

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

17 May 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) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin David Payne Pat Jackson Raymond Graham</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (NorthTeam Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Traffic Engineer) Rory Stracey (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Cllr Michael White Cllr Philip Corthorne Cllr Brian Crowe Cllr John Riley</p>	
2.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Morgan. Councillor Patricia Jackson attended as a substitute.</p>	
3.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
4.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 26 April and 10 May 2012 circulated after the agenda papers had been despatched were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
5.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman agreed to take an additional urgent enforcement item</p>	

	which was considered in Part 2 which was circulated less than 5 days before the meeting.	
6.	<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 Item 14 and an additional urgent item which were considered in Part 2.</p>	
7.	<p><b>150 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE PINNER 25760/APP/2010/2410</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a part three storey, part two storey building with roof space accommodation and basement parking, comprising 11 one-bedroom, 27 two-bedroom and 4 three-bedroom residential flats and a commercial unit on the ground floor fronting Field End Road (involving demolition of the existing building.)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal was completely out of character with the area.</li> <li>• The proposal would not complement the area and was over dominant.</li> <li>• The proposal would result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The proposed mural would be an eyesore to local residents.</li> <li>• The infrastructure of Eastcote would not be able to support the proposed development.</li> <li>• The proposed development would cause local traffic problems.</li> <li>• The proposed underground car park would cause flood problems locally.</li> <li>• The developer should undertake a consultation session with local residents.</li> </ul> <p>Although the application site was not located within the Conservation area (but bordered it on two sides), the Chairman explained he had used his discretion and would allow a representative of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area Advisory Panel to speak for up to 5 minutes.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Advisory Panel representative made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development had been submitted in 2010 and then revised with a further submission in April 2012. Neither application met the required standards.</li> <li>• The RIBA report had denounced this type of development and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

the dwellings it proposed.

- The proposed development was out of character with the Arts and Craft style found in Eastcote.
- The proposed development was 4 stories high rather than the 2 or 3 stories of surrounding buildings.
- The proposed lead roof would be out of keeping with the clay tiles used on surrounding buildings.
- The proposal did not include details about the proposed front gate.
- The residents of Moorford Way were especially concerned about the proposed mural.
- The proposal did not include sufficient amenity or play space.
- The proposed solar panels would create an eye sore.
- There was concern about how the shared driveway would operate.

The representative speaking on behalf of the agent made the following points:

- Considerable resources had been spent protecting the site and the proposed development would deliver a high quality residential scheme.
- The proposed development would bring a number of benefits to the area, including healthcare and education contributions through the S106 unilateral undertaking.
- A number of consultations had been conducted and the application had taken these concerns on board.
- Local residents were not opposed in principle to the redevelopment of the site.
- With regards to amenity concerns, the existing measurements were appropriate.
- In relation to flooding concerns, the Environment Agency had not raised any concerns.
- With regards to floor space, the room dimensions of the proposed development would still provide high quality living arrangements.
- A play area was proposed.
- No highways problems were anticipated with the proposed development.

A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and the following points were raised:

- The bulk and density of the proposed development would have a negative impact on the surrounding area.
- There was insufficient amenity space.
- The proposed development would affect the appearance of the street scene.
- The lead roof incorporated in the proposed design would be out of keeping with the clay tiles used on surrounding buildings.
- The lack of provision to dry clothing, necessitating the use of tumble dryers would increase the carbon footprint of the proposed development.
- The proposed design meant there would be a lack of privacy to a number of dwellings within the scheme.

- Concern was raised about refuse collection arrangements and whether these might have a detrimental impact to local roads.
- The proposed mural (should the application be approved) should not be delegated to officers and should be determined in public at Committee.
- Concern was raised about the shared driveway incorporated within the proposal and how this would operate.
- The proposal would generate overflow parking and concerns were raised about where these vehicles would park.

The Committee sought clarification on a number of points including the lead roof and proposed roof garden. The representative of the agent confirmed it was possible the proposed roof could be clay tiled and officers confirmed that no roof garden was planned. In relation to amenity space, officers confirmed that the proposed development met the current standards.

In response to a question about how many of the proposed dwellings complied with the floor space requirements of the London Plan, officers confirmed that 30 out of 48 dwellings did not comply with this guidance.

In discussing the application, the Committee agreed they could see very little difference between this application and the previous one which had been submitted to the Council and they also had concerns about the number of conditions which would need to be resolved outside the meeting (should the application be approved). Officers explained that although there were a number of conditions which needed to be resolved, this was not an excessive number of conditions for the size of the application.

The Committee also raised concerns about the dedicated pedestrian access shown on the plans and about the likely impact the development would have on peak time traffic flows. In response, officers confirmed that the pedestrian access routes would include a raised pavement and having examined traffic flows, officers did not have concerns about people waiting on the highway for access or egress to the proposed development.

The Committee agreed that officer recommendation for approval should be overturned and the application be refused owing to the size, scale and bulk of the development as well as the unit size failing to comply with the standards as set out in the London Plan.

It was moved and seconded that the recommendation for approval be overturned and the application refused.

