

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

1 February 2017

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 (In place of John Morse), Beulah East (In place of John Oswell), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins and Manjit Khatra</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Peter Loveday (Highway Development Engineer), Neil McClellan (Major Applications Team Leader), Jyoti Mehta (Trainee Solicitor), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p> |
| 139. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Duducu, Councillor Morse and Councillor Oswell.</p> <p>Councillor Curling and Councillor East attended as substitutes.</p> |
| 140. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p> |
| 141. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 26 OCTOBER 2016 AND 11 JANUARY 2017 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 26 October 2016 were deferred for further information.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2017 were agreed as a correct record.</p> |
| 142. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 143. | <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 the items of business marked Part I would be considered in public, and the items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p> |

144. **THE CASE IS ALTERED PUBLIC HOUSE - 38037/APP/2016/2912** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Minor alterations to existing elevations and minor reconfiguration of car park (Amended Plans received which include omission of previously proposed single-storey extension).

Officers introduced the report, which sought full planning permission for minor external alterations to The Case is Altered Public House. These alterations were primarily related to internal reconfiguration works associated with the desire to improve accessibility and provide increased capacity within the building.

An application for Listed Building Consent had been submitted in parallel with this application, and was Item 7 on the agenda. As such, the Chairman confirmed that these items would be discussed concurrently.

Members noted the addendum, with comments from The Ruislip, Northwood and Eastcote Local History Society, the Eastcote Residents' Association and the Eastcote Conservation Panel.

A petitioner in objection to the application confirmed that he believed the proposed increase in drinking area was excessive. Parking was already a concern to local residents, and more people would exacerbate the issue, as well as creating more noise disturbance and a loss of amenity to the local residents. The local residents supported the pub and agree it is an important part of the community and conservation area, but the effect on the residential area was unsustainable and the latest proposal was an overdevelopment of the site.

The Chairman of the Eastcote Conservation Panel then addressed the Committee, citing the large increase in patrons visiting the pub and its impact upon the traffic flow and parking as reasons for objection. Members heard that the carpark was not sufficient for the number of customers already, and its impact on residents would only get worse with the new proposal. There were concerns that the floor area within the bar would be too crowded for wheelchair access, and the single disabled parking space was a substantial distance from the building. Furthermore, the garden bar would lead to noise disturbances that would adversely affect the local residents.

The Committee then heard from the agent for the application, who confirmed that the proposals were internal and the increase in covers at the venue was not a planning issue. There were also extensive pre-application discussions between the applicant and the Council with the intention of retaining the historic fabric of the building. The agent confirmed that the pub did not propose to use the rear garden for customers, it was solely to serve alcohol. Members heard that the internal alterations were a reorganisation, and not an increase in drinking area, and the applicant would be happy to move the disabled bay closer to the building entrance is needed.

Upon questioning from the Committee, the applicant clarified that the garden bar would be used to serve bottles from a kiosk to customers, but it would not be open to the public for any other purpose.

Cllr Haggar, Ward Councillor for Eastcote and East Ruislip, stated that although officers and the property owners tried to reach a suitable compromise, residents and the local community must be taken into account and there were concerns regarding the garden bar area, car parking and increased local traffic, and an increase in anti-social behaviour such as noise and litter which would all impact upon local amenity.

Members were supportive of the pub and recognised it was important to the local community, but were concerned about the impact of the proposed changes on residents. The Committee questioned whether the area was viable for a further increase in traffic and car parking, but Officers confirmed that the proposal provided a revised parking plan which satisfied the parking requirements for the additional 14 covers.

Councillors confirmed that the internal reorganisation did not need planning consent, and while they were sympathetic to the local residents, there was not a viable planning reason to overturn the officer's recommendation.

The Committee commented that with the garden bar serving bottles, it was important for proper recycling facilities to be available, and confirmed that if approved, they would like a condition to ensure this.

Members moved the officer's recommendation, with the additional condition requesting a litter and waste management plan. The motion was seconded, and upon being put to a vote, was approved with four votes in favour, two against, and one abstention.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was approved, with additional condition requiring a waste management plan.**

145. **THE CASE IS ALTERED PUBLIC HOUSE - 38037/APP/2016/2913** (*Agenda Item 7*)

External alterations, internal reconfiguration and associated works (Application for Listed Building Consent) (Amended Plans received which include omission of previously proposed single-storey extension).

