

Minutes



North Planning Committee

11 May 2016

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

	<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: Kiran Grover (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer)</p>
178.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>No apologies were received.</p>
179.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
180.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE 12 APRIL MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2016 be agreed.</p>
181.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
182.	<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 agenda items were Part I and would be heard in public.</p>
183.	<p>17 THE AVENUE, ICKENHAM 71616/APP/2016/553 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Single storey outbuilding to rear for use as a workshop involving demolition of existing timber shed (Retrospective).</p> <p>Officers provided an overview of the application and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum, the application site is a detached property located within the Ickenham</p>

Village Conservation Area. The rear garden is long and currently has other outbuildings used as ancillary space to the main house. The street scene is residential with detached properties and long rear gardens. To the rear of the site are the rear gardens of Ivy House Road.

The Lead Petitioner provided a written statement that was circulated to the Councillors before the meeting and hard copies were available at the meeting, the written statement was noted.

"As detailed on the site plan, 17 The Avenue is an L shaped plot which shares a rear boundary with 42 and 40 Ivyhouse Road within the Ickenham Conservation Area. Despite his declaration in the Planning Application, the Applicant has removed several mature trees from the rear boundary between 17 The Avenue and 42 Ivyhouse Road. The said trees were not subject to a TPO but are in excess of 30 years old. I understand that the Council Tree Officer does not have a problem with their removal despite the fact that the Council has a set procedure for the removal of trees within a Conservation Area and such procedure was not followed by the Applicant.

The Applicant has demolished an old wooden shed used for storage of old motor bikes and replaced it with a block built/timber clad pitched roof building described in the application as a workshop. The old shed was not visible to neighbouring properties due to its height (at least 1.5m lower than the new workshop) and because of the screen of trees which have now been removed.

The new building is some 7.5m long by more than 3m wide by in excess of 4m high. A building of great magnitude for a workshop. It has been erected in the "leg of the L-shaped" plot and is not clearly visible from the Applicant's own property. However, to properties bordering at the rear it is the proverbial blot on the landscape as can be seen from the previously submitted photos. It is also clearly visible from Ivyhouse Road, standing in excess of 2m higher than our garage at 42, despite the fact that the Applicant's declaration states that it cannot be seen from the road.

Most of our concerns are of an environmental nature but I feel the Council should be made aware of them in case of future problems.

In view of its height, the Petitioners request the Council to reject this Planning Application and ask for a modified, much lower, flat roofed building in its place. We would also request the Council to prohibit its use for business purposes and request reinstatement of mature trees (not Leylandii) between the aforementioned boundaries to screen any modified building from the view of neighbouring properties.

Indeed it is worthy of mention that as I circulated the Petition in Ivyhouse Road, many residents who have followed the correct procedure when applying for planning permission were extremely concerned that the Applicant went ahead without such permission in the Ickenham Conservation area. In doing so, he has breached bone fide building regulations that other applicants were forced to follow when building extensions/making modifications to property within the Ickenham Conservation Area."

It was noted by Councillors that the outbuilding was not an eyesore and was not part of the boundary. The applicant brought it to the attention of the Committee that the original building had become rotten and the new building was used only as a hobby workshop and had been built sensitively to the local area. It was confirmed that there was electricity in the building but not heating.

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

approved unanimously.

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

184. **COTTESMORE HOUSE, PERKINS GARDENS, ICKENHAM 71579/APP/2016/402**
(Agenda Item 7)

Alteration of parking layout to create 10 additional spaces.

Officers provided an overview of the application and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum; the application sought planning permission to provide an addition of 10 car parking spaces to Cottesmore House, at the front and back of the existing block of flats. Both areas currently provide some parking spaces, as well as soft landscaping, however the proposal seeks to increase the current parking space spaces provided in these areas. The proposal represents an appropriate development, and having considered all material considerations it is recommended that this application be approved.

