

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 October 2014

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), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Raymond Graham, John Morse, Jas Dhot, Roy Chamdal, Ian Edwards and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Matthew Duigan, Planning Service Manager, Syed Shah, Highway Engineer, Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager, Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer.</p>
79.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Henry Higgins and Cllr Duncan Flynn with Cllr Ian Edwards and Cllr Roy Chamdal substituting.</p>
80.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr John Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 6, 106 Copse Wood Way and remained in the meeting and took part in the decision of this item.</p>
81.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
82.	<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>It was confirmed that items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and those marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>
83.	<p><b>22 BROADWATER GARDENS, HAREFIELD 35700/APP/2014/1220</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Use Class C4 (HMO) to Sui Generis to increase occupancy in HMO from 6 to 8 persons.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>Officers explained to Members that a HMO had been operating at the application</p>

property for approximately ten years. There had been a previous application which was refused due to the lack of landscaping. It was noted that the Council's Private Sector Officer had no concerns. Members were aware of an additional 11 signatures to a petition in objection had been received.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners supporting/objecting the proposals addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- Residents were opposing the HMO.
- The proposals would cause a massive strain on parking in the local area.
- 50% of parking is only available on one side of the road.
- Broadwater Gardens was a no through road.
- Emergency Services had previously had trouble accessing the road.
- Only 3 vehicles could fit on the driveway of the application premises.
- There was no dropped kerb for vehicles to access the private parking.
- Was confused why the owners had requested an HMO when the house had been up for sale.
- The property was no longer a home and was now a business.
- There had only been 4 lodgers at one time.
- The traffic and parking situation would be worse than the current situation.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- Had lived in the Borough all their life.
- Have 2 other properties which are also rented.
- Residents had long standing tenancies.
- Had provided a high standard of accommodation for residents.
- Had purchased the property in 2013.
- The previous owner had 7 tenants living in the property.
- There had been no evidence to suggest that the property had contributed to the traffic and parking problems in the local area,
- Tenants were professional working people, many of which worked at the local hospital, school and industrial estate.
- There was a lack of affordable housing in Harefield which included flats.
- The area was often patrolled by Civil Enforcement Officers to ticket vehicles parked illegally.
- There had been no complaints received about tenants since they had owned the premises.
- Had two sought after rooms in the premises.
- The provided plans met the relevant criteria.

Members sought clarification on how many rooms were currently let and how many were proposed to be let. The applicant informed the Committee that there were only 6 rooms let and that the proposal was for 8 rooms to be let. The applicant also informed Members that no soft planting or landscaping had yet been implemented.

The Council's Highway Officer informed Members that the existing dropped kerb needed to be widened. Members agreed to add an additional condition for the vehicle crossover details to be submitted to ensure appropriate access and egress arrangement in order to maintain appropriate levels of highways and pedestrian safety.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote

was unanimously 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.**

84. **106 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD 8287/APP/2014/1934** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, first floor front extension including new dormer to front and raising of roof to allow conversion of roof space to include 2 rear dormers, 2 front roof-lights and 3 side roof-lights involving alterations to all elevations and demolition of conservatory and side extension.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application. Members had deferred the application at its previous meeting on 7 October 2014 for a site visit.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting the proposals addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- The petition was based on compliance with UDP and HDAS documents which defined what is permitted and what is not.
- The property had previously been extended and further extensions should be referenced from the original property from which there were permitted limits.
- The limit for 2 storey extensions was 4 metres and this limit had been reached by the original extension.
- Main objections were a new construction in front of the building line and the proposed 3 storey extension of more than 9 metres beyond the original building.
- The bulk of the proposed extension would change the character of this part of Copse Wood area unfavourably.
- The privacy of immediate neighbours would be affected.
- There were numerous reasons for refusal.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The application should be judged on its own merits.
- Fits in very well with the relationship of the Copse Wood area.
- The appearance of the property would be retained to suit the area.
- There would be no drastic change to the street scene.
- Good quality materials would be used.
- The overall quality of the design was of a high standard.
- None of the trees on site would be threatened.
- The garden was large and would be retained.
- There were no issues regarding privacy or overlooking.

Members discussed the site visit that took place and agreed that the front building lines were not a major issue. Members were also satisfied that the level of screening would alleviate any privacy concerns.

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

**Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.**

85.	<p><b>39 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM 67201/APP/2014/2224 (Agenda Item 7)</b></p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear and front dormer and 3 roof-lights (Part Retrospective).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application. The building had undergone several extensions, some of which had planning permission. Members agreed that the proposals were extensive.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</b></p>
86.	<p><b>21 KNOLL CRESCENT, NORTHWOOD 52149/APP/2014/2877 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>Single storey infill extension to front.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. Members had deferred the application at its previous meeting on 7 October 2014 for a site visit.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners supporting the proposals addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner supporting the proposals made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had lived in Knoll Crescent for 36 years.</li> <li>• Had been a resident of Hillingdon all their life.</li> <li>• A Ward Councillor had requested that the application come before Committee.</li> <li>• Members would have noted on the site visit that the properties on Knoll Crescent were some of the least expensive in Northwood.</li> <li>• The extension was very small in size.</li> <li>• The property was semi-detached and was located in a cul-de-sac.</li> <li>• There was a mix of properties in Knoll Crescent.</li> <li>• The report had referred to an access statement.</li> <li>• No neighbours had objected to the proposals and many residents of Knoll Crescent had signed the petition in support.</li> <li>• The proposals were so that the residents could continue to live in their property.</li> </ul> <p>Members discussed the recent site visit and agreed that the proposals would not have a major effect in the local area. Members requested that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces should match those used in the existing building to safeguard the visual amenities of the area.</p> <p>Four additional conditions were agreed to be added if the Committee decided to overturn the officer's decision which included conditions HO1, HO2, HO4 and HO10.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved subject to additional conditions being attached.</b></p>

87.	<p><b>S 106/278 QUARTERLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT - UP TO JUNE 2014</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p><b>Resolved - Members noted the contents of this report.</b></p>
88.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></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>
89.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></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>
90.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 12)</p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></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</i></p>

	<i>Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.00 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Danielle Watson on Democratic Services Officer 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.