

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 July 2013

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) Raymond Graham Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Yarrow David Allam (Labour Lead) Robin Sansarpuri</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Sports and Green Spaces Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Syed Shah, Principal Highway Engineer Tim Brown, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Douglas Mills</p>	
45.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
46.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
47.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 25 JUNE 2013 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
48.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
49.	<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>	

	All items were considered in Part 1 with the exception of item 8 which was considered in Part 2.	
50.	<p>18 PARK WAY, RUISLIP (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of single storey detached outbuilding to rear to be used as a children's activity business (Use Class D1 - Non-residential institutions).</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. The lead petitioner raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would adversely affect a quiet and peaceful residential setting and be detrimental to the area. • It was accepted that most activity would take place within the building. However, concern was expressed at the level of disruption caused adults and children using the site on an ongoing basis. • The proposal lacked sufficient car parking space for its proposed use and would result in the displaced parking along the road. • The displaced parking caused by the proposal could cause road safety issues <p>The applicant raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant had spoken to numerous new mothers and there was a local need for the service. • The proposal would not be run as a nursery but as a baby and toddler activity class. • The classes for children and parents would be held inside in a fully heated, sound insulated facility. No activities would be held outside so there would be no disruption to local neighbours. • The proposal would be an attractive summer house design and not be an eyesore to local residents. • It was anticipated that most local users would come by foot so parking issues would not arise. • The applicant explained that as the family home was located approximately 150 metres from the blind corner there were no safety issues. <p>A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the proposal and the following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While being supportive of the need for an activity centre, this was the proposal was not right for the arena and would affected the amenity of local residents. • Most local residents were retired and any outdoor activity would affect adjacent households • In adverse weather, users would be inclined to travel by car and local parking issues would arise. • The proposal was situated on a very busy road • Changing the current usage to D2 would strike against the 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>Authorities core planning policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee were urged to refuse the application. <p>Members discussed the item and agreed with the ward Councillor that while there was a need for this type of provision locally, they were unable to support the proposal as the change of use was not appropriate in this case.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be unanimously refused.</p>	
51.	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - UP TO 3 MARCH 2013 <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p>Officer introduced the monitoring report.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the report be noted</p>	Action by
52.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>The recommendations as 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.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolved 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 & Adrien Waite</p>
53.	<p>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
54.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>None.</p>	Action by

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.28 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.