

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 July 2015

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



	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Peter Curling (Labour Lead) Raymond Graham Carol Melvin Jazz Dhillon Manjit Khatra Brian Stead David Yarrow</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: James Rodger, Residents Services, Adrien Waite, Residents Services, Syed Shah, Residents Services, Tim Brown, Legal Services, and Ainsley Gilbert, Democratic Services</p>
32.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Jem Duducu, John Morgan, John Morse, and John Oswell, all of whom had sent substitutes. Councillor Duncan Flynn had sent his apologies and had not been able to arrange for a substitute to be present.</p>
33.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
34.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2 JUNE 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2015 were agreed to be accurate.</p>
35.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were no such matters. The Chairman explained that applications relating to 2 Park Avenue and 2 Raisins Hill would be considered before the application at 26a Windmill Hill.</p>

36.	<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 as part 1 would be considered in part 1 and all items marked as part 2 would be considered in part 2.</p>
37.	<p>2 PARK AVENUE, RUISLIP 11331/APP/2015/807 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for a two storey rear extension, which would be 3.3m deep, 6.4m wide and would be the full height of the building. Neighbouring properties had already built large extensions to the rear, and this would be no deeper than neighbouring properties. The separation distances were adequate, and the proposal was fully compliant with relevant LB Hillingdon policies.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal would impact significantly on the outlook from 116 and 118 Bury Street, as well as impacting on sunlight, and potentially causing overlooking. <p>In response to questions from members, officers explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed extension would be 26 metres from 116 Bury Street, and so only a very limited impact on that property was expected. - The windows on the second floor facing Bury Street would be obscure glazed, and would not be able to be opened. <p>Following debate, the recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report, and an additional condition to ensure that obscure glazing, with restricted opening, was used in windows the first floor in the wall facing Bury Street.
38.	<p>2 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE, PINNER 32216/APP/2015/517 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and the conversion of roofspace to habitable use, including 2 rear dormers, 2 side rooflights and 1 front rooflight. It was considered to be oversized and detrimental to the street scene, and so was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The petitioner showed 3 pictures, which the Chairman noted had not been verified as accurate by planning officers, and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would have a significant impact on the streetscene; - The proposal was not subservient to the original house; - The materials required to tie in with the existing property were hard to acquire and very expensive; - The proposal constituted overdevelopment. <p>The agent for the applicant made the following points:</p>

- The proposal was for a larger home for the applicants, not a House of Multiple Occupancy;
- The existing house was very small compared to the size of the plot;
- The alterations would, in his view, remain subservient to the main house;
- Other extensions along the road were more than half of the width of the property;
- The development would not impact upon neighbours.

Following a brief debate a motion for refusal was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously.

It was resolved:

- **That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officers report.**

39. **LAND FORMING PART OF 26A WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP 67242/APP/2015/188** (*Agenda Item 6*)

The Chairman noted that consideration of this application had been deferred from a previous meeting in order to receive more information relating to the footprint of previously refused schemes on the site.

Officers introduced the report explaining that the application had been designed to allay the concerns of planning inspectors regarding the footprint. In 2012 an application had been refused because the property would be too wide and close to the front of the site. In 2014 a second application had been refused as a result of concerns that the frontage was too narrow. The Council's Tree Officer had raised concerns about the impact of the proposal on a protected Ash Tree, however, these had been dismissed by previous appeal inspectors. Officers felt that the proposed development was acceptable and so recommended approval. Members attention was drawn to the addendum report.

In response to questions from members, officer explained that planning inspectors had not supported the argument that developing this plot of land would constitute backland development, as the site had a significant street facing frontage.

Following debate a motion for approval was moved, seconded and agreed by use of the Chairman's casting vote.

It was resolved:

- **That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.**

40. **7 MORFORD WAY, EASTCOTE 42971/APP/2015/1629** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report, explaining that the proposal was for the conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 rear roof lights, 2 front roof lights, a new window in the western side roof and the conversion of the roof from hip to gable ends, including the removal of chimney stack in rear roof. The proposal was considered to be unacceptable because of the impact of the changes on the dwelling, the wider conservation area and the streetscene generally; consequently it was

	<p>recommended for refusal.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officers report.
41.	<p>JOEL STREET FARM, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 8856/APP/2015/1333 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the proposal was for the erection of a single storey side extension, which would be used as an office. A similar scheme had previously been approved, and this application was also recommended for approval.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report.
42.	<p>61 & 61A HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM 51656/APP/2014/4334 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the erection of three three-bed and three four-bed terraced houses over two storeys with habitable roofspace. Associated bin storage, parking, landscaping and amenity space would also be provided. The application involved the demolition of existing office and residential buildings.</p> <p>A submission from the Ickenham Residents Association had been distributed, and members attention was drawn to both this and the addendum report.</p> <p>In response to questions from members officers confirmed that the old chapel was in poor condition and had been used as a store room for many years.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded, and agreed unanimously.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the officers report, and an additional condition regarding the recording of historic details, to be drafted by officers.
43.	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>The report was noted.</p>
44.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report

	<p>be agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee agree 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>
45.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee agree 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>The meeting, which commenced at 8.10 pm, closed at 9.25 pm.</p>

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