

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 April 2010

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Edward Lavery, Allan Kauffman, Anita MacDonald, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Sarah White, Keith Lancaster and Charles Francis</p>	
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr David Payne substitute Cllr George Cooper</p>	Action by
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr George Cooper declared a Non-Prejudicial interest on Item 13. Cllr Cooper is Hillingdon's representative on the Colne Valley Park Partnership and the application site overlooks the Colne Valley Regional Park.</p>	Action by
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of 23rd February 2010 and 6th April 2010 were agreed as correct records</p>	Action by
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None</p>	Action by
5.	<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>	Action by
6.	<p>FORMER REINDEER, PUBLIC HOUSE, MAXWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD 18958/APP/2009/2210 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a part two, part three, part four storey building comprising of 1 one-bedroom flat, 4 two-bedroom flats and 7 three-bedroom flats, with associated surface and basement car parking, secured cycle parking, bin store and alterations to vehicular access.</p>	Action by James Rodger Meg Hirani

	<p>18958/APP/2009/2210</p> <p>This application was withdrawn by the Head of Planning and Enforcement</p>	
7.	<p>HAREFIELD PLACE, THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 12571/APP/2010/319 (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>Erection of a new building for use as a care home (Use Class C2), the refurbishment , alteration and change of use of Harefield Place to a care home (Use Class C2), provision of ancillary amenity space and car parking (involving the demolition of existing office extensions).</p> <p>12571/APP/2010/319</p> <p>This application was withdrawn by the applicant</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
8.	<p>HAREFIELD PLACE, THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 12571/APP/2010/355 (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>The refurbishment, alteration and change of use of Harefield Place to a care home (Use Class C2), provision of ancillary amenity space and car parking (involving the demolition of existing office extensions) (Application for Listed Building Consent).</p> <p>12571/APP/2010/355</p> <p>This application was withdrawn by the applicant.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
9.	<p>ST JOHN'S SCHOOL, POTTER STREET HILL, NORTHWOOD 10795/APP/2009/1560 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Retention of additional classroom and assembly area with library for pre-prep school, together with first aid room and staff toilet, without complying with condition 4 of planning permission ref. 10795/APP/2001/1600 dated 21/11/2001 (which limits pupil numbers at the school to 350 and staff to no more than 40) to allow the retention of the current numbers of 405 pupils and 65 full-time equivalent staff (Retrospective Application).</p> <p>10795/APP/2009/1560</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution representatives of petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back in 2001, the applicant assured the Council that they would not increase the numbers of pupils and staff. This has proven to be incorrect. • School numbers have increased from 336 pupils in 1997 to 405 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

in 2009 and there has been a massive amount of overdevelopment at the school.

- Two applications were submitted to the Council by the school in 2008/09 due to the increase in pupil numbers.
- The current application needs to be considered afresh and all relevant factors material to a retrospective planning application need to be considered.
- The proposed development constitutes an undue intensification in the Green Belt.
- A letter written by the case officer in 2001 was used to illustrate the point that back in 2001, the Council was not minded to allow an increase of both pupil and staff numbers at the school.
- About 50 mature trees have been removed and therefore the school is less well screened from residential properties.
- There is a history of withdrawn and revised applications submitted by the school to improve facilities to allow the school to increase the number of pupils.
- The overdevelopment and intensification at the site has led to the removal of trees and shrubs which has affected the water-table. This has allegedly affected the structures of some of the residential properties in Woodgate Crescent.
- A request that the trees which have been removed are replaced with mature saplings.
- A request that a phased programme is used to lower pupils numbers.

Points raised by the applicant:

- The school was completely unaware of the conditions relating to pupil numbers.
- There was no consultation about the removal of the mature trees on the school grounds.
- The school had monitored traffic flows and the traffic survey found that the school traffic was not detrimental to the area. The school encouraged car sharing as part of its travel plan.
- The school is open 170 days per year but is closed for 190 days.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:

- The school was clearly a successful business and it was bad luck that it was situated in the Green Belt.
- There was a strongly held cross party view (at the Council) against development in the Green Belt and especially if there had been a number of past infringements.
- There had clearly been a breach of pupil and teacher numbers which had led to an intensification of use.
- 40 to 50 mature trees had been removed.
- Traffic flows had been affected and with reference to photographs of a country lane circulated at the meeting, parking was clearly an issue. The school car park was inadequate.
- The school's ignorance (of the breaches of planning conditions) was not an excuse.
- The Council needed to make a strong stand against planning

applications within the Green Belt.

