

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 September 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), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Jem Duducu, Raymond Graham, Carol Melvin, John Morse and John Oswell</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Michael White (spoke in relation to item 6)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant) Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Tim Brown (Legal advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
67.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr. Duncan Flynn, with Cllr. Brian Stead substituting.</p>
68.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
69.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>No additional matters had been notified in advance of the meeting or were urgent.</p>
70.	<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 agenda item numbers 1 to 7 were Part I and would be heard in public. Agenda items 8 and 9 were Part II Members only and would, therefore, be heard in private.</p>
71.	<p>51 WIELAND ROAD, NORTHWOOD 17990/APP/2015/2372 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 6-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report which sought permission for the demolition of an existing dwelling and its replacement with a two storey, 6 bedroom detached dwelling. The</p>

Committee's attention was drawn to the planning history included in the officer's report, noting that a proposed extension had previously been granted planning permission.

Any concerns about drainage and accumulated groundwater could be addressed through conditions and were not grounds for refusal of the application.

The footprint of the proposed dwelling would be larger than the footprint of the existing premises. The proposed building was considered to be too bulky and would detract from the character and appearance of the original dwelling. It was, therefore, unacceptable in design terms and officers were recommending that the application be refused.

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 had obtained 130 signatures in objection to the plans, which was indicative of the strength of local feeling.
- The development would not comply with a number of Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policies including :
 - BE1 Built Environment, as the development would impinge on gardens and green space.
 - BE6 - there would not be a gap of at least 1.5 metres between the development and neighbouring properties.
 - BE19 - the development would not complement the character of the local area.
 - BE20 - there would be a significant loss of daylight.
 - BE21 - the development would be excessively bulky.
- The lack of WC facilities on the ground floor was a concern as the premises may not be suitable for disabled persons in the future.
- The eaves of the house would be deep and in breach of the 45 degree rule.
- The area of the garden would be reduced, resulting in it only being possible to park three cars, instead of four.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- The footprint of the proposed dwelling was comparable to the plans that had previously been approved.
- There would be a minimum distance of 1.5 metres between the development and the property boundary, with there being a 4 metre gap to the boundary of number 53 Wieland Road.
- The elevation of the proposed development was less than that of the previously approved plans.
- The development ensured that sufficient green space would be retained and the development would amount to a high quality family home.

In response a Member question, it was confirmed that a condition could be added to ensure the provision of a ground floor WC. There were also concerns about the compliance of the development with the 45 degree rule.

It was clarified that there was no requirement for four off road parking spaces to be provided. As at least two spaces would be provided this was, therefore, not relevant to the planning decision.

It was questioned why there were concerns about the current proposals as there did not appear to be a significant difference between the plans under consideration and the previously approved proposals in terms of the distance between the dwelling and the site boundary. Following discussion, there was a consensus that the proposed building did extend too far, especially at the front of the premises.

Members agreed with the officer proposal to reject the application as the development would not be in keeping with the special character of the area and it was felt that making an exception by approving the application could set a precedent.

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

RESOLVED: That: the application be refused as per the officer recommendation.

72. **19 WOODLANDS AVENUE, RUISLIP 68835/APP/2015/2369** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Single storey side/rear extension involving demolition of attached garage to side.

Officers introduced the report, noting that the application related to a two storey semi-detached property. A verbal change to the officer report was requested to note that a petition in support of the application had been received after publication of the agenda.

The proposed depth of the extension was 4.0 metres. This was 0.4 metres deeper than was normally permitted by the HDA Residential Extension guidance. However, a 4 metre deep single storey rear extension had previously been approved in 2013.

It was confirmed that the single storey element of the extension would extend beyond the wall of the single storey rear extension at no.21 Woodlands Avenue by approximately 1.17m. This and the separation distance from the property at number 21 were considered to be acceptable.

Overall, officers considered the proposals submitted to be acceptable and recommended that the application be approved.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners supporting the proposals, who was also the applicant, addressed the meeting.

