

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 March 2016



HILLINGD
LONDON

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Morse and John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Mandip Malhotra (Interim Major Applications Manager) Tim Brown (Legal Advisor), Syed Shah (Highways Officer) and Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
144.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
145.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
146.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD 5 JANUARY 2016 AND 20 JANUARY 2016 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Minutes of the meetings held 5 January 2016 and 20 January 2016 were agreed.</p>
147.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
148.	<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 items marked Part I would be considered in public, and those marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
149.	<p>81 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE, PINNER - 363/APP/2015/3827 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and noted the addendum. Members were informed that the recommendation was what officers would have recommended, had the application not already been appealed for reasons of non-determination. Eastcote Conservation Society had suggested additional reasons for refusal which were deemed to be at risk of being overturned at</p>

appeal.

A petitioner speaking in objection on behalf of two petitions addressed the committee and raised the following points:

- There had been no submission of a groundwater or drainage survey, which had prevented full consideration of the application.
- The proposed development had balconies overlooking a busy road which would allow pollution into the building, and there had been no air pollution survey.
- There was only very small space designated for staff.
- There were already 4 pharmacies in Eastcote, and the petitioner doubted that it would gain government funding.
- Trees had already been cut down, and the landscaping proposed for the roof was hard landscaping.
- The building opposite was sheltered housing.

In response, officers clarified that the proposed development site was not in an air quality management area, and therefore did not require a report.

A petition in support had been received though no one was present to speak on behalf of the signatories. The Chairman confirmed that a letter from the applicant had been received and was circulated to Members of the Committee on 1 March 2016.

Members commented that they were concerned about loss of light to neighbouring buildings, and their attention was drawn to Refusal Reason 2 which cited loss of light.

The motion for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- That the application would have been refused, with the additional informative that to ensure safe access and egress from the basement ramp it would have required details of a shuttle signal system via planning condition. The Council would also have added a further planning condition requiring submission of a parking allocation scheme for the residential units and visitor parking.

150. **12A NORTHWOOD ROAD, HAREFIELD - 45363/APP/2015/3363** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. This included a grampian condition to ensure that access to the proposed car park to the rear was secured prior to any development.

A petitioner speaking in objection addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- The petition had been signed by all local residents consulted.
- There were already 2 dental surgeries located on the nearby high street.
- Petitioners had not seen proof that this would be an NHS practice.

- The parking provision was insufficient with only 4 spaces.
- There was ongoing legal action regarding the access to parking, and it was surprising that the application had been allowed to progress this far. There was not room for 2 cars to pass on the access.
- There were already problems with parking on the street and there had been numerous collisions.
- A previous application for a practice at number 52 Northwood Road had been rejected, and the petitioner could discern no difference in the new application.
- The opening of a dental practice would remove much-needed housing.
- The proposed hours of activity (11 hours Monday-Friday, 5 hours on Saturday) would be disruptive of a quiet, family life for neighbours, who would be applying for a rate reduction.
- Some trees had already been removed.

Members requested clarification of the status of the two nearby dental practices. The petitioner confirmed that both were private, but believed that they may be tendering for NHS status.

The applicant speaking on behalf of a petition in support addressed the Committee and raised the following points:

- Harefield had a great reputation for NHS services, but did not have an NHS dentist. The area had been identified by NHS England as an area for an NHS practice.
- The NHS had confirmed the successful tender for the practice proposed at 12A Northwood Road.
- The petition had garnered 110 signatures.
- The applicants were an established group of dental practices, and had worked with the NHS for over 30 years.
- Commercial units had been considered, but none had been suitable.

The Chairman confirmed with the applicant that they had received confirmation of a successful tender for NHS status, and enquired regarding the condition for access to the proposed rear parking. The applicant responded that without access this would prevent the practice from opening.

A Member asked the applicant to comment on what planning rather than policy reasons supported the application. The applicant responded that there was limited availability of commercial units, none of which provided sufficient space.

A Member asked for an estimate of the proximity of the nearest dentist and the applicant advised that this would be in either Hillingdon, Uxbridge or Moor Park. Harefield residents had to travel approximately 8-11km to an NHS practice.

