

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

23 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), Jazz Dhillon Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Morse and John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Edward Oteng (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement)</p>
55.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Khatra and Councillor Morse was substituting.</p>
56.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Flynn declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 9 and stated that he acted for a coffee chain in his professional career therefore would not be voting on that item.</p> <p>Councillor Oswell declared a non-pecuniary interest in the enforcement item on the agenda.</p>
57.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 2 August 2017 were agreed.</p>
58.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
59.	<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 1 would be considered in public and items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
60.	<p>52 FIELD END ROAD - 4913/APP/2016/4358 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which sought to erect a 3-bed detached dwelling</p>

and to convert a dwelling house into 2 self-contained units.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that residents had two primary concerns. The first concern related to the proposed 'garden house'. The petitioner stated that some residents of The Sigers would be overlooked by the new development and would also inevitably be overlooking the new garden property themselves. The petitioner also stated that, according to the planning officer's report, the distance between the proposed garden house and The Sigers properties was approximately 21m which was the minimum distance required. The second concern related to the conversion of the main house into two flats. The petitioner claimed that conversions of this kind were proliferating in the area at the expense of larger houses. It was suggested that further reasons for refusal could therefore be added to the decision notice.

The applicant addressed the Committee stating that the division of the existing house into two flats appeared to meet all the Local Authority requirements so he wanted to focus on the new build. The applicant advised that he had sought pre-application advice and the position and design of the development was as proposed by the Planning Officer. It was claimed that the Planning Officer had stated in a report to the applicant that he had no objections in principle either to the proposed conversion of the main house or to the garden house. One of the concerns raised related to the back drop to the listed Tudor Lodge Hotel. The applicant referred to the row of mature trees on the boundary with the Hotel and stated that there was scope to plant more trees to increase the density. It was stated that the proposed new build would be further away from the Hotel than the existing Hotel annex and the trees would provide some shielding. An arboricultural report had been received advising that the works could be carried out without damage to the existing trees. The applicant also claimed that his neighbours would experience no more overlooking than he currently did in his own garden and commented that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the current street scene. The development was intended for the use of the applicant's family members only so they would not be forced to move out of the area.

The applicant was informed that, if he felt dissatisfied with the pre-application advice provided, this was a separate issue and would need to be raised with the planning department at a later stage.

The Head of Planning addressed the points raised and stated that the 21m limit had definitely been met in this case, but this meant that the proposed development would be very close to the boundary with the trees. It was confirmed that the trees had a very important role in screening the development from the Grade II listed Hotel. It was further stated that an arboricultural report had not formed part of the pre-application advice provided. It had subsequently become apparent that there were substantial root systems which extended into the rear garden and it was confirmed that the proposed development would heavily encroach on the root system. Members were informed that no significant changes to the front elevation of the main property were proposed. The Head of Planning did not believe that any additional reasons for refusal could be added to the report.

The Committee moved, seconded and unanimously voted to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: That the application was refused.

Officers presented the application and highlighted the addendum. Members were informed that this was a retrospective planning application for the retention of roller shutters already in place. Attention was drawn to the close proximity of a conservation area.

A representative of the petitioners spoke in objection to the application stating that a petition with 213 signatures had been submitted together with 50 letters of objection. It was felt that the shutters were inappropriate due to their colour, size and bulk. The petitioner referred to the area behind the shutters used for trolleys and boxes and stated that food and other consumables were also being stored there. The area was exposed during opening hours which lead to overspill onto the pavement and created health and safety issues for passing pedestrians. The petitioner had understood that the application related solely to the side shutters and the storage area behind but had now been lead to believe that it also referred to the front of the shop. She requested that this point be clarified. With regards to the front shutters, Members were advised that the shutters were bright orange and very bulky. Moreover, perishable food items were displayed at the front of the shop on the boundary with the pavement. Customers and shop workers were obliged to stand on the pavement to select items / fill the shelves which created a further hazard and signage was felt to be unacceptable. The petitioner also stated that the shop was in a primary shopping area, rather than a secondary shopping area as stated in the report and advised Members that no. 197 was attached to the locally listed Devon Parade.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement stated that the applicant's submission was somewhat unclear with regards to what was meant by the shutters to the side / front elevation as the forms and plans appear to differ in their interpretation. It was therefore confirmed that an informative would be included to indicate that all the shutters were being considered.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously voted to refuse the application subject to the addition of the informative.

