

## Minutes



**NORTH** Planning Committee

**20 June 2017**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, Manjit Khatra, Jazz Dhillon and Tony Eginton</p> <p><b>Councillors In Attendance</b> Councillor Nick Denys Councillor Jonathan Bianco</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), Alan Tilly (Transportation, Policy and Projects and DC - Transport and Aviation Manager), Zenab Haji - Ismail (Principal Planning Officer) and James McClean Smith (Major Planning Applications Officer)</p>
18.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies received from Cllr Oswell with Cllr Eginton substituting.</p>
19.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
20.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
21.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items marked Part I would be considered in public, and items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
22.	<p><b>EASTCOTE SERVICE STATION - 3689/ADV/2017/16</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum. The application sought permission to install 9x internally illuminated signs and 1x non illuminated sign.</p> <p>A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection of the proposal and made the following points:</p>

- Local residents did not accept the number and size of signs, illuminated or otherwise which had appeared on this site;
- The main issues concerned night time lighting. Unlike nearby sites which were in built up areas, this site was in a conservation area with the river pin behind and close to residential homes. The distance to the back of the homes was and may residents would suffer as a result of the illuminated signs, particularly in the winter when tree foliage would not protect them from the sites.
- Outside daytime the lights were stronger as they are surrounded by unlit area. In winter months the brightness would be felt for a longer period.
- The site was trading and all signs have been installed, along with others that have no permission. Whilst waiting for the Committee's determination on this application the applicant agreed not to turn on the canopy lights.
- Petitioners requested that the ESSO sign continue to be unlit outside day light hours. Illuminated front COOP sign had been installed contrary to the officer's report, which should also be unlit outside of day time hours. Petitioners requested that a condition was added to this effect.
- Petitioner welcomed the recommendation for pump lighting to be refused.
- Overall the petitioner requested for all lights to be unlit at night as canopy and shop lighting were sufficient. The petitioner suggested all lights be off between 10pm - 6am in the winter and summer months.

The Chairman of the Eastcote Conservation panel addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- The Eastcote Conservation panel fully agreed with the concerns raised by the petitioner and local residents.
- The panel had an aim to preserve all aspects of the conservation area.
- The new layout of the shop had affected the local area and meant that there was no "buffer" between the lighting and the river. The light level of the pin far exceeded the optimum.
- The area was also a site of importance for nature conservation and was covered by blue ribbon policies and blue chain policies. The excessive lighting was contrary to the policies.
- The company had not obliged with conditions previously imposed. The lack of fulfilling conditions showed how uncooperative the company had been.
- This current application had six lit panels, including Synergy, Coop, Costa Coffee, Esso and two petrol price indicators. This is five more than previous and the duplication was not necessary.
- The panel was of the view that extra lighting would be detrimental to the river, local residents and the conservation area.
- It was obvious to drivers that there was petrol station on the site and there was no need for excessive lightening.

The agents working on behalf of the applicant for the site addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- The applicant, MRH, now owned Eastcote service station but did not own during previous signage applications made. It could not therefore be held responsible for earlier failings.
- The site was recently redeveloped. It was the first collaboration between the applicant and the COOP group. It had to remain commercially confidential which is why there have been some discrepancies in the signage.
- The application had been re-modified to remove much of the illumination following feedback and remove the shard element of shop signage.

- Night time illumination levels given off by the signs were based on individual perception.
- The application document showed that the degree of lights coming of the signs was very low and would be considered to be absorbed in the exiting neighbourhood
- The applicant was happy with the officer's report and the proposed conditions. The
- Illumination for the flag signs- there had been no objection by highways, the flag sign was what motorists saw from both sides of the road. It allowed drivers to slow their speed down and drive safely.
- The company had reduced the number of signs it usually used and had followed officer's recommendation.

Councillor Nick Denys addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Eastcote and East Ruislip. He agreed with the views put forward by the petitioner and Chairman of the Eastcote Conservation panel. He welcomed the refurbishment of the petrol station, with the addition of the COP shop and commended the positive local development. Eastcote village had kept its green feel and was not as lit up as nearby areas particularly in relation to street lighting. The service station in the village environment close to residents, wildlife the river did not work in the local area. The local residents were asking for more sensitivity.

Members of the Committee deliberated the application. The main issue was the canopy. Members noted that generally lighting had now changed as LEDs were being used. If the lit sign were off, drivers could assume that that service station was closed.

Members were concerned about the impact of light pollution on the river. The Ecology report had signed off the canopy lighting but Members considered that further lighting underneath the canopy could impact the river and this underpinned the refusal. There was a concern that there may be too much signage on the site and it may be cluttered if anything further was allowed. Members noted that there was an illuminated cash machine which was not part of the application.

Members noted that there had been some give and take by the applicant. According to the photo images, Members considered that the flag signs were not particularly lit up. However Members were advised not to read too much into photographs.