**Resolved –**

**That the recommendation be overturned and application REFUSED on the grounds of the size, scale, bulk etc of the building and its impact on the conservation area, the internal size of the proposed units and the lack of a S106 agreement. Exact wording to be agreed with the Chairman and**

	<b>Labour lead.</b>	
8.	<p><b>LYON COURT AND 28 - 30 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 66985/APP/2011/3049</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of 3, part 2, part 3 storey blocks with accommodation in the roof space, to provide 61 residential units, comprising 25 one bedroom, 27 two bedroom, 8 three bedroom apartments and one 5 bedroom house, together with construction of a new access, associated parking and landscaping, involving demolition of existing buildings and stopping up of existing vehicular access.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In introducing the report, Officers confirmed that the proposed development was fully HDAS compliant and the scheme fulfilled the 10% development mix as directed by the London Plan.</p> <p>In response to questions about access and egress to the development, officers confirmed that two cars could be accommodated off the highway while the electronic gates were operating. If the gates failed, the Committee heard that these would need to be forced open.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that an independent viability study had been conducted as part of the proposal and this stated a payment of £40,000 would be made towards the provision of affordable housing within the borough.</p> <p>Members expressed concern about access and egress to the site given this was located on a primary route for heavy goods vehicles across the Borough. Members also expressed concern about the level of education contributions as part of the scheme.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be deferred for amendments relating to the removal of the proposed gates, amendments to or removal of the proposed house and a site visit.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
9.	<p><b>ST MARTINS SCHOOL , MOOR PARK ROAD, NORTHWOOD 664/APP/2012/223</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey front extension</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition in objection received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>A representative of the petition did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed reception area was designed to improve the school reception facilities and was not about increasing school</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed reception would not result in the loss of any car parking spaces but there would be a loss of car parking spaces during the construction phase.</li> <li>• It was proposed that (subject to approval) the Head Teacher would write to all parents and staff requesting they park considerately during the construction phase.</li> </ul> <p>No Ward Councillors attended.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed the proposed development would enhance the appearance and facilities of the school.</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 per the officer report.</b></p>	
10.	<p><b>11 BRIDGWATER ROAD, RUISLIP 45285/APP/2012/600</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use a hobby room (Retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which concerned an application for a single storey detached out building to be used as a hobby room.</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>• The proposed development incorporates a shower room which is out of keeping with its proposed usage as a hobby room.</li> <li>• The proposed development would be over dominant due to its size, scale and bulk.</li> <li>• The proposed development would overcrowd the garden</li> <li>• The proposed development (if approved) would set a dangerous precedent.</li> <li>• The proposed development would be out of keeping with the back gardens of the surrounding area.</li> <li>• The proposed development would affect the privacy to neighbouring properties.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar developments had been approved locally.</li> <li>• Washing facilities were required as the hobby room would be used for exercise equipment.</li> <li>• The applicant had liaised with the Council and an officer had inspected the proposal during the construction phase but there</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>had been no challenge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant was prepared to raise the height of his fence line to address neighbours concerns regarding overlooking.</li> <li>• The proposed development would not affect the character of the area.</li> </ul> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the existing building was over dominant, too large for the garden and did not require washing facilities as a hobby room.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the officer’s report</b></p>	
11.	<p><b>206 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE 14770/APP/2012/50</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</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><b>Deferred from North Committee 13/03/2012</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the officer report and the changes set out in the addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
12.	<p><b>LYNTON, BELFRY AVENUE, HAREFIELD 17663/APP/2012/368</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>2 x two storey, 4-bed, detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving the demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings</b></p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed the proposal would encroach into the Green Belt and would therefore constitute inappropriate development.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be refused as per the officer report</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
13.	<p><b>17 EAMONT CLOSE, RUISLIP 68141/APP/2011/2587</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

	<p><b>Single storey rear extension</b></p> <p>Officer's introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a ward Councillor was invited to address the meeting. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The proposed extension would impact on the patio areas of adjoining properties.</li> <li>• Officers were asked whether a shadow diagram had been produced for the application.</li> </ul> <p>Officers explained that the as proposed development met all the HDAS criteria (and HDAS took right to light into consideration) a shadow diagram was not required.</p> <p>Referring to the photographs of neighbouring properties, the Committee agreed that a canopy structure situated next door to the application site already had an impact and the application should be approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>The application was unanimously approved as per the officer report.</b></p>	<p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p><b>PEMBROKE HOUSE, 5 - 9 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 38324/APP/2012/42 (Agenda Item 13)</b></p> <p><b>Change of use of ground and first floor from Use Class B1 (Business) to Use Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) for use as a nursery</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which concerned a change of use of the ground floor and first floor from class B1 to D1.</p> <p>Officers explained that they had examined traffic flows, parking and dropping off points in detail and the applicant had submitted a travel plan as part of their application.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee raised a number of concerns. These included parking and traffic movements, given the application site was located opposite a bus station, the anticipated use of the upper floors and also the hours of use which were cited as 7 am to 8 pm.</p> <p>As there were a number of unresolved questions at this stage, the Committee agreed to defer the item until further information had been provided and a site visit had taken place.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>



	<p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be deferred to resolve issues relating to parking and highway safety, the use of the upper floors, the hours of use and a site visit.</b></p>	
15.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</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 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><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Helen Taylor</p>
16.	<p><b>URGENT MATTER - ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item</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><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Helen Taylor</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 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 9.45 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.