The application was introduced by officers, and sought listed building consent for minor alterations to the external facades of the building and internal reconfiguration works.

This item was discussed with item 6, and the minute for the discussion was included under item 8.

The Committee moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, and upon being put to a vote, there were four votes in favour and three abstentions.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was approved.**

146. **219 SWAKELEYS - 10215/APP/2016/1443** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Two-storey dwelling with habitable basement and roofspace to create six one-bedroom self-contained flats with associated parking, bin store and amenity space (Outline Planning Application with Some Matters Reserved).

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.

A petitioner in objection to the application spoke, and stated that the proposed application would lead to an overconcentration of flatted conversions in the area, that would breach the Council's guidelines of 10% flats along a one kilometre stretch of road. Furthermore, the Committee heard that the dwelling's bulk would be overbearing and have a detrimental impact on Nos. 1, 3 and 5 Roker Park due to its height and impact on visual amenity. The proposed dwelling would also be too close to the properties at Roker Park, and back onto the side boundary to No. 3 Roker Park, creating privacy and security concerns, and a loss of trees and vegetation. The

petitioner also told the Committee that the reduced run-off area for water would increase the flood risk, and traffic, parking and access issues would also impact upon local residents.

The architect for the application then spoke on behalf of the applicant, and confirm that the property would be further away from Nos. 3 and 5 Roker Park than it is currently, while the angle of the roof would reduce the impact on those properties. In addition, three of the four windows that overlooked Roker Park would be made of obscured glass, and parking concerns could be alleviated by a yellow line in the area.

Responding to Members' questioning, officers confirmed that they did not believe the application would breach the Council's threshold of 10% for flatted conversions, but conceded that it was very close to going over the threshold.

The Committee questioned the bulk and building line of the proposed dwelling, and confirmed after questioning officers that they were content there would not be an impact of overshadowing on properties in Roker Park. There was concern that the dwelling would be very close to properties in Roker Park, and Members commented that the application would be visually intrusive for Nos. 3 and 5 Roker Park.

The Chairman noted that there was concern among Members regarding the application, and commented that a site visit was an option for the Committee should they wish to better understand the layout of the site.

Councillors confirmed that a site visit would be helpful, and proposed deferring the application. Members seconded and unanimously agreed the proposal, confirming that the deferral could also be used to clarify that the proposal did not exceed the 10% flatted conversion guidelines and undertake a site visit.

– **RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.**

147. **1A GROVE ROAD - 14379/APP/2016/3279** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Two-storey, five-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space, involving the demolition of the existing bungalow.

Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum which contained an alteration to condition 4. The application sought the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a two-storey, five-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking an amenity space. However, it was noted that the floor plans indicated additional rooms in the loft space, some of which would be capable of being occupied as additional bedrooms, and as such the proposal was considered a six-bed property.

The Committee was addressed by a petitioner in objection to the application, who commented that there were amendments to the application due to concerns from objectors but the impact upon neighbouring properties remains too overbearing. Members heard that the plot size was not large enough for the proposed dwelling and the impact on privacy and visual amenity would adversely affect the neighbouring properties.

The agent then spoke to Members and stated that the street scene already has large, wide, two-storey dwellings. The current proposal ensured overlooking was respected with the distance from neighbouring properties, and was not out of context with the street scene. The current bungalow was more out of keeping with the current street scene and the application would enhance Grove Road.

Councillor Lewis, Ward Councillor for Northwood, commented that the proposed dwelling was un-neighbourly and overbearing, and would cause harm neighbouring amenity, particularly at Nos. 24 and 26 Moor Park Road. New proposals should complement the amenity of the area, and this plot was not big enough to house the proposed dwelling, unlike other neighbouring properties.

Members commented that there were issues with the bulk and mass of the proposed dwelling on the site, and officers confirmed that there would be overshadowing of neighbouring properties in the morning. The Committee also expressed concerns that the dwelling was too large for the current plot, and would have a detrimental impact upon the street scene.