RESOLVED: That the application was refused with an informative to be added to clarify that all the shutters were considered.

62. **88 LONG LANE - 29164/APP/2016/4622** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The application sought to erect a 3-storey building to provide 9 self-contained units. The addendum noted that no. 66 Long Lane had been re-developed to provide 7 flats which were still unoccupied. However, it was confirmed that the proposal would continue to meet the 10% threshold test. It was also noted that officers did not consider that the proposal would result in overshadowing or harm to the occupiers of no. 90 Long Lane.

A representative of the petitioners spoke in objection to the application. It was stated that the proposed development was in a conservation area and it was therefore felt that the character of the existing dwellings should be maintained. Petitioners believed that approval of the plans would set a precedent for flats to be built in the area; possibly with less sympathetic designs than that proposed. It was felt that the open gardens in the area should be preserved. With regards to footprint and over-development within the conservation area, petitioners were of the opinion that a footprint of 3 times the size of the current house was inappropriate and unacceptable. It was stated that the proposed development would increase traffic flow in an overcrowded road and only one parking space per flat had been allocated which would not be sufficient. Reference was made to a similar development in Swakeleys Road and it was claimed that resultant

parking issues had caused disputes and discontent in the area.

Members questioned whether there were any other similar developments already in existence in Long Lane and were informed that the petitioner was unaware of any; with the exception of the development at no. 66 already referred to by officers.

The applicant addressed the Committee stating that the depth of the building was acceptable as the existing building was disproportionately small in relation to the size of the plot. It was confirmed that the new build would be only 1m wider than the existing building and there would be no overlooking issues; therefore no objections had been raised by the neighbour. Members were reminded that the development would not breach the 10% threshold and had to be considered on its own merits. The applicant claimed that reference to an appeal decision bore no similarity to the development in question as it was for a much larger care-home scheme. Members were advised that pre-application advice had been sought and plans revised accordingly as required. It was stated that the design was in keeping with other mock Tudor style buildings and the mature trees were being protected to ensure the increased depth would be barely visible from the road. If agreed, the flats would be included in the Government's help-to-buy scheme thereby helping first time buyers and adding desirable housing stock to the area.

Councillors sought clarification regarding the mature tree to the front of the house. Officers confirmed that the tree was a TPO tree and the building was set back so there would be no impact on it. Plans had been revised previously to ensure that another Beech tree in the grounds of Douay Martyrs School was not adversely affected by the proposed building work. With reference to the depth of the development, it was confirmed that the footprint would still be smaller than no. 90 so was not a concern.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the application.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved.

63. **35 SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM - 3445/APP/2017/1715** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the report explaining that the application was for a change of use from an A2 class to a mixed A1/A3 coffee shop involving an amended shopfront door and signage.

Officers stated that there was no policy objection in this case in terms of food hygiene.

Members moved, seconded and voted to approve the application. Councillor Flynn had declared a non-pecuniary interest therefore did not vote on the item.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved subject to conditions.

64. **236 SWAKELEYS ROAD - 72634/APP/2017/769** (*Agenda Item 10*)

This agenda item was moved to the Majors Applications Planning Committee meeting prior to the meeting commencing.

65. **PEMBROKE HOUSE, 5-9 PEMBROKE ROAD - 38324/APP/2017/2287** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Officers introduced the application which sought consent for an extension at roof level to create a 2 bedroom residential unit. Attention was drawn to the fact that the

application provided little or no information regarding parking provision, covered cycle areas or additional refuse / recycling facilities.

Members stated that a very similar development was proposed and refused previously as it was too high. It appeared that the current proposal was almost identical to the previously refused application.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously voted to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: That the application was refused.

66. **CLUB HOUSE, MIDDLESEX STADIUM - 17942/APP/2017/2084** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Officers introduced the application which proposed to remove two changing room buildings and a shed and replace them with a one storey building for use as changing rooms.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the application.

RESOLVED: That the application was approved.

67. **11 HARVIL ROAD - TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 759** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Officers introduced the report which sought to confirm TPO 759 and stated that it related to a Beech tree which was an attractive landscape feature that contributed to the amenity and arboreal character of the area.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the preservation of the TPO.

RESOLVED: That the TPO was preserved.

68. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13a*)

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 enforcement 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 7.20 pm, closed at 8.10 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250185 . 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.