

Minutes**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

21 June 2016

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors John Morgan (Chairman), Jem Duducu, Jazz Dhillon, Ian Edwards, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Morse, John Oswell and Brian Stead.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
16.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery, with Councillor Brian Stead substituting, from Councillor Manjit Khatra with Councillor Jazz Dhillon substituting and from Councillor Duncan Flynn with Councillor Ian Edwards substituting.</p>
17.	<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>
18.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 31 MAY 2016 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Resolved: That the minutes of meeting held on 31 May 2016 be agreed as accurate.</p>
19.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>No matters had been notified in advance or were urgent.</p>
20.	<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, therefore, be heard in public.</p>

21. **53 PINN WAY, RUISLIP - 1244/APP/2016/342** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Two storey rear extension, part single storey rear extension and two single storey side extensions involving demolition of existing side structures.

Officers introduced the application, noting that the application had previously been deferred from the meeting held on 31 May to enable a site visit to be undertaken. Two letters and a petition had been received in relation to the application.

The single storey rear extension would have a width of 15 metres, a part pitch and part flat roof to a maximum height of 3.4 metres and would project beyond the original rear of the dwelling at a depth of 5.5 metres. The proposals were considered to be acceptable and were recommended for approval. Members were also referred to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

There was no petitioner, applicant or agent present to speak in relation to the application.

A Member stated that it had been agreed previously that a shading diagram would be provided to the Committee in relation to the proposals and that this had not been provided.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was agreed by 8 votes for to 0 votes against, with 1 abstention.

Resolved: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

22. **LAND TO THE REAR OF ROBINS HEARNE & LITTLEWOOD DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 41674/APP/2015/2100** (*Agenda Item 7*)

4 x two storey, 4-bed detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space (Outline planning application for access and layout with some matters reserved)

Officers introduced the application which was for outline planning permission for four houses. Only the means of access to the site and site layout was currently under consideration. It was noted that plans showing the siting and floor plans of the houses were only indicative. The application site lay within the 'Developed Area', as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One and also lay within an Archaeological Priority Area.

The local street scene was primarily residential in character and comprised mainly of two storey detached dwellings. Therefore, the proposals were considered to be in keeping with the character of the area. The application involved the development of garden land and although this would normally be unacceptable, the proposals needed to be considered in the context of other developments that had taken place in the area. There was no policy in place to prevent the development of garden land where this was in keeping with other development in the local area. There were developments close to application site where garden land development had already taken place.

The Committee was advised that the site already had an extensive number of trees on it. Approval of the application was recommended.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the

Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The petitioners represented ten out of eleven houses in the particular section of the street relevant to the application.
- The officer report suggested that previous applications should be taken into account. The petitioners were not aware whether it was the first time that such an application had been considered by the Committee, but it was the first time that such a significant number of residents in the immediate area had objected.
- Petitioners were not experts in planning matters, but they were experts on the local area and had direct personal experience in relation to traffic levels, access and parking issues. Other developments in the area were also having an impact and were reducing the availability of parking.
- The proposals were considered to be too intensive for the location and were out of character with the area.
- Traffic was the main concern of the petitioners. The presence of four houses on the site would make it impossible for the applicant to accommodate adequate on street parking. It was unclear whether eight or 12 parking spaces would be provided. Traffic problems in the close would also increase. The street was too narrow to accommodate extra parking and even pavement parking was likely to obstruct HGVs and emergency vehicles.
- Extra visitor parking would push resident parking 100 yards towards the public highway. This would restrict access to the road. There would also be increased traffic noise and pollution.
- The Committee was asked to reject the application.
- In the event of future applications taking place at the site, it would be appreciated if the procedures for notifying residents could be re-visited.

In response to questions from the Committee, the petitioner further explained the difficulties that larger vehicles faced in accessing the road.

Members expressed unease about the application as it was felt that it was not clear what precisely the Committee was being asked to determine. This was due to the officer report specifying that the application was an outline planning application for access and layout with some matters reserved. Officers advised that the Committee was being asked to determine the principal of the development and showed Members the plans that they would be approving. The more detailed floor plans were not currently for determination and were subject to change. Details of the building elevations and designs had not been provided.

