

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 September 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 (Labour Lead) Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Raymond Graham Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Matthew Duigan – Planning Services Manager Meghji Hirani – Planning Contracts and Planning Information Rory Stracey – Legal Advisor Charles Francis – Democratic Services Officer</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Philip Corthorne</p>	
90.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Allan Kauffman. Councillor Brian Stead attended as a substitute.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
91.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
92.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman notified the meeting that Item 10, 52 the Drive, Ickenham in Agenda B was an urgent item.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
93.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>All items were considered in Part 1.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
94.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO AND FORMING PART OF 30 HARVEY ROAD, NORTHOLT - 67335/APP/2011/1968</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p><b>2 x two storey, 2-bed semi detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In discussing the report, the Committee asked Officers to clarify the access arrangements to the rear garden. Officers confirmed that residents would need to walk around the site as there was no direct thoroughfare.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that the proposal was deemed acceptable the character and appearance of the local area and the scheme provided the education contributions and details of the off-site highways works which were required.</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 subject to a Section 106 agreement, as per the agenda and addendum.</b></p>	
95.	<p><b>56 - 58 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 17961/APP/2012/1008</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Part first floor and part two storey extension to existing rear element to create a studio flat</b></p> <p><b>Deferred from North Committee 08/08/2012</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 support of 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 petitioner was pleased that a site visit had taken place and that the access reason for refusal had been withdrawn from the officer report.</li> <li>• The petitioner was disappointed that the officer recommendation of refusal remained unchanged.</li> <li>• The proposal would enhance the appearance of the area.</li> <li>• The petitioner was surprised that additional reasons for refusal had been added.</li> <li>• There were inaccuracies in the officer report and three windows did not overlook the garden.</li> <li>• The garden was currently over looked.</li> <li>• The proposal would provide a good quality unit and high</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p>standard of accommodation.</p> <p>A ward Councillor attended the meeting and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ward Councillor supported the officer recommendation for refusal and supported the petitioner whom spoke in objection to the development at 8<sup>th</sup> August 2012 meeting.</li> <li>• There already were high levels of parking stress locally and further development would exacerbate this.</li> <li>• The proposed development lacked amenity space.</li> </ul> <p>In response to Member's questions about overlooking, officers confirmed that the only windows which overlooked the garden space were from the kitchen window. In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposal was not in keeping with the character of the area and looked as though it was 'bolted on' to the existing building.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal 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 refused as per the agenda and addendum.</b></p>	
96.	<p><b>CAR PARK FOR VIRGIN ACTIVE AT 18 DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 272/APP/2012/975</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 10 x light columns with luminaires involving the removal of existing bollard fittings</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which concerned the installation of light columns and the removal of existing bollard fittings at a Health Club. In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the installation of light columns would enhance pedestrian safety and the enclosed nature of the site and existing screening meant that the proposal would not adversely impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>It 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>	Action by
97.	<p><b>19 GATEHILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 68454/APP/2012/1686</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, first floor side extension, and single storey front extension involving demolition of garage to side</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p>	Action by

	<p>In discussing the report, the Committee noted that the property which was the subject of the application was smaller in size than the vast majority of homes in the area and agreed that the application would be in keeping with the street scene of the local area.</p> <p>The recommendation 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 and Addendum.</b></p>	
98.	<p><b>3 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - TPO 689</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>MAGNOLIA AT 3 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the item and drew the Committee’s attention to objections as set out in the report. Members asked for further clarification to be provided regarding the quality and value of the flowering magnolia. In response, officers confirmed that the tree was in early maturity and in good condition which contributed to the arboreal character and amenity of the Ickenham Conservation Area. Based on the report and further clarification provided by officers, the Committee agreed that the TPO should be confirmed.</p> <p>The Recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That TPO 682 (2010) be confirmed without modification.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
99.	<p><b>52, THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - TPO 697</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>MONTEREY CPRESS AT 52 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the item and drew the Committee’s attention to objections as set out in the report. The Committee discussed the topic of nuisance and impact the tree roots had had on to the neighbouring driveway of Number 54. In response to Members questions about possible remedial action, officers advised the Committee that the offending tree roots could be removed to a depth of up to 200mm prior to the installation of suitable root barrier which would probably address the nuisance.</p> <p>Further discussions focused on the height of the tree and its prominence in the local area. On the basis of the officer report and further clarification provided at the meeting the Committee agreed the TPO should be confirmed.</p> <p>The Recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<b>Resolved –</b>	
	<b>2. That TPO 697 be confirmed without modification.</b>	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.40 pm.	

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.

---