

Minutes**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

7 August 2013

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Yarrow David Allam (Labour Lead) Robin Sansarpuri Michael White Brian Stead</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: Matt Duigan, Planning Services Manager Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger, Transport Consultant Rory Stracey, Legal Advisor Nadia Williams, Democratic Services Officer</p> <p>ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Judy Kelly (Item 7) Councillor John Riley (Item 10)</p>
55.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>) Apologies had been received from Councillors John Morgan and Raymond Graham. Councillors Michael White and Brian Stead attended in their place.</p>
56.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>) There were no declarations of interest notified.</p>
57.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 JUNE 2013 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>) The minutes of the meetings held on 25 June 2013 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>
58.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>) There were no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>

59.	<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 items marked Part 1 would be considered in public.</p>
60.	<p>51 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 21977/APP/2013/1333 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</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>In introducing the report, officers directed the Committee to note the changes set out in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, two representatives of petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal was not in accordance with policy • Need to provide and keep more family homes with adequate space • Losing family homes and replacing with 5 blocks of flats would not be in keeping with residential homes in the area • It was not the purpose of policy to allow such conversions, which would not be compatible with the objective of maintaining family spaces • No similar development of this size existed in the road and failed to protect the impact on the character and amenity of the area • The proposed development would result in significant loss of residential amenity • The planning application provided insufficient parking for 5 families • The proposed development did not compliment the character of the road • The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on Nos. 49 and 51a • Urged the Committee to refuse the application by virtue of the size bulk and height of the proposal • This application was a new version of the same previously refused application, therefore should again be refused • Although the new application partly addressed the issue of light, there had been no change to the detrimental effect on Nos. 49b and 51 • The footprint of the proposed development still exceeded that at No. 49b and 3 storey high • Concerned that the size and bulk of the scheme would cause movement and impact footings • Lighting in the living room (where most time was spent during the day) would be severely affected and would be further compounded by the use of dark brickwork • Concerned about the noise that would be generated from the kitchen,

dining room and utility areas, which would be further exacerbated by the use of the communal gardens

- Feared that cars would be parked on the road making access to own drive impossible and additional cars would lead to increased traffic on the road
- Concerned about potential problem of refuse collection, how this would be managed
- The proposed development would impact on drainage, as currently No 51 was having to clear the drains every 6 to 8 weeks, and the proposed hard surfacing would create even more pressure on the drainage system
- Urged the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.

In response to a query about the right to light and the issue of footings, officers advised that these were civil issues which were outside the Planning Act and that the issue of footings was dealt with under the Party Wall Act.

Officers advised that previous concerns in relation to overshadowing had been resolved.

The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved –

a) That the Council enters into a legal agreement with the applicant under section 106 of the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:

i) Educational facilities contribution of £22,253.

b) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Statement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

c) That planning officers be authorised to negotiate and agree details of the proposed Statement.

d) If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised before within 6 months of the date of this resolution, delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to refuse planning permission for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of capacity enhancements in educational facilities). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the adopted Local Plan and the Council's Planning Obligations SPG'.

e) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning Green Spaces and Culture under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the agreement.

f) That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officer's report be attached and the changes in the Addendum.

61. **61 ANGUS DRIVE, SOUTH RUILSIP 4254/APP/2012/2740** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of use from Sui Generis to Use Class B2 (General Industrial) for MOT testing, servicing and mechanical repairs of motor vehicles to include a new overhead door and entrance screen to front and alterations to rear elevation.

Officers introduced the report and directed Members to note the changes set out in the addendum circulated at the meeting.

The addendum was amended to retain points 2.a, 2.c and 2.f and deleted other points.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal and the applicant were invited to address the meeting.

The petitioner raised the following points:

- Surprised that the Council had agreed a development of this kind to operate on this site
- Could not understand why a bigger site in Victoria Road had not been considered for this type of application
- The proposed development would lead to noise pollution, the smell of oil, increased traffic and the problem of storage
- The scheme would lead to potential pest control issues around the area
- The nature of the business would place the safety of residents in potential risk
- Concerned about the likely increase of business during the weekends
- Ground slap party walls between the application site and neighbouring properties should be installed on both sides and not just on one side of a neighbouring property
- Urged the Committee to reject the application.

The applicant raised the following points:

- Had worked closely with the Council to address issues raised
- With regard to concerns about the potential for excessive noise, a robust noise assessment had been conducted and all work would take place inside the building
- The proposal was for MOT testing and would not involve body work or vehicle spraying
- The proposal would not give rise to excessive car parking issues, as there would be 5 work places to provide for 22 vehicles
- All staff and customer parking would be within the development

- The scheme would provide six full time jobs and bring the vacant unit back into sustainable and accessible use.