- A request was made that the planning application was refused, the removed trees replaced and that enforcement action was taken over the number of pupil numbers.

The Legal officer advised the committee about limitation periods for enforcement action relating to breaches of planning control. In the case of operational development the period was four (4) years. In the case of action against a breach of condition the period was ten (10) years.

Members were concerned that at no time had the school complied with some planning conditions and agreed that the claim by the applicant that they were unaware of the planning breaches was not an excuse.

There was cross party consensus that the Green Belt needed to be protected and it was agreed that there had been an intensification of use at the school. In relation to the impact on the local highway, the Committee agreed that local roads and parking facilities faced difficulties at both the start and end of the school day when parents drove the children to and from the school. In relation to past planning applications, Officers confirmed the application in 2001 was entirely related to traffic and highway matters only.

Members were concerned at the continued growth of pupil and staff numbers at the school and considered a phased reduction in numbers was appropriate in this case. In response, Officers referred to the degree of material harm and advised the Committee that if a decision for refusal was proposed, this would require strong and clear planning grounds.

Members also raised the question of using S106 contributions related to the expansion of the school, if they were minded to approve. In response, Officers confirmed that it would be inappropriate to seek to raise revenues through a S106 agreement.

Members were also concerned about the number of mature trees which had been removed by the School. In response, the Legal Officer advised Members this concern could be addressed through an informative.

To assist members in their deliberations, the Head of Planning and Enforcement confirmed that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application the Committee could propose this on two grounds:

1. An adverse impact on Highway safety.
2. Highways safety in relation to the increase of pupil numbers and the material impact on the greenbelt arising from an intensification of use.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds that it was detrimental to the Green Belt and Highways safety. On being put to the vote refusal was unanimously agreed.

	<p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposal by reason of the increase in capacity of pupils and staff would result in increase in parking demand and traffic to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety and contrary to Policy AM7 and AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.</p> <p>2. The proposed development would result in an intensification of use to the detriment of the visual amenities of the Green Belt contrary to Policy OL4 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and National Planning Policy as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 - Green Belts.</p>	
10.	<p>19 GROVE ROAD, NORTHWOOD 27846/APP/2010/145 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Single storey front and side extension, two storey rear extension, alterations to existing sides, conversion of loft space for habitable use to include 2 rear rooflights and 4 skylights, alterations to front elevation to include new front porch, new pitched roof to single storey front and pitched roof to existing bay windows at first floor.</p> <p>27846/APP/2010/145</p> <p>At the beginning of the item, the Planning Officer introduced the report and then the Legal Officer confirmed there was a valid petition on this item.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development will have significant impact on adjoining properties. • The proposed design is over-dominant. • If the application is approved it will set an undesirable precedent in the local area. • The proposed development incorporates a large roof structure which will amount to a 3 storey extension. • The height and roof design of the application are contrary to the SPD • The maximum depth of the proposal should be reduced in depth by 3.6 metres. • The flat top mansard roof design is alien to properties in the surrounding area. • The proposed design will cause significant overshadowing to neighbouring properties, especially to number 17 due to the height of the design proposal. • The proposed patio design will cause overlooking and lead to a 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

loss of privacy for these properties.

Points raised by the agent:

- The proposed design does take account of the objections raised.
- The application is for a four-bedroom home which is typical of the area and has not been much enlarged since 1930s.
- The proposal will bring the property up to modern standards.
- The proposed design is relatively modest compared to other (local) projects and the applicant had not anticipated it to be as problematic.
- The properties at 14, 21 and 23 have substantial side and rear extensions.
- The proposed depth of the design has been reduced substantially and should this application not be approved it would be setting a precedent.
- Disappointment that the objections had not been withdrawn.
- The architect and client have co-operated with the Council.
- The majority of the work is to the rear of the property and therefore there is reduced impact on the street scene.
- There are substantial gaps between the adjoining houses at 17 and 21 Grove Road.
- The rear of the (application) building is north facing which lessens the impact of overshadowing.
- There is minimal overlooking to the rear of the property.
- The proposed design is not excessive and complies with the guidance.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:

- When viewing the rear of the property, the Councillor enquired whether it was usual to meet with only the applicant (and not the neighbours).
- In relation to the privacy concerns raised by neighbours, the raised patio will be reduced in height.
- The proposed design will harmonise with the area but the issue is the extent and depth of the proposed extension.
- The proposed depth of the extension will be greater than 6 metres which is considerably larger than other properties. This will double the size of the extension of the house.
- The proposed development will amount to an overdevelopment which will limit neighbours right to light and reduce their privacy.
- The proposed development (if approved) will lead to massive overshadowing.

