurately shown existing caravans/mobile homes/ buildings on site. The agent had been advised of the apparent discrepancies and requested to clarify precisely what was being sought but to date, no such clarification had been forthcoming. As such, the Local Planning Authority could not be certain of the full extent and impacts of the works being proposed. Nonetheless, it was clearly evident that the real harm of the proposals was greater than the submitted plans indicate with respect to the Green Belt and landscape of the Countryside Conservation Area.

The Environment Agency also objected to the absence of an assessment dealing with pollution risks of foul drainage. The scheme also fails to demonstrate that it will contribute towards sustainable development. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

15 responses objecting to the proposal had been received, together with a petition with 64 signatories. 2 responses in support had also 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. Petitioners were not present and therefore did not address the Committee.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Joseph Jones stated that the 2 previous applications had been overturned. The Planning Inspectorate had granted planning permission.
- Since the last appeal very little had changed.
- Very special circumstances had been put forward and if the Council refused permission then they would be morally wrong.
- If there was a need for amendments then these could be dealt with by further conditions.
- If further information was required the agent asked that the decision be deferred.
- The agent also stated that the Human Rights Act was engaged and needed to be considered by the Committee when making their decision.
- Mr Alan Masters also spoke on behalf of the applicant.
- Mr Masters pointed out what he felt were clear fundamental mistakes in the officer report.
- The applicant, Mr Cox, had given full plans 3 or 4 weeks ago to the planning department and these had not been included in the report.
- There were several discrepancies in the report which were not clear.
- The site could not be looked at in isolation as the family breed horses on the site.
- He pointed out the Race Relations Act in regard to the comments made in the report by residents in objection to the application.
- There were personal and medical circumstances to consider.

Members asked officers for comments regarding the amended plans the agent spoke about. Officers replied that they wrote to the agent/applicant on 8th November 2011 and to their knowledge had not received anything from the applicant. Officers had spoken to the relevant planning officer who said no further plans had been submitted.

Members asked officers about horse breeding on the site. Officers had sought clarification from the agent in an email to ask what exactly the use of the site was. This information had not yet been provided.

Officers stated that the previous appeal inspectorate took into consideration all aspects and concluded that it was not suitable for a permanent application.

The Council's Legal Officer advised that the inclusion of comments from objectors in the officer report was standard Council practice. In any case, the planning file would details these comments and this was available for public inspection.

Members discussed the options available to them and they felt that they needed further information before they could consider this application for

determination.

The recommendation for deferral was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred for officers to obtain correct plans and further information on uses.

109. **OAKWOOD, CATLINS LANE, PINNER - 67139/APP/2011/2005** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Part two storey, part single storey rear/side extension and single storey detached garage to side/rear involving demolition of existing detached garage to side.

The application property was a distinctive, two storey, detached dwelling situated on the western side of Catlins Lane. The property dates from 1904, was locally listed and within the Eastcote Village Conservation Area.

To the rear, the two storey elements of the building were broadly "L" shaped with a two storey element extending out to the rear at the northern end of the building, adjacent to an existing garage and outbuildings that were set behind the rear elevation. A large single storey (original) conservatory structure occupied the area to the south of this return, extending to the same depth.

The building was located opposite St Catherine's Farm which is a Grade II Listed Building. The streetscene was verdant and semi-rural in nature. It was primarily residential with large two storey individually designed houses, generally set in large plots, with the buildings set well back from the road.

The application was for the erection of a two storey side extension to the southern side of the building, a rear extension and a replacement garage. The plans had been amended from that originally submitted, principally resulting in changes to the proposed siting of the garage, alterations to the extent of the patio/terrace area at the rear and alterations to the proposed landscaping at the front of the property.

The two storey side extension would be 3.425m wide and set back from the main front elevation of the house by 1m. It would extend beyond the rear elevation of the two storey element to which it was attached by 4.8m. This would be 1.2m beyond the existing conservatory, and broadly in line with the rear elevation of Westcott that lies to the south. A 1m gap would be retained to the boundary with Westcott. No windows were proposed in the flank elevation and external materials would be to match the existing house.

To the rear of the house a two storey extension was proposed at its northern side, closest to the garage. This element would be 3.5m in depth, with the width reflecting that of the gable above. The extension would continue

the existing roof form, extending out further from the house than that existing. The extension would be finished in a smooth render, as would the whole of the house. There would be no windows in the northern flank wall.

The gap created by the two storey extensions either side at the rear would be infilled with a single storey rear extension, extending to the same depth as the southern most two storey extension adjacent to Westcott.