Members would be approving the principal of four dwellings on the site in a specific formation. Planning policies that had changed or entered into force since previous permissions had been granted at the site in the early 2000's had been reviewed. These included policies relating to back garden development within the London Plan, The National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's own policies. The impact that these changed policies had on the officer recommendation had been considered. The general view was that back garden or back land development would be unacceptable. However, consideration needed to be given to the character of the area. In relation to the application under consideration, officers had concluded that the area already had a considerable amount of back land development and therefore, approval had been recommended.

Committee Members expressed concern that approval of the in principle development could make it difficult to refuse future applications at the site. It was considered that the

proposed development of plots 3 and 4 would not be in keeping with the character of the area. The development was back land development and was out of character with the area. In view of this, it was proposed that the Committee should go against the officer recommendation and refuse the application.

It was noted that a similar development in Jackets Lane had recently been considered by the Committee and it was considered that the application under consideration amounted to too much development in the area. Access to the road and the limited turning space for vehicles was a cause for concern as was the potential for overlooking onto neighbouring properties. Approval of the development would contribute towards giving the area a new character, which was then likely to be exploited by future applications. The Council's back land policy was against the development of such land and it was felt that this principle should be upheld.

Officers confirmed that there were not considered to be highways reasons for refusing the application as the proposals met the Council's parking standard. In addition, refuse vehicles would not necessarily have to access the road immediately adjacent to the proposed four properties in order to be able to service them.

It was agreed that the precise wording for the refusal reasons would be agreed outside the meeting and that these would primarily relate to the fact that the application was back land development.

It was agreed to overturn the officer recommendation and to refuse the application. The proposal for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

Resolved: That the application be refused and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of the reasons for refusal in conjunction with the Chairman and the Labour lead.

23. **68 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE - 62664/APP/2016/831** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension involving demolition of garage to side.

Officers introduced the application, which was for an extension to an existing two storey, semi-detached property located on the east side of Raisins Hill. The property was within the Raisins Hill area of special local character. Six letters and a petition had been received in objection to the proposals. The main issues for Members to consider were the impact on appearance and character of the existing property and the street scene and the impact on adjoining occupiers.

The Council's supplementary planning document on residential extensions set out the standards for these aspects. This document required that two storey side extensions for semi detached properties should be set in from the boundary of neighbouring properties by at least one metre and should be set back at least one metre from the main roof elevation, set below the main ridge by at least half a metre and should not be more than half to two thirds the width of the original property. The proposed extension would be set in by more than one metre from the boundary with the neighbouring property, set back from the front elevation by one metre, would have a roof set below the main ridge by half a metre and was not more than half or two thirds of the main width of the original property. Therefore, the two storey side extension would be in full compliance with the Council standards. In relation to the single storey rear extension,

the Council standards required that the depth should not exceed 3.6 metres and the maximum height should not exceed 3.1 metres, for a flat roof. The proposed single storey rear extension also complied with Council policies.

The proposals were not considered to impact unduly on the character and appearance of the existing property or the street scene. Both of the adjoining properties had been extended at ground floor level and in one case, also at roof level. The proposed extensions at the application site did not go beyond the extensions at the adjoining properties. The application was recommended for approval.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The application proposed the conversion of a three bedroom, one bathroom house into a five bedroom, three bathroom house.
- The extension would be of a significant size, with a 74% increase in frontage and a 100% floor area increase. It would be an overdevelopment for the area that would not harmonise with the existing street scene.
- There would be an impact on the street scene and on the area of special local character and the property would be unbalanced when compared to the adjoining semi-detached property.
- It was considered that a number of policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan could be cited as possible reasons for refusal of the application. These included policies BE5, BE13 and BE19.
- The view over the single storey level would erode the area of special local character. The Planning Inspector had considered that the views into back gardens formed part of the setting of an area of special local character as part of an appeal decision in relation to number 2 Raisins Hill.
- The point of the Area of Special Local Character was to try to preserve the character of the area, as it stood. It was questioned what the purpose was of such an area if the development was to be permitted anyway.
- A drainage channel passed directly under the proposed two storey extension. Flood prevention was an important civic amenity for residents. The planning authority had a duty of care to residents with regard to this matter.
- As a compromise, the Committee could consider restricting the development to a single storey extension.

In response to a Member question which asked whether there had been similar developments to the proposals in the vicinity of the application, the petitioner stated that a similar extension had been proposed at number 41 Raisins Hill around two years ago. This had been rejected and subsequently rejected at appeal.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the applicant addressed the meeting in response to the petitioner and made the following points:

- The proposed extension rejected at number 41 Raisins had been different to the type of extension currently under consideration and there was another property in the area that already had a similar extension.
- The applicant had lived in the area for 38 years and had moved to their current house two years ago. Their children were settled into the area and there was a good community spirit.
- The applicant's architect had sought to ensure that the plans were sympathetic

to and complemented the area of special local character.

- It was stated that the proposals were sensitive to the existing street scene and were subordinate to the host property.
- None of the applicant's neighbours had raised objections directly to the applicant. Many of the immediate neighbours had expressed surprise that there had been objections to the application.
- It was proposed that existing bricks from the garage, which was to be demolished, would be reused for the extension to ensure that the appearance of the extension was similar to that of the existing property.
- The proposals would enhance the appearance of the property and result in it becoming a benchmark for others looking to improve their properties.
- Loss of light was not an issue as only one property could be affected and the proposed extension would be further in from the applicant's property boundary than the existing garage that was proposed for demolition. The residents of this neighbouring property supported the proposals.
- Flood risk would not be increased by the proposals. The applicant would be liable for repairs in the event that the culvert on their land was damaged. Discussions had taken place with Thames Water to ensure that the impact of the development was minimised.
- It was requested that the Committee approve the application.

In response to a Member question, the applicant confirmed that they had access to the culvert and that it did not have a cover.

Officers advised that the area of special local character had been recently designated. The designation of an area as having special local character did not necessarily prevent development, which would need to respect the character of the property and the spacing around the property. The design of the extension proposed was in character with the property and the setbacks from the boundary were in compliance with what was normally required in a conservation area.

The possibility of a site visit was discussed. This would be in order to consider how the view would be affected by the proposals.

Members raised some concerns due to the fact that the property was in an area of special local character. However, on balance, given the separations of existing properties in the area, the extension was not considered to cause sufficient detriment for it to be rejected. It was considered that the proposals were in character with the local area and complied with policy and on that basis, they agreed with the officer recommendation for approval.

Officers advised that a condition could be added to request that material samples be provided in advance of construction taking place in order to help ensure that the appearance of the extension matched the existing dwelling. There could be no guarantee of the condition of existing materials if material from the demolished garage was reused. Adding a condition in relation to providing a materials sample would help to overcome this issue.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to a vote, was agreed by 8 votes for to 0 votes against, with 1 abstention.

Resolved: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and subject to an amendment to approval condition number 3 to specify that the applicant must provide material

samples and have these approved by the planning authority prior to building work being commenced.

24. **38 OAK AVENUE, ICKENHAM - 25891/APP/2016/409** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Single storey front, side and rear extensions, raising and enlargement of roof to create a first floor with habitable roofspace to include 2 rear dormers, 2 side rooflights, vehicular crossover to front involving demolition of existing front, side and rear elements.

Officers introduced the applications, which was for front, side and rear extensions for a detached bungalow. The proposal was to raise the height of the roof to allow for the conversion of the bungalow to a two storey dwelling. There would also be single storey front, side and rear extensions and the conversion of the roof to a habitable roof, which would include two rear dormers. A petition had been received in objection to the proposals. The main issues to be considered were the design and appearance of the development, its impact on the street scene and the impact on adjoining properties. The application site was located between a bungalow to the south and a two storey property to the north. Oak Avenue currently contained a mix of two storey houses and bungalows. Therefore, the principle of two storey buildings in the road was not disputed.

The proposed front elevation reflected the design of other two storey properties in the street and the appearance was considered to be in keeping with the area. The depth of the proposed extensions would not breach the 45 degree line of sight from the nearest habitable window of the neighbouring property. There were no windows in the side elevations of either of the two neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of adjoining properties by one metre at single storey level, so would not impact on either of these properties. The dormer windows complied with Council standards. The proposals were not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the property or the surrounding area or on the amenity of the adjoining properties. Accordingly, approval was recommended.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- There had been a similar application for an extension at 34A Oak Avenue in 2003. This application had been refused by Committee and had been dismissed upon appeal. The refusal had been due to a lack of privacy.
- A subsequent application that had included obscured windows had been refused in 2004. These decisions had set a precedent. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights was quoted, which related to respect for one's private and family life.
- In relation to the proposed crossover, the officer report stated that the proposed crossover would be installed on a residential road that did not have a significantly high influx of traffic or vehicular movement. However, there were already high traffic volumes in the morning and mid afternoon due to children being dropped off at a nearby nursery. A local cricket club also generated significant traffic on weekend afternoons.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the applicant addressed the meeting in response to the petition and made the following points:

- The application submitted had taken into account all relevant planning

considerations and pre planning advice had been sought twice in order to minimise any objection from neighbours.

- Extension of the property would future proof it and it enable it to accommodate their children and grandparents who would be moving in.
- There had been a number of previous applications from other householders in the street which had contributed to an increase in traffic.
- The crossover would not cause any difficulties for neighbouring properties and would enable visitor parking to be accommodated.
- Upstairs windows overlooking neighbouring properties would be obscured.
- None of the neighbours to the right hand side of the applicant's property had objected to the proposals. All the objections had come from residents on the left hand side, who would be least affected by the proposals.

Members felt that there would be grounds to reject the proposals if the property was located between existing bungalows but as it was not, it was felt that there was no alternative but to approve the plans.

It was requested that where proposals would result in a change to the footprint of an existing property, that an overshadowing diagram be provided, even if this confirmed that there would be no overshadowing. Officers agreed that increased use would be made of overshadowing diagrams but noted that the application currently under consideration was not one where the provision of such a diagram was likely to assist Members.

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

Resolved: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.

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

Erection of detached building to accommodate refuse storage at ground floor and office accommodation above.

Officers introduce the application, which had been deferred from the Committee meeting held on 11 May 2016 to allow clarification of the differences between the current proposals, the previously refused scheme and the scheme that had been dismissed at appeal. These differences had been set out in detail within the officer report. The length of the building had been reduced by approximately 1.5 metres but the extent of the two storey element had been increased to 11.3 metres, compared to a previous length of 8.6 metres. The first floor of the scheme that had gone to appeal measured 8.51 metres, compared to the 11.15 metre measurement of the current application. The length of the ground floor had been reduced from 12.75 metres to 11.22 metres. The height of the building had been decreased by 200 millimetres and the location of the building had been re-sited. The parking layout had also been altered. The issues for the Committee to consider related to its design, appearance and siting.

The Committee's attention was drawn to comments made by the Planning Inspector who had considered the previous proposal to be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area and that the design and location would be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality. The pattern of development of the current application was not considerably different to that refused by the inspector and the

impact on the conservation area and area of special local character had also not changed significantly. Accordingly, the application was recommended for refusal. Members were referred to addendum sheet circulated. This noted a letter received from the applicant's agent to the Committee Chairman, which had been circulated to the Committee and a proposed amendment to a refusal reason.

In response to a Member question, officers advised that the building was currently proposed to be used as an office, but it was possible that use could be considered for another purpose.

The Committee considered the two storey development proposed to be unacceptable for the location, especially as the length of the two storey element had been increased in comparison to the previous application.

The proposal to refuse the application was proposed and seconded and upon being put to the vote, was refused unanimously.

Resolved: That the application be refused for the reasons set out on the officer's report.

26. **8 WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP - 68915/APP/2015/3776** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Loft conversion with two side dormers and one rear dormer.

Officers introduced the application, noting that the site had a long history of enforcement. The original design of the property was similar to adjoining properties. The applicant had altered the roof, which had been considered to be out of character with the area. Enforcement action had been taken as a result. There had been part compliance with the enforcement notice. The roof had been removed, but the original roof had not been fully reinstated as required by the enforcement notice.

The application currently being considered was recommended for approval, although it was noted that it did not fully comply with the Council's standards. Officers confirmed that this was the first application received by the Council for a particular type of development at the property.

The Committee was not satisfied with the appearance of the proposals and considered them to be out of character with the local area. It was considered that the Committee would not be meeting the Council's design standards by approving the application. It was also noted that the height of one of the dormers in terms of its distance from the roof ridge did not meet the Council's standards by half a metre.

It was agreed to overturn the officer recommendation and to refuse the application. The proposal for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon been put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

Resolved: That the application be refused due to the design and appearance of the building being out of character with the local area and the impact of the dormers on the host property and on the surrounding area. It was delegated to planning officers to agree the precise wording of the reasons for refusal, in conjunction with the Chairman and Labour lead.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.45 pm.

--	--

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655 or democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk. 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.