Two Petitions were received. The following points were made by the first Petitioner who is the neighbouring occupiers:

- No problem with the provision of car parking spaces in Area 2 (North)
- Against the proposed 3 car parking spaces to the front in Area 1 (South)
- Allocating all parking to the rear of the building will keep disruption to a minimum as there are currently 3 building sites operating in our small area
- The 3 car parking spaces to Area 1 will result in the reduction of the small garden area to the front of the building. Residents in the extra care only use the front garden and not the green at the rear of the building, so it makes sense to put all parking to the rear.
- If the 3 car parking spaces to the front are approved, it would result in the residents in extra care, sitting right by the car fumes as they are ill and have not got good health this is not a good thing.

The Second Petitioner made the following comments:

- These parking places are desperately needed.
- Not only visitors but health professionals, tradesmen and outreach carers have the almost impossible task of finding parking for this building.
- If one dares to park in front of the adjoining building a tirade of abusive language is immediately forthcoming from residents there.
- I find it astounding that only 4 publicly available spaces are provided.
- Double parking is a constant problem with cars being blocked in until the owners can be traced.
- The proposal doesn't inconvenience other residents in the area and I am sure that the house owners beside Cottesmore will be only too pleased to have their rented parking spaces left open for their own use, instead of coping with the running battle they presently face from trades and visitors alike.

Councillor Corthorne in his capacity as a Ward Councillor for West Ruislip attended the meeting and spoke on behalf of the Petitioners adding that the lack of parking could leave vulnerable people in isolation if there is nowhere for their visitors or health care workers to park.

Councillors questioned parking space 3 and its proximity to the gazebo questioning whether that space in particular could be deleted and this was met with approval.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to a vote was approved unanimously on the condition that the Head of Planning revising the plan to delete space 3.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation, subject to the Head of Planning being provided with a revised plan omitting parking space P3 from Area 1 at the front of the building.

185. **46 DAWLISH DRIVE RUISLIP 49706/APP/2015/3668** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum, provided an overview of the application. The application site is situated on the south side of Dawlish Road and comprises a two storey terraced dwelling with an existing single storey rear extension serving a kitchen, a front porch and two parking spaces to the front of the property.

It was proposed and seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed to refuse the item.

RESOLVED: That the item be refused.

186. **38 ELGOOD AVENUE NORTHWOOD 8469/APP/2015/3883** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report, noted the addendum and provided an overview of the application.

The application site was located on the western side of Elgood Avenue and comprised a large detached two storey house. The property was brick built with a hipped roof and had an existing two storey side extension and had a single storey extension and glass conservatory to the rear. The property benefited from good sized front and rear landscaped gardens, with parking provision for 2 cars.

The street scene was residential in character and appearance comprising mainly large detached properties.

It was proposed and seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed to approve the item.

RESOLVED: That the item was approved as per the officer's recommendation.

187. **PEMBROKE HOUSE, PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 38324/APP/2016/407** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Officers apologised that they were not able to put the plans in the Committee pack; the papers were being circulated at the meeting.

Officers introduced this application which sought consent for the erection of a detached building to accommodate refuse storage at ground floor and office accommodation above. The proposed building will be located in the North West corner of the site and is approximately 11 metres in length at its longest part on the western boundary and 6 metre in depth. The building would be approximately 2.55 metres to the eaves and 5.3 metres overall in height.

The proposed building by reason of its unacceptable height, scale, size, form and siting is considered to appear visually at odds with the established pattern, scale, form and

design of backland development within the surrounding area, and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and Area of Special Local Character.

Further, by reason of the buildings height and siting, it would appear visually intrusive when viewed from the residents in Pembroke House, and would result in a loss of amenity space for these units, to the detriment of their amenities. The proposal thereby fails to comply with the Councils adopted policies and guidance.

The Agent spoke on behalf of the Applicant in support:

- The statement was inaccurate and that the application was for a covered area for refuse and a small office for two members of staff offering an onsite presence for the flats.
- Historically in 2015 a larger scheme was put forward but this had been revised addressing previous concerns.
- The agent brought to the attention of the committee a typo that changed the word 'refuse area' to 'refuge area'.
- The Agent concluded that the residents of Pembroke House supported the application.

Councillors questioned the Officers and it was decided that clarity was needed.

RESOLVED: That it was unanimous that the application was deferred in order to allow detailed clarification as to how the current scheme compares with the appeal scheme.

ADDENDUM

The meeting, which commenced at 7.20pm, closed at 8.55pm.

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

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.