The existing garage would be removed and replaced with a larger garage that would be 6m deep and 3.7m wide. It would feature a hipped roof with front and rear gables, with a ridge height of 3.3m. Land levels drop to the rear of the garage and within the rear garden.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting:

- Mrs Leach addressed the Committee on behalf of the petition submitted to the Council.
- She was not objecting to the whole development but six points on the application that was submitted.
- The proposed side extension would give the appearance of a terrace as it would close the gap between the houses.
- The application was out of keep with the houses in the area and the Conservation Area.
- The 2-storey extension proposed did not comply with Council legislation.
- The proposed extension was too wide and with within the 1 metre minimum requirement as was suggested in the officer report.
- The proposal to trees would impact by loss of light and have an impact on drainage. This issue needed to be looked at with a condition on the application.
- The application would be over dominant and result in a loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.
- The patio would be raised and result in overlooking, which was against policy.
- That should any work be carried out there should be a condition imposed to protect the front garden, front wall and front path.
- Aesthetically there was an architectural imbalance in the proposed application.
- The residents association had echoed the views of the residents and those 118 that signed the petition.
- The petitioner asked the Committee to refuse the application that was submitted.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mrs Parmjit Lalli spoke on behalf of the application.
- She stated that it was important to the owners that any extension was in-keep with the character of Oakwood.
- The applicant was keen to work with the Conservation officer who had advised significant changes to the application and her client had accepted these. Changes had been made which included a reduction of a bedroom.
- The client was surprised that a petition had been submitted in objection to the application. The agent stated that the majority of

those that signed the petition lived outside the local area.

- That none of the neighbours had raised objections directly to them.
- Neighbouring properties had extensions.
- The 1metre was within planning guidelines.
- The proposal would enhance the conversion area.
- The applicants had brought the property and wished to keep it to look the way it did and to update the property.
- The agent asked the Committee to support the application and grant planning permission.

Members asked officers for clarification on the patio height and boundary distance. Officers confirmed that the proposed patio would include an increase of about a foot. Officers confirmed that there would be a 1 metre gap between properties on the assumption the boundary line was as per the report and plans. If that was not the boundary line then it would be less than 1 metre and therefore non-compliant. Members wished for officers to clarify this distance.

Members felt the dominance of a 2-storey side extension was a key issue and proposed a site visit. Members were concerned that there maybe a terracing effect.

The recommendation for deferral was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be deferred for a site visit.

110. **HIGHWAYS LAND AT ROUNDABOUT, JUNCTION OFF PARK AVENUE AND KINGS COLLEGE ROAD, RUISLIP - 61954/APP/2011/2925** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Installation of a 14.8m high telecommunications monopole, associated equipment cabinet and ancillary developments works (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)

This application had been submitted by Vodaphone and 02 Orange and sought to determine whether prior approval was required for the siting and design of a 14.8m high monopole supporting 3 number Vodaphone antennas and 3 number 02 antennas, the installation of an associated radio equipment cabinet and ancillary development works.

The proposed installations would be located in the centre of a roundabout nestled between 6 existing trees. To the north west and north east of the site are a series of detached and semi-detached houses, to the south of the site is King College Playing Fields containing the Kings College Pavilion and the Eastcote Hockey & Badminton Club and their respective car parks. The site and its immediate surroundings had a verdant quality to it, was populated with trees, and was generally free of an excess of street furniture that can give rise to a sense of clutter within the streetscape.

The installation of the telecommunication mast and associated cabinet would have an adverse impact upon the visual amenity value gained from the trees located within the roundabout, be detrimental to the general streetscene and to the setting of the high quality public open spaces located to the south of the site that is designated as forming part of a Green Chain link.

The applicant had failed to demonstrate that the trees will be unaffected by the development and had not made provision for their long-term protection. As such, refusal, was recommended on these grounds.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting:

- Mr John Scrivens addressed the Committee on behalf of the petition submitted against the application.
- In 2006 Mr Scrivens had spoken in regard to a phone mast application that was submitted by Orange.
- He was surprised a Vodafone application had been submitted since.
- The phone mast would be visually intrusive.
- The health effects needed to be considered.
- The landscaping trees officer objected to the application as it would result in some of the tree roots being destroyed and trees dying. This, in-turn, would mean that the phone mast would not be hidden.
- The mature trees had wide trunks and these would be difficult to replace.
- The petitioner stated that Vodafone sold a 'sure signal' device on their website which was box around the size of a modem. This device helped to get good signal and cost around £50. This was something that could be looked into.
- He stated that as all mobile phone companies used similar technology that this in-turn should reduce the need for phone masts.
- Resident views should be considered rather than occasional users who drove past the area.
- There was a genuine depth of feelings against this application.