In answer to a query about vehicle movement on the site, the applicant responded that the business would operate on an appointment basis and would typically have from 12 to 15 paying customers in a day. Large stock would not be maintained and the only large delivery vehicle would be used for oil waste every 4 to 6 weeks, whilst other deliveries would be made by auto car vans.

In response to concerns raised about the issue of noise, officers explained that the Council's Environmental Protection Unit had examined the noise report to ensure that it was robust and in line with guidelines. Operating hours requested were within planning policy and officers had no objection, given the mitigation measures proposed.

A Ward Councillor spoke about the application raising the following points:

- Wished to voice the concerns raised by residents
- The proposed development was in a predominately residential area and would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the locality
- The scheme would result in a huge change for the neighbourhood, in terms of noise pollution
- Concerned that the proposed development would result in road safety issues, due to increased traffic
- The scheme was sited in a prime residential area in South Ruislip and would have a negative impact on the local area.

In response to a question regarding road safety, officers explained that there would be a slight increase in traffic but there were no safety concerns.

The recommendation for approval 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 and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

62. **GOSPEL OAK (228), SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM**
11246/APP/2013/827 (Agenda Item 8)

Three storey building to include 2 x 3-bed, 3 x 2-bed and 2 x 1-bed self contained flats with associated parking involving demolition of existing detached dwelling house (Resubmission).

Officers introduced the report and directed Members to note the changes set out in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

The recommendation for approval 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 and addendum sheet

	<p>circulated at the meeting.</p>
63.	<p>ASTRAL HOUSE, THE RUNWAY, RUISLIP 42507/APP/2012/2734 <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>Change of use from Use Class B1 (Office) to either Community or Adult Education Facility, Play Centre or Community Centre within Use Class D1 (Non-residential Institutions).</p> <p>Officers directed the Committee to note the changes set out in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that the application had been deferred from the North Planning Committee meeting on 12 February 2013 and not Central and South Planning Committee meeting as stated in the report.</p> <p>The Committee deleted Condition 9 and amended Condition 8 requesting officers to provided robust wording in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.</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 and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting, deletion of condition 9 and amended condition 8 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (amended) or the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended), the premises shall only be used as a Community or Adult Education Facility, Play Centre or Community Centre and for no other purpose (including in particular, as a place of worship or any other purpose within Use Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended.</i></p> <p>REASON</p> <p>To safeguard the amenity of the surrounding area and ensure that the development does not have adverse impacts on the operation or safety of the highways network, in accordance with policies OE1, AM2, AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).</p>
64.	<p>WAITROSE, KINGSEND, RUISLIP 36969/APP/2013/918 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Variation of condition 1 of planning permission ref: 36969/APP/2011/2450 dated 02/12/2011 to extend opening hours (Variation of condition 8 of planning permission ref. 36969/G/89/2037 dated 30/11/1993) to extend Saturday opening hours (Erection of 13 unit shopping mall; extension to supermarket; and provision of additional parking (involving demolition of Kingsend Court and 5 & 7</p>

Kingsend).

In introducing the report, officers directed the Committee to note the changes set out in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and raised the following points:

- Residents had expressed great concerns about the proposed extension of opening hours, which would potentially lead to an increase in noise
- The general consensus was that late opening hours would not be conducive to residents living nearby, particularly to residents who worked on shifts and those with young families
- Expressed general concerns about noise and especially from banging doors and trolley movements
- Concerned about the potential for anti-social behaviour
- Should the extension of hours be granted, it would be the start of the request for further extended hours
- Suggested that there were plenty of late night shopping already in the area
- Objected to the extension of hours principally on the grounds of increased noise, as the Waitrose store was situated just at the edge of the High Street where a substantial number of residents resided.

Several Members expressed concerns about the extension of the opening and closing hours and indicated that opening at 7am with deliveries at 6am would be disruptive to nearby residents.

Officers highlighted that there had and been no change to the current delivery times.

In response to a query raised regarding Sunday trading hours, officers advised that the rules for such hours were completely separate and could not be overridden by Planning Laws.

The recommendation for approval 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.

65. **18 DEERINGS DRIVE, EASTCOTE 56765/TRE/2013/44** (*Agenda Item 11*)

To fell one Oak (T16) and to carry out tree surgery to one Oak (T17) on TPO 363.

In accordance with the Council’s constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the planning application addressed the Committee and stated that:

- Petitioners welcomed officer’s recommendation to refuse the proposed felling of the Oak Tree (T16)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported the crown reduction to Oak Tree (T17). <p>The agent did not address the Committee.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved:</p> <p>A) That approval be given for the Tree Surgery to Oak Tree (T17) (a crown reduction by about 30% by cutting back to previous pruning points).</p> <p>B) That the application to fell Oak Tree (T16) be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 8.00 pm, closed at 9.20 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.