

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

21 January 2015

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

| | |
|------|--|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Carol Melvin, John Oswell, Janet Duncan and John Morse</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Michael White (<i>Item 5</i>)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Matthew Duigan, Planning Service Manager, Syed Shah, Highway Engineer, Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager, Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer.</p> |
| 119. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Peter Curling, Cllr Jas Dhot and Cllr John Morgan with Cllr John Oswell and Cllr Janet Duncan substituting.</p> |
| 120. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 121. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 122. | <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 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> |
| 123. | <p>R/O 57-59A EXMOUTH ROAD, FRONTING SHALDON DRIVE, RUISLIP 16124/APP/2014/2943 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 2-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, installation of vehicular crossover and cycle store.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>The application sought planning permission to erect a detached dwelling on land to the</p> |

rear of Nos. 57, 59 and 59a Exmouth Road, with a frontage onto Shaldon Drive, with associated parking and amenity space.

Members noted that the proposals would accord with the terms and objectives of the identified policies and the impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers was also considered acceptable.

The Inspectors comments on a recent appeal scheme for a similar development in respect of highways and parking matters was noted by Members. In the absence of strong highways grounds for resisting a new dwelling in this location, given the minimal additional impact on the capacity for on-street parking in the locality, a highways reason for refusal was not therefore considered sustainable.

An appeal against non-determination of this application had now been lodged and therefore it was recommended that Members resolve that planning permission for the proposed development would have been granted if the Council were in a position to determine the application.

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 officers' final report contained a number of inaccuracies.
- Petitioners' were concerned with statements made.
- The pavement was not used for parking.
- The highway officer had suggested only one parking space would be lost, which was not the case.
- The proposals were blatant garden grabbing.
- The proposals would be in close proximity of the petitioners' property.
- The applicants photos had been taken during the day, not the evening, and therefore did not give a true reflection of the parking situation.
- The demolition of the garage would result in the loss of 4 parking spaces.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The recent appeal was relevant and comprehensive.
- The Council had refused permission on a number of issues that the planning inspector had considered in great detail.
- There was a WC located downstairs.
- A window had been removed to prevent overlooking.
- The planning inspector had stated that highways were not a reason alone to dismiss the appeal.
- After the appeal had been lodged the applicant had to wait for highways issues to be considered.

A local Ward Councillor also spoke in objection to the proposals and made the following comments:

- There would be loss of parking spaces.
- The proposal would be detrimental to the street scene.
- There would be lack of amenity space.
- The proposal was close to the corner.

- The proposals were blatant garden grabbing.

The Council's highway officer informed Members that there were 2 parking spaces per house which the proposed dwelling would provide. A parking stress survey had been undertaken in the area. Officers informed Members that the proposal would be hard to defend at appeal on highway grounds. Officers clarified that overlooking could not be justified as a reason for refusal; there were no habitable rooms and no windows on the side elevation.

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.

124. **2 LINKSWAY, NORTHWOOD 36910/APP/2014/2869** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Two storey, 5-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace involving demolition of existing dwelling.

Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.

The application was deferred from the North Planning Committee on the 9th December 2014 for a site visit, which had now taken place.

Officers remained of the view that the proposal did not overcome the reasons for refusal in the inspectors appeal decision and accordingly refusal was recommended.

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 proposals were large and would be implemented on a small plot.
- This application was the 4th proposal.
- The proposal had the same footprint as the previous application.
- Would destroy the appearance of the area.
- Was within an area of special local character.
- Policy BE13 and BE19 required the development to be well designed and appropriately scaled.
- The application did not address the concerns of the planning inspector.
- There were more than a 100 signatures on the petition objecting to the proposals.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The drawings had been given 4 months ago but had not been included.
- There was a petition with 150 signatures from people who supported the proposals.
- Was disappointed that the proposal was not up for approval.
- There had been 10 new homes built on Cope Wood estate.
- The proposal would have the same access and position.

