

Minutes



HILLINGDON
LONDON

NORTH Planning Committee

2 August 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), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Manjit Khatra, John Oswell, Jazz Dhillon and David Yarrow (Reserve) (In place of Jem Duducu)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Zenab Haji-Ismail (Principal Planning Officer), James McClean Smith (Major Planning Applications Officer), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
43.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Duducu, with Councillor Yarrow substituting.</p>
44.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
45.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
46.	<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 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>
47.	<p>21 NICHOLAS WAY, NORTHWOOD - 22734/APP/2017/900 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>Two-storey, five-bedroom detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of existing building.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which sought for the erection of a two-storey, five-bedroom detached dwelling, and noted the addendum, which highlighted a change to condition 6.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and commented that 28 residents signed the petition. Residents were concerned that the projected loss of three trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders in an Area of Special Character would set a</p>

precedent and Members heard that in a quarter of Copse Wood, 57 trees were already approved for removal, and if this projection continued along the rest of the road, over 200 trees would be removed.

Officers confirmed that it was confirmed more than three trees would be removed, but only three were covered by TPOs; two cypress trees and one oak tree. Responding to Members' questioning, it was confirmed by Officers that when these were surveyed, the trees were considered to be of declining quality and would be replaced with high quality trees. Councillors heard that standard practice was to plant small replacement trees, but this could be altered in a landscaping condition should the Committee wish.

Members confirmed that they wished to alter the landscaping condition to ensure that replacement trees were semi-mature, and the officer's recommendation was moved, subject to the change to the landscaping condition and delegated authority to the Chairman and Labour Lead to ensure that Councillors were satisfied with the proposed condition.

The proposal was then seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved, subject to an additional condition regarding landscaping, and delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement, in conjunction with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

48. **1A GROVE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 14379/APP/2017/1592 (Agenda Item 6)**

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

Officers introduced the application for a two-storey, five-bed detached dwelling, and highlighted the addendum, which proposed an additional condition.

A petitioner, in objection, spoke to the Committee and stated that the building is overbearing with very limited changes from a previous application that was refused. Members heard that in contrast with the previous proposal, the readjustment of the dwelling on the site moves it closer to 1 Grove Road, and as the site sits deeper in the plot, it is now closer to the garden, pool and patio of 26 Moor Park Road; with the dormer windows to the rear of the site, this would lead to overlooking of 26 Moor Park Road, and impact on neighbours' amenities.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and commented that changes have been made from the previous application to overcome the reasons for rejection. Members heard that the proposal is smaller, with less impact on the street scene and neighbouring amenities, with the ridge height lower than 1 Grove Road and it set back in the plot to match the existing building line on Grove Road.

Councillor Seaman-Digby, Councillor for Northwood Ward, supported the refusal of the application and informed the Committee that he believed there were minimal changes from the previously refused application, and the impact on amenities and size and bulk of the application, in relation to the plot size, were unacceptable.

Responding to questioning from the Committee, the Head of Planning and Enforcement confirmed that the application met planning policy with regards to overlooking, and the distances between the proposal and 26 Moor Park Lane were acceptable.

Members expressed sympathy with the petitioners, but recognised the work the applicant had done to find a more acceptable proposal and noted that the application complies with planning regulations and would be difficult to refuse.

The Committee stated that they would like to add a condition to ensure obscure glazing was used for the habitable roofspace, and confirmed they also supported a condition to ensure the garage was built for that use only.

The officers' recommendation, subject to the additional conditions, was then moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved, subject to the additional conditions:

1. Obscure glazing was used to the rear windows of the habitable roofspace; and
2. The garage shall be used only for the accommodation of private motor vehicles incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse as a residence.

49. **2 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE, PINNER - 32216/APP/2017/1290 (Agenda Item 7)**

Two two-storey, three-bed semi-detached dwellings with habitable roofspace and associated parking and amenity space.

Officers introduced the application which sought the demolition of the existing dwelling, and the erection of two two-storey, three-bed semi-detached dwellings, and highlighted the addendum, which including an amendment to condition 5.

A petitioner, in objection to the application, addressed the Committee and stated that the proposal was unprecedented in the area. Members heard that the proposal would lead to a loss of light and visual amenity for neighbouring properties, and its size and bulk constituted an overdevelopment that would lead it be 70% larger than over houses in the street. The petitioner noted that the proposed development was very close to the boundary of the site, and noted that the reduced gap with the neighbouring properties on the ground floor was out of keeping with the street scene. Furthermore, it was noted that the building materials proposed were different to the rest of the street.