In the circumstances, Members compromised to accept the officer's report with the additional condition that the ESSO and COOP signs were switched off during the hours 10 pm - 6 am.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- (1) The application be approved subject to an additional condition; and**
- (2) The Head of Planning be delegated authority to add a condition to ensure that the ESSO sign on the canopy and two CO-OP signs on the shop fascia are switched of between the hours of 10 pm - 6 am.**

**23. 3 OLIVIA GARDENS - 4672/APP/2017/765 (Agenda Item 6)**

Officers introduced the report, which sought planning permission for an outbuilding to be used as an office/ games room. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote,

unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.**

24. **3 ALBANY CLOSE - 72581/APP/2017/1057** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report, which sought planning permission for a conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 1 x front and 3 x rear dormers and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with a Juliette Balcony. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and raised concerns about properties directly overlooking their garden and blocking direct light into the room. The number and size of the windows proposed would also disrupt privacy. Increase in traffic and parking were also causing concerns as driveways and pavements were being blocked.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per the officer's recommendation.**

25. **53-55 THE BROADWAY, JOEL STREET - 5564/APP/2016/3908** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report, which sought planning permission for the change of use of the first and second floor to a 24 hour gym from an office. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner, Chairman from Northwood Hills Residents' Association addressed the Committee, in objection of the application and made the following points:

- There was concern about the number of people accessing the gym by public transport and vehicle.
- Assessment of late and demand was also a concern to local residents as the applicant believed that the number of memberships could rise to 2177. The petitioner reported that 25 percent of these memberships would be for people outside the area. This would cause noise pollution and traffic congestion.
- The petitioner questioned the traffic comparative statement, as it was being compared to a different area which did not include a roundabout and nearby schools.
- The traffic situation in Joel Street was bad and traffic surveys had already been commissioned by the Council.
- 16 car park spaces was just about feasible. With the proposal of 20 staff members, parking would be very limited. The opening of the pub underneath of the gym would also cause parking stress. 10 full time staff members and 5 full time staff this will impact the available parking.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and made the following points:

- This site was being used as an office space and the number of people visiting the offices was comparable to people who would be visiting the gym.
- The benefits of the scheme would include offering people with hectic work patterns access the gym.

- It was estimated that the number of people using the site at any one given time would be 100.
- There was no restriction on the current operation use. Extensive work with the council had ironed out any issues. The proposed conditions would protect residents neighbouring the sites.
- The applicant was committed to ensure that the gym did not impose an adverse impact on the local amenity of neighbours.
- The proposal would increase business in the local area and it was close to a tube station.

Councillor Bianco, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills addressed the Committee. He explained that Northwood Hills was not a town centre but a suburb. All other shops had residential properties nearby. In the last few years Northwood Hills had seen significant improvement, which included improving the car parking for local shops. Most staff members would come by car. Parking was a significant issue and a 24 hours gym would cause issues for local residents.

Members discussed the practicalities of parking, with only 16 car parking spaces available for both staff and gym users. Members noted that this street had many shops offering refreshments and restaurants which meant that there was already limited parking. Parking would also be limited due to vehicles dropping off goods to the pub. The gym operating 24 hours would have illuminated lighting which would also impact local residents who lived nearby. Members did not accept the transport assessments.

Officers explained that that proposed development was in a suburban location with excellent transport links, served by three bus services and tube services. The last train left for Chesham at 10 30pm. The town centre had recently been improved and it was well lit and modernised. Joining a gym was a lifestyle; members paid money to use the service and had an incentive to use the gym. The more gym members used the gym the more familiar they would become with the area. Officers also commented that there are other 24 hour gyms in the Borough.

There were a number of conditions in the report to manage noise issues but Members were concerned about parking stress and light pollution. Members wished to overturn the officer's recommendation on highway grounds; mainly on the basis that there was parking stress in this area and this proposal offered insufficient parking.

A motion to overturn the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED - The officer's recommendation be overturned and the application be refused.**

26. **50 RODNEY GARDENS - 45146/APP/2017/1639** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the addendum. The application sought permission for the removal of fascia to rear elevation; alterations to single storey rear extension including pitched roof with crown; new brickwork to matching existing; retention of extension once altered. Officers made a recommendation for approval.

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

**RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.**

27.	<p><b>78A THE DRIVE - 38308/APP/2017/1130</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The application sought planning permission for roof extensions to provide additional space at first floor level.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</b></p>
28.	<p><b>54 PARKFIELD ROAD - 20899/APP/2016/2376</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, provided an overview of the application and highlighted the addendum. The application sought planning permission to build two x 2 storey dwellings with habitable roof space, outbuildings to rear, installation of vehicular cross over to front and associated landscaping works, involving demolition of existing bungalow. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: The application was approved as per the officer's recommendation.</b></p>
29.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED -</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed;</li> <li>2. That the Committee resolve 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.</li> </ol> <p>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).</p>
30.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED -</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report be agreed;</li> <li>4. That the Committee resolve 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.</li> </ol>

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 7.45 pm, closed at 9.30 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655. 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.**