A motion to refuse the application was moved, due to the impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene and bulk and size of the proposal, and this motion was seconded and unanimously agreed upon being put to a vote.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was refused, with the Head of Planning given delegated authority to confirm the reasons for refusal.**

148. **47 - 49 HIGH STREET - 46454/APP/2016/427** (*Agenda Item 10*)

First and second floor rear extension to create four two-bed and one one-bed self-contained flats with associated cycle spaces.

Officers introduced the application, which sought approval for a first and second floor extension to provide four two-bedroom and one one-bedroom self-contained flats on the first and second floors of the application building. Members noted that there was a petition in objection to the application.

The Committee confirmed there was no reason to overturn the officer's recommendation, and moved, seconded and unanimously approved the recommendation.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was refused.**

149. **6 FLOWERS AVENUE - 72269/APP/2016/4278** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Single storey rear extension.

The application which sought to erect a single storey rear extension was introduced by officers.

The Chairman confirmed that similar applications had been approved nearby, and Members commented that they were happy with the conservatory.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

- **RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

150. **CORNERWAYS - 18414/APP/2016/3792** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Variation of condition No.6 (Attendance Numbers) of planning permission ref:

18414/APP/2016/2486 dated 07/10/2016 to increase enrolment numbers from 30 to 60 (change of use from Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) to Use Class D1 (Non-Residential Institution) for use as a children's day nursery with associated parking and landscaping).

Officers introduced the application which had been deferred from the Committee meeting on 11 January 2017 to address concerns raised on potential highways impact of the application. Members also noted the addendum, which included accident data for the junction between Rickmansworth Road and Green Lane, confirming that there was just one incident in the three year period between 1 August 2013 and 31 July 2016, and this was a minor accident involving a shunt between two vehicles.

Members welcomed the favourable accident report but commented that they would have liked to have seen more information on the flow of traffic in the area, and the impact people stopping to drop of children or turn into the site would have had on traffic flow.

Officers confirmed that the applicant has offered very supportive measures to assist parents and children in getting to the site, and traffic flow into the site would not be very heavy at any one time. Responding to Members, officers confirmed that it would be possible to prevent right turns into Cornerways from Green Lane, thus preventing cars from stopping the traffic flow to turn right. The Council's Highway Development Engineer confirmed that this was possible with minor works by extending the traffic island, and it was acceptable to ask the applicant to meet this cost in the s106 agreement.

Members confirmed they were happy with this development, and moved the officer's recommendation with an additional condition amending the s106 agreement to allow an extension of the traffic island on Green Lane that would allow cars to only turn left in and out of the site. This proposal was seconded, and unanimously agreed upon being put to a vote.

- **RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to an additional condition in the s106 agreement.**

151. **91 JOEL STREET - 45536/APP/2016/3092** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to restaurant/pub/hot food takeaway (Use Class A3/A4/A5), involving installation of bin and cycle stores.

Officers introduced the application which sought to change the use of the site from a shop to a restaurant/pub/hot food takeaway, involving installation of bin and cycle stores.

Members commented that there were a number of takeaways in the area already, but it was preferable to have the site active than inactive. The officers recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed upon being put to a vote.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was approved.**

152. **5 MAYCROFT - 67893/APP/2016/2836** (*Agenda Item 14*)

Extension to roof over existing single-storey rear extension and extension to existing dormer to create additional habitable roof space (amended description).

Officers introduced the application which sought an extension to the roof over existing single-storey rear extension and extension to the existing dormer to create additional habitable roof space. This scheme was amended, and following negotiation, the proposed new dormer windows which were facing towards No.4 Maycroft were removed and the extended side dormer was set back an addition metre from the back elevation of the extended dwelling.

The Committee heard that the application was now policy compliant, and Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was approved.**

153. **HILLINGDON BOROUGH FOOTBALL CLUB - 17942/APP/2016/3158** (*Agenda Item 15*)

Installation of three temporary changing room cabins.

Officers introduced the scheme, which sought to replace the existing changing room building with three temporary changing rooms due to the presence of asbestos in the existing structure.

Members confirmed they were happy with the proposal, providing it was temporary. The officer's recommendation was then moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

- **RESOLVED: That the application was approved.**

154. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 16*)

RESOLVED:

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

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 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 250636. 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.

