

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

30 August 2012

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Raymond Graham</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Matt Duigan, Planning Services Manager Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts and Planning Information Manager Manmohan Ranger, Highways Engineer Anne Gerzone – Legal Officer Nadia Williams, Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Michael White</p>	
77.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
78.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor David Payne declared a Non Pecuniary interest in Items 7, 8, 9, & 10 – Former RAF Eastcote, Lime Grove, Ruislip, by virtue of having been involved as a Ward Councillor and Item 13 – Woody Bay Station, Ruislip Lido Railway, Reservoir Road, Ruislip; as he was a member of the Ruislip Woods Management Advisory Group. He left the room and did not take part in the decision of these items.</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a Non Pecuniary interest in Item 13 - Woody Bay Station, Ruislip Lido Railway, Reservoir Road, Ruislip, as he was a member of the Ruislip Woods Management Advisory Group. He left the room and did not take part in the decision of this item.</p>	
79.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 8 AUGUST 2012 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 8 August 2012 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	

80.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There had been no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>	
81.	<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>It was confirmed that all business marked Part 1 would be heard in public and all items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>	
82.	<p>32 EAST MEAD, RUISLIP - 68276/APP/2012/1240 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 1 bed self contained flats to include part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey extension to side to create 2 x 1-bed self contained flats, with associated parking and amenity space and installation of a vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes in the Addendum (circulated at the meeting) and to note the correct plan, as the incorrect plan had been attached to the plan pack.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitions received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would be detrimental to the character of the street • The street was an established family street and objected to a family home being demolished and replaced with flats • Would have no objection to the development of a family home • The proposed development would be opposite St Swithun Wells school, and with Queensmead school near by, would result in increased traffic congestion • The plans showed no access from the boundary gardens serving the first floor flats which would give rise to security issues • Future occupiers would be required to walk down unlit access road, which had not been designated or intended as a public foot path • Concerned about the return of crime and disorder which residents had experienced prior to the security gates being installed • Urged the Committee not to grant permission for the proposed development, as future occupiers would not be able to access their rear gardens • No provision had been made to access amenity spaces 	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

- Residents were concerned about the total misuse of access road
- Suggested that the application submitted was a backland proposal.

A Member commented that the security gates had been installed as part of a gating scheme which had been funded through the Chrysalis Programme.

The agent addressed the meeting and raised the following points:

- Agreed with the officer's recommendation of approval
- The plans had been amended to consider neighbours objections
- Was aware of the security issues there had been regarding access to rear parking and was the first to venture through the access gates in 2003
- Suggested that future occupiers would equally be concerned about security around access, which was why the gates would be closed at all times
- The access road on the side was owned by the application property
- The three terraced benefited from the access road and were owned by the property
- The access road was currently not a used road and would therefore benefit from being used and from having security lighting
- The scheme complied fully with all the policies and guidelines; was symmetrical in appearance and would not look out of place in a terrace of 4 houses
- The proposed development had been amended to maintain on-street parking spaces as was currently the case
- Parking (which exceeds space standards) would also be maintained for future use for the school
- Existing hedge would be maintained and award winning contractors would ensure that due care was taken during construction and would be instructed to ensure that access road was kept unblocked
- The scheme would provide much needed living accommodation for disabled people.

The Chairman sought clarification as to whether the applicant owned the access road or the right of use of the access road.

The agent confirmed that No.32 owned the access road to the side and rear; whilst all residents had the right to access the access road and maintenance was shared by all.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- Concerned about the size of the proposed development where the eaves appeared to be over the access road

- Concerned about security issues for residents if gates were left opened
- With regard to lifetime homes, considered that the bathrooms were inadequate
- Suggested assurances should be sought to ensure that the access road was left unblocked during development
- Where security lightings were proposed, asked that adequate measures were taken to ensure they were not detrimental to neighbours
- Due to the size of the proposed development, urged the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to a question relating to lifetime homes and the width of the access way; officers advised that conditions had been imposed to ensure that the proposed units were large enough. With regard to the access way, there was a 3m gap between the two blocks.

In discussion, Members raised concerns about future occupiers needing to go outside the curtilage to use the amenity space. Officers advised that this would not be the case for the ground floor flats but would only apply to the first floor flats. With regard to security lighting, officers advised that although this was mentioned in the condition for design and access, it did not form part of security and therefore, Condition 9 could be amended to include this.

The Committee was minded to impose an additional condition due to concerns raised about the Eaves which appeared in the plans to be over the alleyway. Officers advised that the drawing in the plan pack on page 127 showed that the eaves were within the development site and the elevation details however, showed that the eaves were over the access road, which the applicant owned. The Committee noted therefore that an addition condition would not necessary.

Members expressed concerns about access into the alleyway being shared between vehicles and pedestrians. Officers advised that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, a condition could be imposed requiring details of surfacing of the alleyway and speed restricting measures to be provided for the Local Planning Authority's approval.

The Committee agreed to impose an additional condition relating to the improvement of the access road.

