

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 April 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 John Morgan David Payne Pat Jackson Brian Stead</p>
	<p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Sarah White and Nav Johal</p>
151.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Michael Markham and Councillor Carol Melvin. Councillor Pat Jackson and Councillor Brian Stead were in attendance as substitutes.</p>
152.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a personal interest in regard to item 7, Mountwood Healthcare Properties, Mountwood Surgery, as it was his personal doctor surgery. Councillor Morgan remained in the room for the duration of this item.</p>
153.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 13 MARCH 2012 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>These were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>
154.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
155.	<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. Item 9 was a part 2 item and therefore considered in private.</p>

156. **135 SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM 380/APP/2012/250** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Part single storey part two storey rear extension; single storey front extension and entrance porches plus raising of roof incorporating front/rear dormers and rooflights and alterations to elevations to allow for conversion of existing dwelling to 2 x two storey with habitable roofspace, 6-bed semi-detached dwelling houses with associated amenity space and parking.

The proposed scheme had been assessed against the relevant Council policies and the London Plan and it was considered that the proposed increase in size, scale and bulk of the original building would unduly detract from the character of the street scene and its surroundings. In addition, the proposed on-site parking layout was inadequate and was likely to raise issues of general highway safety. For these reasons, the proposal was recommended for refusal.

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 Ian Philips spoke on behaviour of the petitioners:

- The application was on a prominent site on Swakeleys Road.
- The context for development was mainly a 2 storey family style dwelling.
- It was a mature property and situated back from the road.
- The application was on a rat-run, busy road, with 2 schools in the area.
- Traffic management and parking issues were highly relevant to this application.
- Residents in the area were aware that the site required development and asked that the application was in-keep with the street scene.
- The view from the neighbouring property was a concern.
- The petitioners felt that a family detached house would suit the area.
- The height of the roof was a concern and the profile needed to be sympathetic to neighbours.
- Most of the buildings in the area were 2 storeys but this application was for a 3 storey application.
- There was an issue with the bulk and mass, in particular the roof lines. This made the building seem intrusive.
- Petitioners felt that the proposal did not meet planning criteria, therefore objected to the application.
- Petitioners were happy to assist in the development and would be happy with an application that met planning criteria.

Mr Chris Barrett on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Barrett was not aware this application was going to Committee until the day before.
- He believed the application would be considered at the North Planning Committee on 26 April 2012, as this was the advice he received from the Planning Officer.
- The applicant stated that this application was almost identical to another application which had been approved.
- He had been working with the Council and architect to sympathise the

application to something that was acceptable.

- Mr Barrett asked for a deferral in order for plans that he was currently working on to be made available.
- He believed he could accommodate the requested changes and a meeting for new drawings had been scheduled.
- He had consulted with neighbours and would continue to do so, in order to submit an application which they would be happy with.
- The applicant was not prepared for the meeting as he believed the application was not ready for Committee.
- Mr Barrett would be amending the application and asked the Committee to defer the item to give him the opportunity to do so.

Officers clarified that information had not been passed to the applicant to say this application was being deferred. That the option of deferral was open for the Committee to discuss and consider. That if minor amendments were to be made than it could be acceptable but as considerable amendments were required to this application, officers would not recommend a deferral. This application would involve re-consultation with residents and would not be ready for the next North Planning Committee. Officers confirmed that were there were substantial changes to an application then it was usually the officer view that a new application be submitted.

Members discussed the application and felt that it should not be deferred. That the issues with the side elevation was not going to be resolvable by a small change to the application. The rear extension was also huge and looked like a new building rather than an extension.

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.

157. **MOUNTWOOD HEALTHCARE PROPERTIES, MOUNTWOOD SURGERY, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD 3807/APP/2012/100** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Installation of 2 x flood lights mounted on lamp posts.

This application sought planning permission for the installation of 2 flood lights mounted on lamp posts to be situated projecting onto a car park. The flood lights would provide additional light to the Mountwood Surgery car park. The proposal would not cause any detrimental harm to residential amenity nor would there be a public or highway safety risk. The proposal was minor and would not harm the visual amenities of the green belt or the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It was therefore recommended for approval.

Members confirmed the lighting was for security purposes and would have no impact on any adjoining properties; the lights would be facing away from the nearby buildings.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put

to the vote was agreed by a majority of 6 to 0, Councillor Morgan abstained from voting.

Resolved –

That the application be approved as per the agenda.

158. **150 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 698/APP/2011/2951** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change of use of dwelling house to a Nursery School (D1), including single storey side and rear extensions, two storey front extension, canopy to front, side and rear, alterations to the elevations and relocation of pedestrian and vehicular accesses, retention of a one bed staff flat at first floor level, involving demolition works.

The application sought planning permission for a change of use from the existing dwelling house to a Nursery School including front side and rear extension. The application was a revision on a previous refused scheme (698/APP/2010/1947) which was refused on three grounds; loss of a residential unit; highways issues and design.

An appeal to the Planning Inspectorate was dismissed on design grounds only. The Inspector considered that both the highway safety, parking and the loss of residential were acceptable in this instance.

The current application was similar to the previous submission with the exception of the front extension. This front element now appeared traditional in design and would blend in with the existing property and surrounding street scene. It would therefore comply with policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of UDP.

Given the Inspectorate's decision, both the highway concerns and the loss of residential unit would now be acceptable. As such the application now overcame the previous reasons for refusal and was recommended for approval. A unilateral undertaking had been agreed with the applicant which covered highway safety measures.

Members discussed the possible problems that may arise with regard to parking. Officers confirmed that 1 parking space would be available for staff and the rest of staff would have to park on the nearby road. Members were familiar with the area and felt that there would be parking problems; because of the Inspectorate decision Members felt that they had no choice but to approve on application.

Members and officers discussed the option of including an extra condition with regard to the Green Travel Plan.

Members stated that the application would increase the number of nursery places available and this was positive.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority of 5 to 2. Councillors' Morgan and Dhillon voted against approval of the application.

	<p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum, and additional Green Travel Plan condition.</p>
159.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 9</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. Councillor Kaufmann abstained.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>1. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purpose of informing future complainants that no further action will be taken in respect of the advertising outlined in the report, and the exact wording to be agreed under delegated authority.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.55 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.