- The last application was 20% bigger than the one before Members.
- The applicant was willing to tweak the design.
- The applicant had waiting over 18 months for approval.

The Chairman highlighted that the site had been visited by Members following the last Committee. Members discussed the site and had the view that it was not out of character for the local area. Members were informed that they would need to decide if the applicant had done enough to overcome the issues that concerned the planning inspector if they were to decide to approve the application.

Refusal was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was lost. Approval was then moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed, with one abstention.

Resolved - That the application be approved, subject to conditions and informatives to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead outside the meeting.

125. **6 LINKSWAY, NORTHWOOD 5380/APP/2014/2288** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Two storey, 6-bed, detached dwelling with habitable basement and roofspace involving demolition of the existing dwelling (Resubmission).

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

The application related to No 6 Linksway, which was a detached property within a spacious plot in the Copse Wood Area of Special Local Character. The application sought permission for the erection of a two storey 6 bed house. A member site visit took place prior to the meeting.

Members noted that the proposed building would have an appropriate appearance within the street scene and the area of special local character. It had a generous set back from the site boundaries and would comply with the Council's guidance such that it would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would also provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers in all respects.

The proposal would have a basement; however it was supported by geo-technical reports. The Council's Flood and Water Management officer had reviewed the proposal in details and considered that subject to appropriate conditions it would not have any adverse impacts on groundwater or drainage. Members also noted that the proposal was served by adequate car parking and provided appropriate levels of accessibility.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioner objecting the proposals was welcomed to address the meeting but decided not to comment.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The officer's report confirmed strong reasons for approval.
- Had worked with the applicants for over 2 years.
- The design of the proposal was compatible with the surroundings of the local area.

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

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>was unanimously 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.</p> |
| 126. | <p>8 & 9 NEW YEARS GREEN FARM, NEWYEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD 70392/APP/2014/3842 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Single storey rear extensions to numbers 8 & 9 and a first floor side extension to number 8.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The application related to a pair of semi-detached properties at 8 and 9 New Years Green Lane, which were located within the Green Belt. The application sought the erection of single storey extensions to both properties and a first floor side extension to number 8.</p> <p>The proposed extensions would be in accordance with Green Belt policy as they represented proportionate additions to the original properties, they would also serve to balance out the properties achieving an appropriate appearance within the area. Members noted that given the separation from other properties and their design they would not have any detrimental impacts on neighbour amenity.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| 127. | <p>1 EASTBURY ROAD, NORTHWOOD 1095/APP/2014/3713 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A3 (Restaurant) involving, installation of new shopfront, outdoor seating to front and installation of extraction fan to rear associated works.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>The application sought planning permission for the change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A3 (Restaurant) involving the installation of extraction/ventilation ducts to the rear elevations. It was considered that the proposal for the use of 1 Eastbury Road would be acceptable in principle, as it would bring the vacant unit back into use within the primary shopping frontage area.</p> <p>In addition, it was considered that the Restaurant use proposed provided for a use compatible with the main retail functions within the Town Centre and would add to its vitality. Members noted that the development was considered to contribute to the vibrancy of the Town Centre and would enhance the viability of the secondary shopping area as a whole. Members agreed that it would bring a vacant building back into use.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> |

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| 128. | <p>23 WOODFORD CRESCENT, PINNER 41976/APP/2014/3768 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Single storey detached outbuilding to rear involving alterations to roof (Part Retrospective).</p> <p>The application sought planning consent for the erection of a single storey detached outbuilding to the rear of the property for use as a summer house. The scheme differed from the building which had been constructed on site (and for which permission was previously refused) by virtue of the removal of the pitched roof with a flat roof which reduces the overall height of the structure by approximately 1m and reduced its bulk.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p> |
| 129. | <p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was 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>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> |
| 130. | <p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was 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>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> |
| | |

| |
|---|
| The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 9.10 pm. |
|---|

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gill Oswell on Democratic Services Officer 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.