

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

13 March 2012

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Brian Stead Tim Barker</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning) Matthew Duigan (Central and South Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Traffic Engineer) Sarah White (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillors Allan Kauffman and Shirley Harper O'Neil.</p>	
136.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillors Allan Kauffman and Michael Markham with Councillors Brian Stead and Tim Barker acting as substitutes.</p>	
137.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
138.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 21 February 2012 were agreed as accurate record subject to amending paragraph 3 on page 8 of the agenda by adding the word 'the' between that and argument.</p>	
139.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	

140.	<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>All items were considered in Part 1 with the exception of Items 13, 14 and 15 which were considered in private.</p>	
141.	<p><b>48 PINN WAY, RUISLIP - 17220/APP/2011/2804</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey part first floor rear extension, part single storey rear/side extension, single storey side extension (repositioning utility), installation of additional windows to side elevations, involving demolition of (1) existing conservatory to rear, (2) existing attached garage to side and (3) existing lean-to utility to side</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and in doing so, the Head of Planning requested the sentence <i>'The proposed two storey element of the proposals and the amount of roof are considered to fit well with the rear 'back-scape of the properties'</i>, paragraph 4 on page 18 of the report to be removed.</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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extending beyond permitted development was not within keeping of the character of the house or others of the same style within the road.</li> <li>• The proposed development would not be in keeping with other properties in the road.</li> <li>• The proposed development was too bulky.</li> </ul> <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant had taken and followed the advice provided by the Planning Department.</li> <li>• The proposed development would blend in with the current street scene and harmonise with an area of special local character.</li> <li>• The petition received in objection to the proposal was not representative of the local area.</li> </ul> <p>Officers clarified that the main reason for the recommendation of refusal was because officers were of the view that the development would be detrimental to existing building and not be in keeping with an area of special character.</p> <p>In response to a query about the shadow diagrams, officers explained that the proposed development would not detrimentally affect right to light and it was the officer view that this reason could not be defended on appeal.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused with six votes in favour, with one against.</b></p>	
142.	<p><b>111 PARKFIELD CRESCENT, RUISLIP - 68057/APP/2011/2934</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p><b>Erection of a 2-bedroom attached house with associated amenity space and parking (Part retrospective application)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum.</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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parkfield Crescent predominantly consisted of 2 and 3 bedroom semi-detached properties. The proposed application would turn 111 Parkfield Crescent into a terraced home which would be out of character with the current street scene and would result in the end house looking far too small and unsightly.</li> <li>• The proposed development would set a dangerous precedent for the road if it were approved.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in place an undue pressure on the number of localised parking places and impede resident’s ability to park safely.</li> <li>• The proposed development would create a parking pressure in the evening and at the weekends.</li> <li>• The proposed development would affect the privacy of local residents.</li> </ul> <p>The agent / applicant did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>Two Ward Councillors made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development was contrary to BE 13 (street scent), BE 19 (character of the local area), BE 20 (daylight and sunlight considerations) and BE 23 (provision of amenity space).</li> <li>• The developer had shown a disregard for the local area and had damaged fences and walls.</li> <li>• The developer had removed hedges and bushes which had resulted in a loss of privacy to local residents.</li> <li>• The Committee were urged to refuse the application.</li> </ul> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that attempting to squeeze further development onto the site would be a mistake and would be detrimental to the street scene and would fail to enhance the appearance of the local area.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p>put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	
143.	<p><b>206 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 14770/APP/2012/50</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaway) involving installation of extractor duct to rear</b></p> <p>The application was withdrawn by the Head of Planning.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>
144.	<p><b>HAREFIELD HOSPITAL BOWLING CLUB, TAYLORS MEADOW, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 46815/APP/2011/3095</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 2 x temporary portakabins for use as changing rooms involving demolition of existing outbuildings</b></p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that outdoor leisure activities were important and recreational uses of the Green Belt should be supported.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>
145.	<p><b>82 CATLINS LANE, PINNER - 63932/APP/2011/2781</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension with 1 rooflight involving demolition of existing garage to side</b></p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. In discussing the application, the Committee noted that the scheme was subordinate to the existing dwelling.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>
146.	<p><b>89 JOEL STREET NORTHWOOD - 45536/APP/2011/3058</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to a disability vehicles shop (Sui Generis)</b></p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. In discussing the change of use</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p>application, Officers clarified that an error had been made and the application site was located in Northwood ward and not Northwood Hills as cited in the report.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report and changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	
147.	<p><b>53 STANLEY ROAD NORTHWOOD - 44765/APP/2011/2983</b> <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p><b>Single storey side/rear extension involving demolition of existing side extension</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer’s report</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>
148.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

	<p><i>the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	
149.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 14)</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p> <p>This item was deferred to enable officers to check and clarify the measurements cited in the officer report.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the item be deferred to a future committee meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>
150.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 15)</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Matthew Duigan</p>

	<p><i>which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></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 Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.