

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

22 November 2012

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillor Edward Lavery Councillor Brian Stead Councillor David Allam Councillor Carol Melvin Councillor John Morgan Councillor David Payne Councillor Raymond Graham</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Sports and Green Spaces Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts and Planning Information Manager Syed Shar, Principal Highways Engineer Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Philip Corthorne Councillor Michael White</p>	
117.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Allan Kauffman and Councillor Jazz Dhillion. Cllr Brian Stead acted as substitute for Cllr Kauffman.</p>	
118.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillors John Morgan and David Payne declared non-pecuniary interests in Item 6 as they were members of the Ruislip Woods Advisory Group. They remained in the Committee Room and participated in the item.</p>	
119.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF 9 OCTOBER AND 31 OCTOBER 2012 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of 9 October 2012 were agreed subject to noting that apologies for absence had been received from the Chairman.</p> <p>The minutes of 31 October 2012 were agreed subject to the request that Item 8 Enforcement report be withdrawn and referred to a future meeting</p>	

120.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
121.	<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>All items were considered in public.</p>	
122.	<p>RUISLIP LIDO RAILWAY STATION, RESERVOIR ROAD, RUISLIP - 1117/APP/2012/1785 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey toilet block and a single storey ticket office building (involving the demolition of existing ticket office building).</p> <p>Officer's introduced the report and highlighted the changes listed in the addendum. In introducing the report, officers confirmed that in their view the application did not constitute an inappropriate form of development in the green belt.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that the proposal would be situated next to the nature reserve and the Council had sought expert advice about possible ecological impacts. At present the Council was awaiting a response from Natural England.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with 4 votes in favour and 2 abstentions.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the officer report subject to comments from Natural England</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>
123.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 9 WOODLANDS AVENUE, RUISLIP - 66096/APP/2012/1731 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred 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 application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was very little difference between this application and one which had been refused previously • The proposal was out of character with the area 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The living conditions of the proposal would be sub standard • The amenity space of the proposed development was inadequate • The application would damage the street scene • The application did not comply with the life time homes requirement • The bulk and density of the proposed extension was unacceptable <p>Mr Wright, agent for the applicant spoke and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Officer report was inaccurate as it described the development as being 2, 2 bedroom flats, whereas the application was for 2, 1 bedroom flats with a study. • There was no intention of the study areas being used as bedroom accommodation • The scheme was modelled on a scheme which had been previously approved at 124 Woodlands Avenue • The officer report confirms that the proposed development would be compatible with the area as it matched the width, height and detailing as 124 Woodlands Avenue • Sufficient car parking space had been provided <p>In discussing the application, the Head of Planning confirmed that there had been policy changes to the guidance since the approval given to 124 Woodlands Avenue and as a result, the internal floor and garden areas were different. Officers confirmed that in respect of the second bedroom which had been described as a study, that this did not comply with the room size guidance set out in the Mayor’s London Housing Design Guide (Interim Edition).</p> <p>The Committee agreed that the intention of the proposal was for 2, 2 bedroom dwellings. The proposal appeared to be incongruous with the area and would damage the street scene.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as per agenda with two additional reasons relating to highway safety and parking.</p>	
124.	<p>LAND AT REAR AND FORMING PART OF 66 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - 49805/APP/2012/1587 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>2 x two storey, 4-bedroom detached dwellings with habitable roofspace, detached garages and associated parking, amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred to the changes as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution, a representative of the</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>In this particular case, the petitioner in objection chose not to speak. The applicant / Agent did not attend and no Ward Councillors spoke.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposal constituted a case of garden grabbing and should be refused. It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote agreed that the application be unanimously refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as per the agenda</p>	
125.	<p>51 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 68788/APP/2012/2348 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Two storey side extension and single storey side/rear extension to include 3 rear rooflights and 3 front rooflights, involving demolition of attached garage to side.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report. There was no addendum on this item. The petitioner did not attend the meeting and the agent chose not to speak.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report. There was no addendum on this item. The petitioner did not attend the meeting and the agent chose not to speak.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposal was a sympathetic extension. Referring to the pitched roof, Members asked whether this could be conditioned to ensure this did not become habitable roof space. In relation to concerns about overshadowing, the Committee were informed that there was no direct overshadowing in this case and any shadowing would be to the side of the property.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote that the application be approved as per the agenda.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per agenda</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>
126.	<p>54 ST MARGARETS ROAD, RUISLIP - 42371/APP/2012/1877 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Raising of roof to allow for conversion of bungalow to two storey dwelling to include completion of single storey rear extension with alterations to side elevation and raising of rear patio (Part-retrospective)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred to the changes as set out in</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

the Addendum.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:

- The proposed development would not harmonise with the existing street scene
- The proposed development would entail alterations and extensions to existing buildings
- The proposed development would not improve or complement the character of the area
- The proposed development would be an over development of the site, in terms of bulk, height, position and over dominance
- The close proximity of the proposal to neighbouring properties would lead to a cramped development and would lead to a closing of the visual gap
- The proposed development would incorporate a new roof height which would be higher than surrounding properties
- The proposed development would lead to a loss of sun light and day light to surrounding properties
- The applicant had started the proposed extension under permitted development rights which did not apply in this case.
- The removal of a bungalow would set an unwelcome precedent and remove housing stock best suited to pensioners and the less able bodied.

The applicant spoke and raised the following points:

- The proposed development would not be detrimental to the area
- The property was in a state of disrepair and was an eye sore. Extensive works would bring an improvement to the area.
- Prior to purchasing the property, the applicant had worked with the Planning Department to ensure that an acceptable scheme was devised
- An overshadowing diagram had been produced at appreciable cost to the applicant to ensure the scheme met current guidelines and requirements

A ward councillor spoke in support of the petitioners in objection to the proposal and the following points were raised:

- The proposed development would not harmonise with the with the area
- The proposed development would be an overdevelopment and over dominant

Officers confirmed that the overshadowing diagram displayed in the officer presentation was based on the current planning proposal. Officers explained that in their view, if the application went to appeal there were insufficient grounds in relation to overshadowing to defend this on appeal. In relation to the roof line, Officers explained that there would be sufficient habitable roof space, if the roof were raised, but that if this was the case then a further planning application would be

	<p>required.</p> <p>In relation to the car parking provision highlighted in the report, the Highways officer confirmed that cars would be unable to park as shown in the diagrams and one of the vehicles would need to be parked at a diagonal. Upon reflection, the Committee agreed that the only planning grounds which could be used to refuse the application related to overshadowing.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with four votes in favour, one vote against and one abstention.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per agenda and an additional condition be added regarding removing Permitted Development Rights</p>	
127.	<p>MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 3807/APP/2012/2252 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Balcony Repairs to Main Building (Mount Vernon Hospital) (Application for Listed Building Consent)</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per the officer report</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>
128.	<p>HIGHWAY VERGE FRONTING WRIGHT MACHINERY, STONEFIELD WAY, RUISLIP - 68737/APP/2012/2125 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Installation of a 17.5m high telecommunications monopole and 2 associated equipment cabinets.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per the agenda</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7:00pm, closed at 20:45pm.</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.