The agent was not present and therefore did not address the Committee.

Members felt that this application set an incredibly bad precedent, that it was on the approach to a roundabout and agreed with the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.

111. **THE HALLMARKS, 146 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 3016/APP/2010/2159** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change use from Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) to

Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) for use as a Education Institute.

Planning permission was sought for the change of use of a 3 storey office building to an educational training centre with associated parking. No external alterations were proposed and the use has already commenced.

The application failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not harm highway and pedestrian safety and would provide sufficient amenities for wheelchair users.

Members asked officers for clarification on whether attempts had been made to ask the applicant to clarify the outstanding points required by planning. Officers confirmed that several attempts had been made but further information had not been provided.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda.

112. **LAND AT JUNCTION OF FIELD END ROAD, HIGH ROAD, PINNER - 59310/APP/2010/2005** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Replacement of the existing O2, 17.5m high streetworks pole with a 17.5m high streetworks pole, complete with three dual user antennas within a shroud, an associated radio equipment cabinet and development ancillary.

DEFERRED ON 11th January 2011 FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

The proposed replacement 17.5m mast and cabinet installation was considered to be visually acceptable in this location which utilises an existing telecoms site. In addition officers had been unable to suggest any more appropriate alternative sites. It was considered that the proposal is consistent with advice in Policy BE37 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 and, as such, approval is recommended.

It was proposed to replace the existing 17.5m high monopole mobile phone mast, which currently served O2, with a new 17.5m high monopole mobile phone mast (including antennas) incorporating three antennas, to serve both O2 and Vodafone. An additional 1.58m x 0.38m x 1.4m high equipment cabinet, to be located adjacent to the existing cabinets, was proposed. The mast would be coloured grey and the equipment cabinet would be coloured green.

Members spoke about the Residents' and Environment Services Policy Overview Committee review on phone masts. As it stood there was nothing the Council could do to change this kind of application.

This application was for an existing phone mast to be replaced. Members questioned whether it was premature at this stage to grant this application

permission considering other devices and technology available to phone companies.

The area around being a conservation area was discussed by Members and that the application was near a double mini roundabout. Concern was expressed with regard to large vehicles usage and safety of the local residents using the particular section of the pavement where the proposal was. Officers confirmed that there would be no reduction in the footpath that existed.

Members asked highways officers about the location of the cabinet, and whether it was satisfactory. Members and officers discussed the location of the cabinet and whether the size/width was appropriate, including when the doors of the cabinet were open.

Members also discussed where service vehicles would park and whether this would affect pedestrians. Officers commented that service vehicles would park as close to the cabinet as possible and that should not differ to what the situation was with the existing phone mast and cabinet. There should be temporary traffic measures in place to allow pedestrians to pass when the cabinet was being serviced if the footpath was to be blocked.

Members discussed the previous appeal that went to the planning inspectorate and it was stated that the highways objections were unacceptable. It was felt that Members hands were tied with this application as it was a replacement to an existing cabinet and phone mast. If it was a new application they could have more objections against the application.

Members felt they did not really have an option but to grant permission for the application as it was a replacement for an existing phone mast.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority of 6 in favour and 1 against. Councillor Payne voted against the recommendation.

Resolved –

That the application be approved as per the agenda.

113. **FOOTWAY ADJACENT TO AUTOCENTRE NORTHWOOD, PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 67084/APP/2011/2897** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Installation of a 15m high telecommunications pole, associated equipment cabinet and ancillary developments works (Consultation Under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)

This application had been submitted by Vodaphone and 02 Orange and sought to determine whether prior approval was required for the siting and design of a 15m high monopole supporting 3 number Vodaphone antennas and 3 number 02 antennas, the installation of an associated radio equipment cabinet and ancillary development works.

The proposed installations would be located at the back of the

	<p>pavement in close proximity to a zebra crossing. The land behind the site was occupied by advertising hoardings located adjacent to the railway embankment. Due to its height, position, design and appearance together with the existence of a large number of other structures within close proximity of the proposed mast the proposal was considered to have a detrimental visual impact. As such, refusal, was recommended.</p> <p>Officers noted that the coverage diagrams did not present a strong case as there was coverage in the area and it was not a black spot.</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 as per the agenda.</p>
114.	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - UP TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>This report provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the North Planning Committee area up to 30 September 2011 where the Council had received and held funds.</p> <p>Resolved – That the Members noted the contents of the report.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.25 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.