A Member of the Committee advised that the photographs of the street in the introduction did not indicate the usual level of traffic on the road. Even with the rear parking it appeared to be insufficient space. Another member questioned whether 2 parking spaces for visitors was sufficient for 4 consulting rooms. Officers clarified that there were no standards for car parking, only cycle parking, and that as the applicant had indicated 2-3 cars

per hour were anticipated this was deemed to be adequate. Members were advised that they could condition a booking system for parking if they remained concerned.

Members questioned the removal of trees, to which officers responded that the application had provision for retaining several trees and protecting the roots. The Tree Officer had raised no concern regarding the trees that had already been removed.

Members questioned the acoustic fencing proposed for the rear access. Officers responded that the neighbouring property was only partially protected by this, and suggested making 2 of the 3 rear parking bays staff parking to reduce passage along the access road during the day.

Members commented that they were perturbed by commercial development in a residential area, and expressed surprise that a commercial unit could not be identified. Though an NHS dentist was welcome and Members accepted that demand existed, the choice of location was questioned. The high level of traffic on the road was also discussed as a reason why the location may not be suitable.

Officers informed Members that they had the option to defer the application to allow the applicant time to address the highway concerns and the grampian condition for access to parking, and this suggestion was endorsed by the Chairman.

The motion for deferral was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- That the application was deferred.

151. **LAND AT JUNCTION OF WARREN ROAD & SWAKELEYS DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 65862/APP/2016/261** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. Officers clarified that the report implied that this application was an upgrade to an existing mast, when it was in fact an application for a new mast. Members were advised that they could only consider the mast itself and not associated cabinets which fell under permitted development. Since a previous application, the applicant had reduced the diameter and changed the colour of the proposed mast.

A petitioner spoke in objection, and raised the following points:

- This was the fourth application for a mast at the location, and the applicant did not understand or address residents' concerns.
- The application had changed and the number of cabinets reduced, but this remained an unspoiled green area, and the wrong site for a mast.
- Several locations had been discounted based on trees and views from Swakeleys House, but seemingly the views of residents were not relevant.
- The application had overstated the problem of trees, and in fact good

practice was to conceal masts in trees.

- This location had only been chosen due to access to the phone network and power, considerations that were only relevant to the applicant's costs.
- The applicant's assessment that the mast would be assimilated into the surroundings was incorrect.

A representative of the applicant spoke in support, and raised the following points:

- The application had been adjusted for bulk and colour in order to help hide it in trees. This compromise minimised the impact on the conservation area.
- The mast would provide much needed 3G and 4G capacity to the area.
- A similar pole, on the edge of the green belt, was noted by the appeal inspector not to impact on the green belt.
- Alternative sites have repeatedly been sought, but this was the best technical location.
- There was no material reason to suggest a refusal.

A ward councillor spoke and raised the following points:

- Swakeleys Park offered an alternative site.
- With the anticipated arrival of 5G coverage, this could be permitted with a larger pole away from houses.
- The applicant wants to site the mast right by the roadway, and not set back.
- The developer images of the site were helpful, but the angles were selective and did not show the proximity of housing.

A Member of the Committee referenced the report of the conservation officer that the application was in an open, green area of land as a reason why the proposed location was unsuitable. Officers responded that the applicant had provided a detailed survey of other sites and none had been found to be suitable. Members were reminded that this had not been a previous reason for refusal.

Members requested a comparison of the previous application, to which officers responded that the applicant had in their view gone to sufficient lengths to address concerns over the visual impact for reasons of bulk and colour. Members discussed the extent to which changes to the application had reduced the visual prominence of the mast. Though one member expressed support for the applicant's changes, other Members of the Committee expressed discomfort with the prominence of the mast.

A motion for refusal was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed with 7 Members in favour with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

- That the application was refused.

Officers introduced the report, and noted the addendum.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points:

- The proposed change to the application sought to move garages on the property layout. This was not consulted on for 21 days, and residents had not had the due chance to comment.
- An independently commissioned light survey showed a reduction in light for the neighbouring property.
- Windows in the new development would look into the kitchen and bedroom at a distance of 3.5 metres.
- The proposed development protruded an additional 3-5 metres into the garden, increasing the bulk. This would be an increase of 250% compared to the existing building.
- Officers were not enforcing existing flooding policy.
- Subdividing into 2 units sends the wrong message to developers and erodes the character of the area.

