

**Minutes-
NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

27 AUGUST 2009

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Come into effect on: Immediately



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Members Present: Councillors Edward Lavery (Chairman), Anita MacDonald, John Hensley, (substituting for Alan Kauffman) Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, John Oswell and David Payne</p> <p>Advisory Members / Co-optee Members present: Ms Lesley Crowcroft - Eastcote Residents Association and Eastcote Village Conservation Area Advisory Panel.</p> <p>Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah White and Charles Francis</p> <p>Others Present: Alan Edwards</p>
	<p>Declarations of Interest</p> <p>Councillor Hensley declared a personal interest in Item 16 and left the room for this Item.</p>
	<p>Apologies for Absence</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Alan Kauffman with Councillor John Hensley substituting.</p>
	<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</p> <p>It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public.</p>
	<p>Consideration of Reports:</p> <p>Reports were considered as set out below:</p>

<p>6.</p>	<p>16 &18 KINGSEND, RUISLIP</p> <p>63221/APP/2009/1047</p> <p>Conversion of existing dwellings to provide 3 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedroom flats, involving the provision of a new central link, part single storey, part two storey rear extensions, front dormers and side roof lights to each dwelling, together with associated parking, landscaping, vehicular and pedestrian access and bin store (involving the demolition of existing garages).</p> <p>The officer in his presentation advised members that amended information had been circulated as there had been some amendments made since the report had been published.</p> <p>Members were further advised that whilst the Council was not objecting to the mix of units within the scheme, there was an in principle objection to the proposal as the level of redevelopment and/or conversions to flats had now exceeded 10% in this road.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution three representatives of the six petitions received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Two Ward Councillors addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners and a number of issues were raised. Members stated that the proposed development would be visually prominent and out of character with the buildings in the surrounding area. Furthermore the proposed design was contrary to BE4 - a new development within or on the fringes of Conservation Areas.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 9 WOODLANDS AVENUE, RUISLIP</p> <p>66096/APP/2009/1238</p> <p>Erection of two storey building comprising of 2 two-bedroom duplex units with associated parking and vehicular crossover.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting stating that the proposal failed to provide an adequate amount of internal floor space, the passageway was too narrow and did not provide adequate access provision and that overall the proposal was not in keeping with the street scene.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the depth of the rear extension and whether the 45 degree angle rule had been breached.</p> <p>Officer's advised that the nearest habitable room to the proposed building line was a bathroom and so the rule had not been breached.</p> <p>Members still had concerns about the failure to provide an adequate amount of amenity space for the occupiers, inadequate parking provision and direct overlooking of the rear gardens of adjoining properties.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	
8.	<p>1 BLACK HORSE PARADE, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE</p> <p>2074/APP/2009/1045</p> <p>Change from Class A1 retail to Class A5 restaurant</p> <p>The officer in his presentation advised members that amended plans had been circulated as there had been some amendments made since the report had been published.</p> <p>The petitioner objecting to the proposal and the agent were not present at the meeting.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the Eastcote Conservation Panel objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting as the application was located in a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Members asked for several additional conditions to be added to reduce noise nuisance and littering.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>approved subject to the conditions in the report and addendum sheet and as amended:</p> <p>(i) Condition 03 amended as per the addendum sheet but with the following line added to the end of the wording....'There shall be no staff allowed on the premises outside these hours'.</p> <p>(ii) Condition 05 altered to: Deliveries and collections, including waste collections, shall be restricted to 0800 hours to 1800 hours on Mondays to Fridays, 0800 to 1300 hours on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.</p> <p>(iii) Condition 6 after..Local Planning Authority add... ,'the scheme should include covered and secure on site refuse storage facilities'.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and amended conditions 3, 5 and 6 as detailed above.</p>	
<p>9.</p>	<p>140-142 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD</p> <p>66055/APP/2009/1129</p> <p>Three storey building to form 1 one-bedroom, 1 three-bedroom and 7 two-bedroom flats with associated parking and basement, involving the demolition of existing dwellings</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Clarification was sought in relation to whether the design incorporated adequate parking provision and details of the parking layout proposals.</p> <p>Officers reported that the design had an overprovision of parking but that the plans did not include a basement plan to illustrate the parking layout.</p> <p>Members still had concerns about the application in relation to the size, layout, scale and over dominance.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report but with refusal reason 1 being amended to include reference to the adjoining area of special character and refusal reason 2 in relation to parking to be either an informative or a condition to</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

be determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Labour Lead outside of the meeting.

Resolved – That the application be Refused subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and amending Reasons for Refusal 1 and 2 as detailed below:

(i) Reason 1 - To be amended to include reference to the adjoining area of special character

(ii) Reason 2 – To be amended in relation to parking to be either an informative or a condition to be determined by the Chairman in consultation with the Labour Lead outside the meeting.