The agent for the applicant informed Members that two previous applications had been rejected, but the applicant hoped that this proposal had met the planning requirements and addressed previous concerns. The Committee heard that the bulk and size of the application had been reduced and separation differences were improved, along with a reduced roof pitch, removal of dormer windows, and obscured high level rooflights. The agent also noted that the architecture of the proposal matched the street scene, and softened the proposal's appearance.

Members sought clarification regarding the rear dormer windows and rooflights, and were informed that the current plans sought high level rooflights but did not include dormer windows. Responding to questioning from the Committee, the Head of Planning and Enforcement confirmed that a condition could be added to ensure that the rooflights do not protrude too far from the roof.

Councillors expressed concern regarding the materials used in the development and its impact on the street scene, and were informed that condition 3 could be made more robust to ensure that the materials matched those used elsewhere on Raisins Hill.

The Committee moved the officer's recommendation, subject to alterations to conditions 2 and 3, to be agreed under delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement. This proposal was then seconded and, upon being put to a vote, was agreed with four votes in favour, and three votes against.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved, subject to alterations to conditions 2 and 3, and delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.

50.	<p>42 RAISINS HILL, EASTCOTE, PINNER - 27718/APP/2017/1559 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
51.	<p>RUISLIP TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 10105/APP/2017/1329 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
52.	<p>ALDIS HOUSE & WETHERBY HALL, GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD - 68153/APP/2017/793 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Proposed Change of Use of Aldis Hall (from C1 residential to D1 Pre-School Nursery) with associated parking, access alterations and landscaping, and a Change of Use of Wetherby House (from D1 Pre-School Nursery to C3 residential).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which sought the proposed Changes of Use of Aldis Hall to a Pre-School Nursery and Wetherby House to residential, and noted the addendum which included an amendment to condition 5.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application on the grounds of traffic and parking concerns. Members heard that the additional vehicles expected would put further strain on traffic in the area, while the limited set-down and pick-up area on site would not help the road cope with more vehicles, and would only lead to traffic issues as parents queued to drop off children or parked illegally, as the proposed car park is 150 metres from the site and it is not feasible that it will be used consistently by parents. The petitioner also commented that the earlier and later opening times would not make a major difference to traffic problems, as there is little demand for these additional hours at nearby nurseries.</p> <p>The agent for the application addressed the Committee and noted that the number of pupils was capped and traffic management had strong proposed conditions in the hope of addressing concerns of local residents. The earlier and later opening times were proposed to suit the lifestyle of working parents, and it also leads to a large spread of pick-ups and drop-offs to help with traffic management. Members heard that on-site pick-up and drop-off was proposed only for children who were under two years old or had a disability and the Green Lane car park has capacity for the other vehicles.</p> <p>Responding to questions from Councillors, the agent confirmed that the proposal to drop-off and pick-up children under two from the site was a late request, and that this would affect 36 children on a daily basis. The agent also stated that there was no available parking for staff members.</p> <p>Members noted that two local Ward Councillors had both confirmed they objected to the application.</p> <p>The Council's Highways Officer confirmed that the proposal would lead to an extra 154 vehicle movements around the site and the trip generation figures estimated that the busiest time would be between 8-9am when 18 vehicles would use the site. The Committee expressed concern that with 36 pupils under the age of two, the on-site parking would not be sufficient, as it is not so easy for parents to drop-off young pupils quickly and this could cause queuing traffic on the road, in addition to illegal parking or drop-offs.</p> <p>Members commented that the current proposal regarding parking arrangements was not sufficient for the number of vehicles that would be coming to the site, including staff members, and the proposed use of Green Lane Car Park was not deemed practical for</p>

nursery-aged children. In turn, this could result in increased risk to pedestrian and highway safety, especially due to the young age of many of the children. As such, the Committee was concerned that the application would was contrary to planning policy AM7 (ii) regarding the free flow of traffic.

Therefore, a motion to refuse the application, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to confirm the final wording, was moved and seconded. Upon being put to a vote, the motion was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.

53.	10 JACKETS LANE, NORTHWOOD - 70543/APP/2017/1650 (Agenda Item 11)
	Redevelopment of the site to provide four detached single family dwellings with associated car parking, access and landscaping.
	Officers introduced the application, which sought the demolition of the existing detached dwelling, and the erection of four single family dwellings, with one four-bed detached dwelling.
	Members commented that the applicant had worked hard to overcome previous reasons for refusal, and this application was just about within policy. Therefore, the officer's recommendation was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote. RESOLVED: That the application was approved, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.
54.	ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 12)
	RESOLVED:
	That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.
	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.
	<i>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).</i>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.24 pm, closed at 9.39 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Luke Taylor on 01895 250 693. 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.