Members asked officers to comment on the assertion that the proposed development was larger than others in the area that had previously been approved bearing in mind the agent had said the proposal was similar to the properties at 17 and 21 Grove Road. In response, Officers confirmed that the central section of the proposal was larger and surrounding properties were smaller in size.

	<p>Members also asked about whether it was usual for officers to meet with both the applicant and their neighbours, as regards the height of the proposed patio and overlooking and the degree of overshadowing directly caused by the proposal. In response, Officers advised that it was not usual practice to meet with neighbours and they would only do this if they were unable to view the rear of the property. Officers confirmed that the raised patio would enable a degree of overlooking along the entire fence line but this in itself was not a reason for refusal. Officers also confirmed that they considered the loss of light caused by overshadowing to be acceptable and that this reason alone would not hold up on appeal.</p> <p>Having listened to both points of view, Members agreed that the proposal was over-dominant and would adversely impact upon neighbouring properties.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the grounds of size, scale and bulk and that it is out of character with the area. On being put to the vote refusal was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposed development by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design incorporating a large crown roof, would be out of character with the existing and adjoining properties and detrimental to the visual amenities of the area. The proposal would thus be contrary to Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.</p>	
11.	<p>10 ST ANDREWS CLOSE, RUISLIP 43907/APP/2009/2760 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>First floor side/rear extension and conversion of roof space for habitable use involving rear dormer window and 2 front and 1 rear rooflights</p> <p>43907/APP/2009/2760</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the amendment of Reason 1 for refusal as detailed in the Addendum sheet to read as follows:</p> <p><i>“The proposed first floor side extension by reason of its position, size and design proposing a gable end roof design would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses Nos.9 and 10 St Andrews Close and the character and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p><i>Extensions”.</i></p> <p>Members requested their sympathy with the applicants be minuted and requested Officers to work with the applicants on any further re-submission.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused subject to the amendment of Reason 1 as detailed above.</p>	
12.	<p>NORTH OF ROUNDWOOD HOUSE, NORTHWOOD ROAD, HAREFIELD 53258/APP/2010/91 (Agenda Item 12)</p> <p>Construction of new vehicular access with associated hedgerows, timber fencing and gates.</p> <p>53258/APP/2010/91</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
13.	<p>EDWINNS, THE OLD ORCHARD, PARK LANE, HAREFIELD 3499/APP/2009/2729 (Agenda Item 13)</p> <p>Single storey side extension, provision of delivery access road to side, paved terrace area with covered shelter to side to include new wall, new log store shelter and shed, repositioning of gas tank, alterations to banking, new fencing area, enlargement and alteration to car parking area/new fencing and alterations to front entrance, to include demolition of existing bay window to side.</p> <p>3499/APP/2009/2729</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the amendment of condition 13 as detailed in the Addendum sheet to read as follows:</p> <p><i>'Before any part of the development is commenced, the applicant shall submit details to the local planning authority of investigations proposed to be undertaken for landfill gas for the ground at the development site. A proportion of the landfill gas tests shall be taken below the proposed footprint of the new extension. Upon approval by the local planning authority, the applicant will carry out the approved investigations and will submit the results of the approved landfill gas survey to the local planning authority. If landfill gas is found the applicant shall submit to the local planning authority a scheme for installing remediation measures to prevent gas ingress to any buildings on the development site and upon written approval by the local planning authority the applicant shall install the approved measures prior to the occupation and use of the extension.'</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and Addendum sheet as detailed above</p>	
14.	<p>25 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 56137/APP/2010/48 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Change of use to Class A3 Restaurant and Class A5 hot food takeaway and elevational alterations.</p> <p>56137/APP/2010/48</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the amendment of conditions 5,6,7 and 8 and informative 9 as detailed in the Addendum sheet to read as follows:</p> <p><i>“Condition 5 replace 'accord' with 'accordance'.</i> <i>Condition 6 to commence with 'The premises shall not have deliveries or collections...'</i> <i>Condition 7 to be tightened up to state 'The use hereby permitted shall not commence until arrangements are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority for the provision of litter bins within 50m of the site'.</i> <i>Condition 8 to add 'and approved' between 'submitted' and 'plans' in the first line.</i> <i>Informative 9 replace 'careering' with 'catering' in the second line.</i></p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and Addendum sheet as detailed above</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
15.	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT TO 31 DECEMBER 2009 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Members received a report updating them on the current position in relation to S106 agreements.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to vote was agreed that the report be noted.</p> <p>Resolved – That the report be noted</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
16.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation that further action be taken was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.35 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.