Post-meeting note: Prior to the Committee meeting a letter was received by the Council from the applicant informing officers that the planning application was withdrawn.

The Committee Members and the planning officers attending the Committee meeting were unaware of this letter and the withdrawal of the planning application at the time of the Committee meeting. Subsequently, Item 9 was debated, and a resolution to refuse was passed by the Committee. The approved minutes record the resolution to refuse the planning application.

The Committee's resolution will not result in the issue of a notice of refusal, since the Committee's resolution to refuse the application was made under a mistake of fact that the planning application remained extant at the date of the Committee meeting.

The Committee has been informed of the reasons for this oversight, and received an apology from officers. The Committee has in addition required the addition of this text to Item 9 of the minute of the Committee's meeting of 27 August 2009 to ensure clarity and transparency.

<p>10.</p>	<p>2 LEA CRESCENT, RUISLIP</p> <p>48985/APP/2009/165</p> <p>Erection of a single storey side extension with front porch and part single storey, part two storey rear extension (Involving demolition of existing side extension)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution the applicant in support of the proposal addressed the meeting.</p> <p>Clarification was sought in relation to parking provision. Officers reported that the enforcement of specific parking conditions would be difficult and the Legal officer explained that the Circular on planning conditions specifies that enforceability and reasonableness are both factors to take into consideration when applying a condition.</p> <p>Members asked that several conditions be added so that the structure could not be used as a habitable room and that adequate off-street parking was provided.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report with 2 additional conditions to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the additional conditions as follows:-</p> <p>i) Condition preventing building being used as habitable accommodation. (ii) Condition requiring agreement of off-street parking.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
<p>11.</p>	<p>41 Rushdene Road, Eastcote</p> <p>51162/APP/2009/1286</p> <p>Variation of condition 4 of planning permission reference 51162/APP/2009/466, dated 05-06-2009, to allow for alteration of the fenestration arrangement to the dormer window, involving increasing the glazed area from a 2-light window to a 3-light window.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn before the meeting</p>	

12.	<p>41 Rushdene Road, Eastcote</p> <p>51162/APP/2009/1287</p> <p>Single storey rear extension.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn before the meeting</p>	
13.	<p>41 Rushdene Road, Eastcote</p> <p>51162/APP/2009/1288</p> <p>Single storey rear extension.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn before the meeting</p>	
14.	<p>LITTLEBOURNE FARM, NORTHWOOD ROAD, HAREFIELD</p> <p>63630/APP/2009/1291</p> <p>Erection of a single storey extension to existing cattle yard.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
15.	<p>42 LAWRENCE DRIVE, ICKENHAM</p> <p>23057/APP/2009/1053</p> <p>Single story rear extension with roof lantern.</p> <p>Clarification was sought in relation to overshadowing and the likely impact of the proposal on adjoining properties. Members asked that the item be deferred until the following information could be considered:</p> <p>(i) For an overshadowing diagram to be prepared. (ii) For officer comments on compliance with BRE guidelines to be included in the report.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote agreed that the application be Deferred to a future meeting.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>Resolved – That the application be Deferred for an overshadowing diagram to be produced and officer comments on compliance with BRE guidelines to be included in the report.</p>	
<p>16.</p>	<p>28 WARREN ROAD, ICKENHAM</p> <p>63124/APP/2009/1532</p> <p>Amendment to planning permission ref 63124/APP/2009/1521 dated 16/07/2007 (Erection of a part two storey, part single storey, rear and front extension, a rear conservatory and erection of a front porch canopy and conversion of roof space to provide habitable accommodation involving enlargement and raising of the roof height with the installation of a side dormer window and front, side (east elevation) and rear roof lights) to allow alterations to the roof involving lowering the eaves height, the installation of gabled features on the front and rear elevations, changes to the front porch and changes to the side and rear elevations (Part retrospective application).</p> <p>The officer in his presentation advised members that amended information had been circulated as there had been some minor amendments made since the report had been published.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote agreed that the application be Approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the following:</p> <p>i) A revised site plan (Drawing Number 070401/06 Revised as set out in the addendum sheet. (ii) Condition 4 to have the word 'permanently' added to the condition text as described below: .. windows facing No.30 Warren Road shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass.</p> <p>Resolved – that the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, a revised site plan and condition 4 amended as follows:</p> <p>(i) A revised site plan (Drawing Number 070401/06 Revised as set out in the addendum sheet. (ii) Condition 4 to have the word '<i>permanently</i>' added to the condition text as described below: .. <i>windows facing No.30 Warren Road shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass</i></p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

17.	<p>MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD</p> <p>3807/APP/2009/1092</p> <p>Construction of a flat roof over the existing building (involving demolition of the existing pitched roof).</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
-----	--	---

The meeting closed at 9.10 p.m.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.