

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 August 2015

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) Duncan Flynn Raymond Graham Manjit Khatra John Morse John Oswell Brian Stead David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Highways Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer).</p>	
55.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Peter Curling, Jem Duducu and Carol Melvin with Councillors Manjit Khatra, David Yarrow and Brian Stead acting as substitutes.</p>	
56.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>	
57.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 16 JULY AND 5 AUGUST 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
58.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that Item 7 had been withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning.</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>All items were considered in public with the exception of items 11 and 12 which were considered in private.</p>	
<p>60.</p>	<p>128 QUEENS WALK, RUISLIP 70076/APP/2015/1490 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of two storey, 4-bed dwelling house into 2 x 1-bed self contained flats involving alterations to rear.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting the proposal addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal would set an unwanted precedent in the area. • The proposal would compromise the street scene. • The proposal would put an unnecessary stain on drainage and sewerage services. • There were insufficient parking spaces which would cause parking problems locally if it were approved. • No site visit had been conducted by Officers. • The internal layout was different to that suggested in the application. • The report contained no mention of the proposed alterations to the rear of the building. • The report made no mention of amenity space. • The property had been advertised on the internet as 2 double rooms available for rent. <p>A representative of the applicant raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application met all the planning standards. • The petitioners concerns that such a development would set a precedent was misguided. Conversions were a legitimate form of development. • That there had been few applications for a conversions, showed that the application met a local need. • The applicant accepted the Officer recommendation that the car parking needed to be re-orientated. • Bin storage had been moved to rear and side of the property so there was minimal impact to the street scene. • Drainage and sewage would not worsen as a result of the application. • There was no evidence of parking stress in the area. • Interior works to the property were not party to enforcement action. <p>A Ward Councillor raised the following points:</p>	

- The plans and report were insufficient information on which to take a decision.
- The building plans and proposed layouts were different to each other.
- The application was an excuse to try and legitimise the current state of the development.
- There was no Highways Officer report.
- There was no Access Officers' report.
- There had previously been a refusal for a 6m extension, but a 6m extension now existed.
- The application should be deferred so that further investigations could take place.
- Officers should conduct a site visit.

The Chairman began discussions by seeking a number of clarifications from Officers on a number of points. In relation to the 6m extension, Officers highlighted that this had been agreed under the prior approval route. Officers confirmed that a site visit had taken place and that the proposed change from a kitchen window to patio doors was a permissible alteration.

Referring to the internal layout, Officers confirmed that if a room was not previously designated as a bedroom, but the design had evolved, it was permissible for the room to become and be used as a bedroom.

Despite having a number of reservations about the scheme, the Committee was mindful that it could only consider the planning application before it. In relation to parking considerations, the Committee noted the Officer report had allocated 2 spaces to the scheme. The Highways Officer explained that parking standards did not equate to the size of the application and in Hillingdon, the standard was to allocate 1.5 spaces per property. Therefore, applying this standard to the application meant that only one parking space was required for it to be compliant with the current standard.

With regards to the loft conversion already in place, the Committee expressed concern about privacy. In response, Officers confirmed that overlooking had been considered at the relevant time and this aspect of the application did not breach the privacy of neighbouring properties. Summarising the application, the Chairman confirmed that the application complied with all Hillingdon's planning guidance and it was questionable what a site visit might achieve given the internal layout of the property was not something the Committee could determine.

After deliberations, it was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved, with one abstention.

Resolved - That the application be approved

61.	<p>WINDMILL COURT (FORMER WINDMILL PH) WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP 11924/APP/2015/2299 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition 3 (Opening Hours) of planning permission Ref: 11924/APP/2013/1871 dated 27/11/2013 to allow use of property as a 24 hour, 7 days gym (Change of use from A1 (shops) to flexible use permitting A1 (Shops), A2 (Financial and professional services) or use as a Gymnasium, Dental Clinic or health Centre.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning and Enforcement.</p>	
62.	<p>LAND ADJACENT TO 68 KNOLL CRESCENT, NORTHWOOD 70975/APP/2015/2012 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Two storey detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting the proposal addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development represented piecemeal back land development. • There had never been homes on the land. • It would adversely affect the openness and green and verdant character of the area. • The site formed a welcome break between the density of surrounding developments. • The development would cause congestion and parking issues locally. • The proposal would effect the survival / growth potential of surrounding trees. • The proposal would result in further pressure on the local drainage. • The proposal would place a further demand on the local water supply and some local residents already suffered from very low water pressure. <p>A representative of the applicant raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application before Committee was markedly different from previous applications. • The 'design and setting' aspects of the proposal addressed the Planning Inspectorates' previous concerns. • The design now incorporated a dwelling which was set into the hillside. This incorporated more timber and glass than previous designs which contributed to maintaining the openness of the 	

	<p>site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full arboreal report had been provided which had demonstrated that the trees would be retained. • The site had never been 'garden land'. It was land which had been acquired by the applicant under a specific title. • The history of the site showed that a number of developments had been approved in the past. <p>Discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the application did represent a form of backland development, which, on balance would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, as the design meant that a useful turning area for vehicles would be lost, this would further affect the openness and amenity of the area.</p> <p>The Committee also raised a number of concerns about the long-term protection of several trees on and off-site and requested that these be included as an informative to instruct any future application at the site.</p> <p>On being put to the vote, it was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously that the application be refused as set out in the Officer report.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Refused.</p>	
63.	<p>OLD CLACK FARM, TILE KILN LANE, HAREFIELD 42413/APP/2015/987 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension, and a single storey side extension, erection of a glazed link to connect the house and barn and internal alterations to provide a bedroom suite and bathroom.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed that the application be approved as set out in the Officers report.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.</p>	
64.	<p>OLD CLACK FARM, TILE KILN LANE, HAREFIELD 42413/APP/2015/988 (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>Listed Building Consent for a two storey and single storey rear extension, and a single storey side extension, erection of a glazed link to connect the house and barn and internal alterations to provide a bedroom suite and bathroom.</p>	

	<p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed that the application be approved as set out in the Officers report.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Approved as set out in the Officer's report.</p>	
65.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 11</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>	
66.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</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 7.30 pm, closed at 8.52 pm.</p>	

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.