

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

12 February 2013

Meeting held at 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: James Rodger – Head of Planning, Sports and Green Spaces Meghji Hirani – Planning, Contracts and Information Manager Paul Harrison – Traffic Engineer Nicole Cameron – Legal Advisor Charles Francis – Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Shirley Harper O'Neill</p>	
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>	
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a pecuniary interest in Item 9. He left the Committee Room and did not participate in the item.</p>	
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 3 and 23 January 2013 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
5.	<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</i></p>	

	<p><i>Item 5)</i></p> <p>All items were considered in public with the exception of items 9 and 10 which were considered in private.</p>	
6.	<p>51 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 21977/APP/2012/2194 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Two storey building with habitable roofspace to create 5 x self-contained flats with associated parking and landscaping and installation of vehicular crossover, involving demolition of existing detached dwelling</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"> • The residents of the Drive were horrified by the report and the inaccuracies contained within the report • The officer report did not contain references to H5 of the saved Unitary Development Plan • There was no need for luxury flats in the Drive • The flats would not provide adequate amenity space • If approved, the decision would set a dangerous precedent for the area • Parking would be a problem as visitor parking would have to park on the road and cause access issues. <p>The agent spoke and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local residents were worried unduly • The design would integrate with the street scene • The design incorporated 47% planting to the front of the property which significantly exceeded the 25% requirement • If the property was not converted into flats, the plot would have been developed by someone else • The development would free up other properties locally and allow households to downsize <p>No Ward Councillors attended the meeting.</p> <p>To provide clarification, the Head of Planning read out policy H5 and confirmed that the Council was actively trying to encourage balanced communities. In relation to sitting and size, Officers confirmed that the proposal was located on a large plot and would be a larger building than the one it replaced, being 3 metres off each boundary.</p> <p>In discussing the application, Members noted that there were no other flats in the road and if approved, the development would give rise to increased vehicular movements. Members also expresses concern about the potential size, scale and bulk of the proposal and on this</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>basis decided to defer a decision until a site visit had been conducted.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be deferred for a site visit.</p>	
7.	<p>42 RAISONS HILL, EASTCOTE 27718/APP/2012/2930 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Two storey rear extension, part first floor side extension and alterations to elevations</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"> • The proposal would adversely affect Raisins Hill which was in an Area of Special Local Character (ASLC), • The proposal was out of keeping with the street scene. • The proposal would lead to the loss of a garage space. • The 45 degree angle drawn on the site plan provided a wrong impression. The double storey building would cause a loss of visual amenity by virtue of over-looking which would lead to a loss of privacy. • The proposal would lead to a loss of sunlight to number 44 • There was no other detached property in the vicinity of Raisins Hill that has a complete two storey development at the back. If this was allowed it would set a precedent in the local area. <p>The agent did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size, scale and bulk of the proposed extension was noted. • The 45 degree angle would have a detrimental affect on surrounding properties and lead to overshadowing and a loss of privacy • To request that the application be refused or deferred for a site visit <p>Members discussed the size and scale of the proposal and concerns were expressed about its width and full height. The Committee agreed that the proposal did not appear to be subordinate to the main dwelling and if it were approved, the visual amenity of the proposal would detract from an area of special local character. The legal officer</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>confirmed that visual amenity and its impact on an area of special local character were sufficient grounds to overturn the officer recommendation for approval and refuse the application.</p> <p>On being put to the vote, it was moved and seconded with 6 votes in favour, with 1 abstention, that the officer recommendation for approval be overturned and the application refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the officer recommendation for approval be overturned and the application be refused with the exact wording for the refusal to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead outside the meeting.</p>	
8.	<p>ASTRAL HOUSE, THE RUNWAY, RUISLIP 42570/APP/2012/2734 <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>Change of use from Use Class B1 (Office) to Use Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions)/D2 (Assembly and Leisure) (Resubmission)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and the following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised about the consultation process which had been undertaken by officers and further clarification was requested about how this had been conducted. • Assurance was requested about the type of worship anticipated at the site and whether there were any restrictions in place. <p>Officers advised the meeting that the consultation on the application had been undertaken for a building measuring 985m net. The application had therefore been considered as a minor application. Had the building been considered as 1,010m gross, the application would have been deemed a major application and a wider consultation undertaken. This would have included a wider ranging consultation and incorporated the uses of surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The Committee was unclear as to the potential use of the application site and requested officers to clarify what this was.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the traffic implications that might arise from the proposed use of the development and the Committee requested officers to provide further information on proposed parking arrangements.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for further consultation and information.</p> <p>Resolved –</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	That the application be deferred.	
9.	<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.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed; with the exception of recommendation 1.5 which was withdrawn by the Head of Planning.</p> <p>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.</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>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>
10.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 10</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>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meghji Hirani</p>

	<p>Resolved –</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</p> <p>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.</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 8.50 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.