A Member enquired about the weight of traffic on the road, to which the petitioner responded it was very high at key times and often moving dangerously fast.

A representative of the applicant spoke in support of the application, and raised the following points:

- The character of the road was very mixed, with detached and semi-detached, and some intensive detached housing with similar and greater footprints than the proposed development.
- Due to objections to the garages at the rear, this application moved them to the front of the property in order to preserve a tree and reduce impact on parking.
- There would be no reduction in sunlight to the neighbouring property as this was to the south. The main source of light was from the west which would not be impeded, and the applicant has removed a tree already which allows more light to the neighbouring property. A garage near to this house was to be demolished, and the windows would be a further 1.6 metres away and glazed.
- The proposed development is not dissimilar to neighbours, and there has always been a mutual overlooking.

The Chairman requested clarification of which rooms would be overlooked, to which the representative of the applicant confirmed it would be the kitchen and what the plans showed as a dressing area.

A Member asked if a flood report would be prepared, which the representative of the applicant confirmed and said that any problems raised could be mitigated.

Cllr Richard Lewis, ward Councillor for Northwood, submitted comments to the Committee in advance which were read out by the Chairman:

"I would be grateful if you were to pass to the Chairman and Committee Members my objections to this application with my ward. Firstly I would ask the Committee to accept that there is considerable local opposition to this application. For my part, I am greatly concerned about the loss of light for 9

Sandy Lodge Way as well as their loss of privacy. It would appear to be an overdevelopment which would greatly increase the density of housing on a relatively small plot of land and I also have major reservations as I believe the development would change the nature and character for the worst of this very pleasant road. For all the above reasons I would ask the Committee to reject this application."

The Chairman asked officers to comment on the requirement to reconsult over the changes to the layout. Officers confirmed that there was no obligation to reconsult when the biggest change was repositioning two parking bays.

The Chairman asked officers to comment on the changes to access. The Highways officer stated that access was close to a junction which was problematic, and ideally would be a joint access instead of the present location.

A Member commented that the glazed windows were sufficient to address concerns of overlooking, but asked officers to comment on questions regarding light. Officers responded that the projection was the development would not lead to a loss of light.

A Member commented that they remained concerned by the overlooking, the effect of the basement, and also potential changes to the character of the road. Members discussed further consideration of these concerns, and attending a site visit for greater understanding.

The motion for deferral was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- That the application was deferred pending a site visit.

153. **51 HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 70450/APP/2015/4598** (*Agenda Item 10*)

RESOLVED:

- That the application was withdrawn.

154. **LANGLEY FARM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 30836/APP/2014/2107** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.

Members commented that given the condition of the buildings in photos they were pleased that action was being taken to redevelop them.

Officers clarified that the permission would be for ancillary use and would ensure the building was used by the residents and not as a new dwelling.

The motion for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

	<p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application was approved with the additional condition of the removal of permitted development rights at the site.
155.	<p>LANGLEY FARM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 30836/APP/2014/2109 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application was approved
156.	<p>37 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 24043/APP/2015/3509 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns that this application represented a slippery slope which would change the character of the neighbourhood if subdivision was permitted. Officers responded that as subdivision could lead to significant problems, the Council policy was that a maximum of 10% of dwelling could be subdivided in a defined area. At present, this development was compliant with the rule, and future development could be restricted. Officers confirmed that other recent applications that had been approved had been included in this calculation.</p> <p>Members enquired about the impact on traffic, and officers clarified this was expected to be minimal and not a grounds for refusal.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded and upon being put to a vote was agreed with 6 Members in favour with 2 abstentions.</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That the application was approved.
157.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - That: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, be agreed; and 2. the Committee releases its 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</i></p>

	<i>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>
158.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 15)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">- That:</p> <p>1. the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, be agreed; and</p> <p>2. the Committee releases its 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 9.42 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Alex Quayle on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank