

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

3 August 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), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, Manjit Khatra (Labour Lead), John Morse and John Oswell.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) and Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Jyoti Mehta (Legal Adviser) and Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
35.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
36.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
37.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 21 JUNE 2016 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held 21 June 2016 were agreed.</p>
38.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
39.	<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 heard in public, and those marked Part II would be heard in private.</p>
40.	<p>52 BUSHEY ROAD ICKENHAM - 71297/APP/2016/529 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>One two storey 4-bedroom detached dwelling and one single storey 3-bedroom detached bungalow with associated off-street parking spaces, bin/cycle storage and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front (involving demolition of garage to side/rear).</p>

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. The application had previously been deferred for a specific reason, and the updated report demonstrated that the impact of overlooking on number 58 from the proposed development was not of concern to officers, and as a result it was recommended to delete condition 10, that a window to the rear would need to be glazed.

A petition in objection had been received, and in the absence of the petitioner or a representative their written statement was circulated to Councillors prior to the meeting. It was confirmed by the Chairman with Members that all had read the petitioner's submission.

The applicant spoke in support and raised the following points:

- The application reflected changes made following discussion with officers.
- It was proposed there would now be only one vehicular crossover, preserving more on-street parking.
- One proposed property had been reduced in size and bulk and was now a bungalow.

A Member requested clarification regarding any loss of sunlight to neighbours or the property itself, to which officers confirmed that there was sufficient distance for this not to be a problem, and that each habitable room had an outlook of sufficient size to satisfy officers.

A Member, returning to the petitioner's letter, enquired about the possibility that the development may allow access to and from Chiltern Road. Officers responded that existing conditions could be adapted so that no access was allowed.

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

Resolved:

- **That the application be approved, subject to the inclusion of an informative to the wording of condition 5 highlighting the Council's desire to protect the existing hedges on the site.**

41. **57 COPSE WOOD WAY - 24862/APP/2015/3571** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Two storey, 5-bedroom, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace to include 2 front dormers, 1 rear dormer, integral garage, parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling (Additional information received).

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum. The application had previously been deferred, due to concerns relating to impact on neighbours and a request for a shadowing diagram.

A petitioner distributed a written document and, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- The petitioner was addressing the Committee on behalf of 40 residents who had signed the petition.
- That square footage of the proposed development would be an increase of 92% on the present house, and the footprint would increase by 26%.
- It was policy for developments not to protrude beyond the existing building line,

but this property did so in front of the building lines of numbers 55, 57 and 59, and would not step down as other houses did on the street. This set a worrying precedent and would dilute the special character of the street.

- The most recent designs transgressed the 45 degree line with a neighbouring property, though the officer report stated that it did not.
- The petitioner indicated overshadowing diagrams, stating that the proposed development would deprive existing properties of daylight from 1p.m. in summer, and likely at all times in winter.
- The development contradicted numerous policies designed to preserve the visual amenity of neighbours, and the plans should be rejected.

A representative of the agent, speaking in support, raised the following points:

- Though the proposed development did sit within the 45 degree angle for overshadowing, it did not contravene policy as this was only in plan form and not in elevation.
- The centre of the rear garden of number 55 would receive 8 hours of sunlight on the day of the spring equinox, more than the required 2.
- The height of the property had been raised by 200mm in the plans, and described by officers as *de minimis*.
- The current gap between properties would actually increase, affording views of the trees through the gap.
- The property was located on the curve of the street, and there was no standard distance from the street for houses.

The Chairman requested that officers clarify the debate regarding the 45 degree line of overlooking and overshadowing. Officers responded that the proposal was within minimum requirements. Specialist surveyors had been commissioned, and there were no grounds to challenge their findings.

A Member of the Committee stated his belief that the proposal was overbearing and not in-keeping with the character of the street. Furthermore, it was unreasonable to measure overshadowing from the middle of a garden, and the diagrams indicated that the neighbour would be overshadowed by 3pm. Officers pointed out that these were secondary windows, but the Member confirmed that he could not support the application.

A Member of the Committee stated that he had attended the site visit and noted similar properties across the street. He advised that as officers could confirm the overshadowing was of secondary windows the Committee should adhere to the policy and approve the application.

Members queried the landscaping, to which officers drew attention to condition 5 which established the requirements. An informative designed to preserve the hedges was proposed. A general discussion ensued that the property was not wholly desirable, but was within limits set by Council guidance and the impact on the street scene was acceptable.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being put to a vote was agreed by a margin of 7 in favour and 1 against.

Resolved:

- **That the application was approved, subject to the inclusion of an informative to the wording of condition 5 highlighting the Council's desire**

to protect the existing hedges on the site.

42. **11 SANDY LODGE WAY - 16948/APP/2015/4658** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Erection of two x two storey, 4-bed, detached dwellings to include habitable roofspace and basement with associated parking and amenity space and installation of 1 vehicular crossover.

Officers introduced the report, and noted that the application was returning to Committee following a deferral. The reasons for deferral had been to undertake a site visit, for a hydro-geological assessment, which had been submitted and deemed satisfactory by the Flood Officer, and due to concerns around overlooking of a room which had since been confirmed to be non-habitable.

A petitioner, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- A reason for the previous deferral had been the 2 proposed crossovers near to Grove Road. The new application proposed 1 large crossover, with 4 cars parked in parallel, rather than end on end. This was far more dangerous with the high speed of cars and lorries on the street, and there had recently been an accident.
- The flooding report was inconclusive and sloppy, and provided no further information on flooding caused by the basement.
- The development would overshadow neighbours, and did not comply with Council policy. It was unsympathetic to the neighbourhood in bulk, scale and massing, and approval sent the wrong message to developers.
- The proposed 250% increase in footprint was excessive.

In response to a Member question, the petitioner informed the Committee that the character of the street was varied, but tall and narrow properties would be out of keeping, even on large plots. The Chairman noted that there were two blocks of flats across the street from the proposed development.

The Planning Consultant for the application spoke in support, and raised the following points:

- The current designs had been modified following objections to remove a garage and parking to the rear. This avoided the loss of on-street parking in Grove Road. The new proposals included a crossover of sufficient width to allow cars to exit forwards. The proposed parking arrangements were not dangerous, and replicated elsewhere on the street.
- The flooding report had been based on 3 boreholes, and had been undertaken professionally to the satisfaction of Council officers.
- The impact on number 9 of any overshadowing was limited to secondary windows and there would be a gap of over 3 metres between the properties.
- The street exhibited an eclectic mix of buildings with different profiles and density.

A Member enquired whether the flooding report took into account surface water and flash flooding, to which officers responded that ground water was considered. The development would be on high ground, built on London clay, and water would soak into topsoil and run down the slope. An additional condition had been included to mitigate surface water, and the assessment was that there would be no additional impact based on this development.

Officers confirmed that the development was not in an area of special character, but that materials had been conditioned and permitted development rights removed.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being put to a vote was agreed by a margin of 7 in favour and 1 against.

Resolved:

- **That the application was approved.**

43. **227 EASTCOTE ROAD RUISLIP - 63116/APP/2016/2169** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Single storey rear extension and first floor side extension.

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.

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

Resolved:

- **That the application was approved.**

44. **NORTHWOOD HEALTH & RAQUETS CLUB - 272/APP/2016/1562** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Variation of condition 14 (Operating Hours) of planning permission Ref: 272/DL/93/1539 dated 09/01/1995 (Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 11,938 sq. metres indoor tennis centre with ancillary sports and restaurant facilities, and outside tennis courts).

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. It was noted that comments on the application were upon up to 29 July, and the Head of Planning and Enforcement requested delegated powers to approve the application subject to no late responses raising additional considerations.

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

Resolved:

- **That powers were delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to approve the application subject to no new consultation responses coming forward which, in the view of the Head of Planning and Enforcement, raise new, material planning considerations not already addressed in the Committee's assessment of the application.**

45. **LAND AT JUNCTION OF PADDOCK ROAD - 60595/APP/2016/2391** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Replacement of existing 11.7m high telecommunications monopole with 15m high telecommunications monopole and installation of two stacked equipment cabinets (measuring 0.60m wide x 0.48m deep x 0.70m high) and associated development (Application under Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance).

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Members requested clarification of whether other boxes located on site would be removed, and officers suggested that an additional condition could be imposed.

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

Resolved:

- That the application was approved, subject to an additional condition to require the removal of the existing equipment on the site.

46. **BREAKSPEAR ARMS PUB -10615/APP/2016/1398** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Replacement of decking.

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.

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

Resolved:

- That the application was approved.

47. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13*)

ENFORCEMENT REPORT

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.

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 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

48. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 14*)

ENFORCEMENT REPORT

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.

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 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

The meeting, which commenced at 8.07 pm, closed at 9.30 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on 01895 250833. 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.