The petitioner supporting the proposals made the following points:

- The previous applications submitted included off street parking for two cars. The applicant's family now had three cars, but as they worked at different times, it would be rare for all cars to be present at the property. Any parking issues in the street were not caused by the applicant or their family.
- The petitioners had been successful in having their petition in support of the application signed by immediate neighbours and by some other people living further away from their property.
- The applicants did not wish to make any improvements to the driveway until the extension work had been completed as any work that had been undertaken could be damaged by construction of the extension.
- The existing fencing and separation from neighbouring properties ensured sufficient privacy and in any case, the family had no intention of invading the privacy of others.

- The proposals would not cause a noticeable reduction in natural light available to neighbouring properties.
- 53 neighbouring properties had previously had plans of a similar nature approved.

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

In accordance with the Council Constitution, Councillor Michael White, ward Councillor for Cavendish, addressed the Committee.

Councillor White made the following points:

- The role of the Council was to unify communities and the public should be able to have confidence that decisions made had the full weight of the Committee behind them.
- A number of previous applications had been made in relation to the property and the Committee was urged to be careful and to ensure that the correct decision was made.

It was noted that the plans submitted met requirements in terms of the number of parking spaces provided and that any other parking issues within the area were not relevant to the application under consideration.

RESOLVED: That: the application be approved as per the officer recommendation.

73. **FOOTWAY ADJACENT TO AUTOCENTRE NORTHWOOD, PINNER ROAD, NORTHWOOD 67084/APP/2015/2708** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Footway adjacent to Autocentre Northwood, Pinner Road, Northwood. The installation of a 17.5 metre street works pole supporting 6 x antennas and 2 x 300mm dishes, 4 x ground based radio equipment cabinets, 1 x cabinet and ancillary development.

Officers introduced the application which requested the installation of a 17.5 metre telecommunications mast and associated equipment. There were concerns about the visual appearance of the proposals and about pedestrian safety due to the clutter that the development would cause to the street scene. For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

The Committee asked whether the existing mast at the site was of similar height to the proposed mast. Officers confirmed that it was, but that refusal of the application under consideration was being recommended because of the appearance of the proposed new mast and because of the proposed location of associated items.

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

RESOLVED: That: the application be refused as per the officer recommendation.

74. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT - LANGSIDE, LARKSWOOD RISE, PINNER, HA5 2HH - ENF/606/15/** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Enforcement Action in relation to Langside, Larkwood Rise, Pinner.

Officers introduced the report, which related to an alleged breach of planning control at a property called Langside in Larkwood Rise, Pinner.

Two planning permissions had been granted in relation to the premises earlier in 2015. A number of complaints had been received, with the main concerns being that the development was higher than approved and that it did not bear any resemblance to the approved plans.

Officers advised that a planning officer had measured the height of the building and found that the height was correct. It was acknowledged that the development did not reflect any of the approved plans in their entirety. However, each element of the development was in accordance with at least one of the plans. It was noted that the applicant was entitled to submit multiple plans and then build elements of each at different times. Officers were, therefore, recommending that the enforcement investigation be ceased and no further action taken on the basis that there was no breach of planning control at Langside.

The Committee questioned whether the plan would be considered acceptable if the application had been submitted as a single planning application rather than as separate applications. Officers advised that each application was considered to be acceptable individually, but that in combination, they would amount to over development.

Members asked whether there had been previous discussion at Committee about compliance of the previous applications in relation to Planning Policy BE13 (excessive bulk). Officers confirmed that there had not been discussion as the applications had been determined by officers under delegated authority, and therefore, had not gone to Committee.

Members also expressed concern that the plans they had considered at a previous meeting had not been consistent with the construction that had taken place at the premises. It was requested that steps be taken to avoid this in the future.

The legal advisor confirmed that, in order for enforcement action to be taken, there needed to be evidence that the development was unacceptable in planning terms. It also needed to be expedient for enforcement activity to be undertaken. The Chairman noted that there was a higher threshold for enforcement activity than there was for refusal of an application.

Some Members expressed regret that there were no planning grounds for enforcement action to be taken.

The recommendation to agree that the enforcement investigation be closed was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee agree to make the officer reports and the minutes for the item public. This was because there was no longer a need to keep the item confidential as no enforcement action was to be taken. It was also noted that there had been a significant public interest in the planning applications at the property.

RESOLVED: That:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The enforcement investigation be closed as per the officer recommendation. 2. The officer report and associated minutes be released into the public domain.
75.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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><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>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.15 pm, closed at 8.15 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.