The recommendation for approval, changes to condition 9 and additional condition was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, changes in the Addendum, extended Condition 9 to include external/security lighting and the following additional condition:

'No development shall take place until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority for

	<p><i>the improvements of access road to the rear parking, which should include details of proposed surfacing and speed restrictions.'</i></p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To ensure that the access road is suitable to serve the parking area and in the interest of pedestrian safety in accordance with Policies AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p>	
83.	<p>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2012/106 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of 3, one bedroom live work units to 6, one bedroom flats (Block R).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes in the Addendum. It was reported that comments had also been received from Councillors Catherine Dann and David Payne giving their full support of the officer's recommendation for refusal of the application.</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 (also in relation to agenda items 8, 9 and 10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents as well as the Pembroke Park Residents' Association were all in support of the objections raised by the Eastcote Residents' Association • The proposed changes were unattainable and would be difficult to live with • The proposed development would exacerbate existing parking problems in the estate and on the surrounding roads • The proposed development would put pressure on shared amenity space, as no provision had been made • Concerned about the scale and density of the proposed development, which would be out of keeping with the local environment • Urged the Committee to endorse the officer's recommendation for refusal. <p>In discussing the application, Members expressed concerns about the inadequate parking spaces allocated, lack of amenity spaces and the density of the proposed development.</p> <p>The Committee sought clarification as to whether the proposed flats met with the minimal requirements for internal floor spaces. Officers advised that the proposal complied with the requirement for internal floor space but did not meet with requirement for amenity space.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>In expressing concerns about the density of the proposed development and its effects on the larger site, the Committee agreed to attach an additional informative relating to capacity being reached for the overall development of the site.</p> <p>With regard to parking, officers confirmed that that the overall parking provision was for 625 spaces with a maximum of 654, which meant that allocation of parking spaces was an issue. The Committee noted that adding additional units would result in the loss of visitor parking spaces.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to add an additional reason for refusal relating to parking and requested officers to prepare the wording in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal, the additional reason for refusal and informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report subject to the following additional reason for refusal and additional informative:</p> <p>Additional Reason for Refusal</p> <p>The Proposal provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed increase in the number of units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, therefore leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian /highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p>The applicant is informed that in the view of the Local Planning Authority the development of the wider site is now at capacity and thus any increase in the number or size of units is unlikely to be acceptable.</p>	
84.	<p>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2012/108 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Conversion of 3 one bedroom live work units to 6, one bedroom flats (Block H1).</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal, the additional reason for refusal and informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report subject to the following additional reason for refusal and additional informative:</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>Additional Reason for Refusal</p> <p>The Proposal provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed increase in the number of units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, therefore leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian /highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p>The applicant is informed that in the view of the Local Planning Authority the development of the wider site is now at capacity and thus any increase in the number or size of units is unlikely to be acceptable.</p>	
85.	<p>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2012/109 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Conversion of 3 one bedroom live work units to 6 x one bedroom flats (Block L).</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal, the additional reason for refusal and informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report subject to the following additional reason for refusal and additional informative:</p> <p>Additional Reason for Refusal</p> <p>The Proposal provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed increase in the number of units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, therefore leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian /highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p>The applicant is informed that in the view of the Local Planning Authority the development of the wider site is now at capacity and thus any increase in the number or size of units is unlikely to be acceptable.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

<p>86.</p>	<p>FORMER RAF EASTCOTE, LIME GROVE, RUISLIP - 10189/APP/2012/112 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of 3 one bedroom live work units to 6 x one bedroom flats (Block J).</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal, the additional reason for refusal and informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report subject to the following additional reason for refusal and additional informative:</p> <p>Additional Reason for Refusal</p> <p>The Proposal provide insufficient parking provision for the proposed increase in the number of units and would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where parking demand already exceeds supply, therefore leading to conditions which would be prejudicial to the operation of the highway network and pedestrian /highway safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p>The applicant is informed that in the view of the Local Planning Authority the development of the wider site is now at capacity and thus any increase in the number or size of units is unlikely to be acceptable.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>
<p>87.</p>	<p>LAND REAR OF 24 COURT ROAD, ICKENHAM - 68420/APP/2012/633 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Conversion from World War II hut to 1 x 1-bed self- contained dwelling with associated amenity space.</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that the applicant had provided late information regarding the planning application, giving insufficient time for officers to review in detail. It was noted for instance that revised plans submitted, may overcome certain issues and raise issues in another area. Furthermore, there were concerns regarding the changes put forward by the applicant which may result in major changes. Members were informed that the applicant had been advised to withdraw this application and submit a new application. Officers advised that if the Committee was minded, it could defer the item to allow officers to properly review the new details and present to another Committee meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that unless the applicant was prepared to withdraw this application, the Committee would consider it at this meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitions 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"> • The petitioner's home included the application site • Opposed to the proposed back land development, which would be inappropriate and harmful to the local area as stated in point 7.01 of the officer's report • The proposed development would damage the Court Road part of the Ickenham Conservation Area • The proposed replacement of an historic ex-forces billeting hut would consist of a makeshift substandard residential building, which when fenced off would destroy the unity of the existing garden • It would cause damage to the environment and result in the loss of local wild life • The proposed development would result in the substantial loss of trees, necessitating in large scale removal of mature trees to meet day lighting requirements • The proposed development would be unsustainable as a residential unit due to inadequate provision of basic amenities • The hut was currently used for storage by 24 Court Road • The proposed development would deprive 24 Court Road of a utilised parking space • Asked the Committee to refuse the application. <p>The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	
88.	<p>LINDA JACKSON CENTRE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 3807/APP/2012/1563 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Single storey extension.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>
89.	<p>WOODY BAY STATION, RUISLIP LIDO RAILWAY, RESERVOIR ROAD, RUISLIP - 1117/APP/2012/1257 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings, provision of 3 new buildings (woodland centre, ticket office and mess room) with associated landscaping.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Matt Duigan Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval and the changes in the Addendum sheet was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and changes in the Addendum.</p>	
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.34 pm.</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.