

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 May 2010

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Edward Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Allam Anita MacDonald</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Meg Hirani (North Area, Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Sarah White (Legal Advisor) Keith Lancaster (Legal Advisor) Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr David Payne substitute Cllr Michael White</p>	
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kauffman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 'Northolt Junction, Civic Way Ruislip' as he was assisting residents in depth with this application. He left the room and did not vote on this item.</p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 9 '91-97 High Road, Ickenham' as he knew the petitioner. He left the room and did not vote on this item.</p>	
3.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 6 April 2010 were amended for clarification.</p> <p>Under tem 6, Swakeleys House Milton Road, Ickenham, Page 2 - under the points raised by the petitioner, the minute was amended from "Clause 1.7 includes a draft default position in relation to the Open House Policy. The owner should be <b>encouraged</b> to continue this should the ownership change".</p>	

	<p>to:</p> <p><i>“Clause 1.7 includes a draft default position in relation to the Open House Policy. The owner <b>is required</b> to continue this should the ownership change”.</i></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 29 April were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
4.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
5.	<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 5</i>)</p>	
6.	<p><b>NORTHOLT JUNCTION, CIVIC WAY, RUISLIP - 66712/APP/2010/103</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Track and junction improvements involving widening the existing up line embankment for 1.2km; stabilising the existing embankment; laying a second track South of existing up main line; provision of new junctions; replacing the existing single track bridge over Civic Way with a double track bridge; infilling redundant under bridge and ancillary works.</b></p> <p><b>66712/APP/2010/103</b></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"> <li>• The proposal will have significant impact on near-by properties and the lives of local residents.</li> <li>• The proposal will create a significant amount of noise during the construction phase which will affect residents both at night (causing sleep deprivation) and at weekends.</li> <li>• If approved, the proposal will result in higher speed trains which will result in more noise from greater overtaking.</li> <li>• Higher speed trains will increase the number of train movements per day.</li> <li>• If approved, building material will need to be transported to the site which will increase congestion on local roads which are already very busy.</li> <li>• The proposal will damage the material structure of some surrounding properties through increased vibrations caused by train movements.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>

- To request that an environmental impact assessment is carried out.
- The construction techniques used in some local homes means that they are not suitable for the sound insulation measures proposed by the applicant.
- Concerns about the increased risk of flooding.

Points raised by the applicant:

- The aim of the proposal is to improve train journey times between London and Birmingham.
- Under signalling, trains will be separated by 3 minutes, which will mean that there will not be multiple trains passing on the track.
- Signalling proposals will result in less acceleration and deceleration of trains and therefore less noise.
- The proposal will increase train speeds from 70 mph to 100 mph only.
- The developer, Chiltern, is keen to engage with local residents to find solutions to residents concerns.
- Construction will involve working in sections along the track for several days at a time before moving down the line so noise and disruption will not be concentrated for significant periods of time.
- Working at night will be limited and mainly concern replacing the bridge at Civic Way.
- Vibration will not adversely affect surrounding properties.
- To address flooding concerns, Chiltern will increase local flood capacity by 300 metres cubed as recommended by the Environment Agency.

Members asked the applicant for further clarification about the methodology of working in sections and for further details about night work. In response, the applicant confirmed that work would involve some blockades and require some weekend work. It was anticipated that work to stabilise the embankment would last 2 to 4 days in any one position before it progressed further down the line and that the longest work in any one location would last up to two weeks (but not continuously). The applicant confirmed that night-time working hours would be between midnight and five thirty am. The applicant acknowledged that work would be disruptive to local residents but Chiltern would try and minimise this where possible.

Members had great sympathy for the potential disruption to the petitioners but having heard from the applicant and considered the amendments proposed in the Addendum, thought the offer of temporary accommodation during some building works represented a fair compromise.

In response to a query about noise levels, The Head of Planning and Enforcement confirmed that the operation of the railway would continue and the noise officer had concluded that noise levels would not be significant seen in the context of the overall project. Members were encouraged to learn that traffic on the southerly route was planned to reduce by 70%.

	<p>To ensure appropriate communication is undertaken with the local community, Members asked officers to include 'Ward Councillors' to condition 3 (xiii)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved as set out in the report with the changes and additions in the Addendum. On being put to the vote approval was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be Approved as recommended in the report with the changes and additions as set out in the Addendum and the following further changes:</b></p> <p><b>Add in condition 3 (xiii) 'Ward Councillors' after Local Planning Authority.</b></p> <p><b>Add subsection to condition 3 as follows:</b></p> <p><b>(xiv) sizes including height of the HGVs and swept paths for the largest vehicles between junction of West End Road/Station Approach and the site, and junction of Mandeville Road/Eastcote Lane and the site.</b></p> <p><b>Reason: To ensure that construction traffic does not give rise to conditions prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety and the free flow of traffic on the surrounding highway network.</b></p>	
7.	<p><b>3 PIKES END, EASTCOTE - 18957/APP/2010/266</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Front porch infill, first floor side extension and alterations to existing side elevation.</b></p> <p><b>18957/APP/2010/266</b></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"> <li>• The proposal will result in the alteration of a unique and uniform design of the whole street of houses which are protected by covenant and have won architectural wards when built.</li> <li>• It is misleading to suggest that the property is a two-bedroom house rather than a five bedroom house.</li> <li>• Planning conditions differ considerably if a design has 4 bedrooms or more bedrooms.</li> <li>• There is a lack of amenity space to go with the enlarged building. The property only has a small courtyard of 67 metres squared which does not comply with the amenity space guidance.</li> <li>• Adding a further 2 bedrooms will create a 7 bedroom house.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>

- Concerns about the possible uses of the building.
- Car parking is already a problem and the proposal will not improve this.
- The proposal will change the structure of the building and street scene which may effect property values.
- Planning proposals for 1 Pike's End have already been dismissed and therefore the roof line has been considered before.

Points raised by a representative of the Eastcote Village Area Conservation Panel:

- Maintaining the existing roof line is key to preserving the character and appearance of the area.
- The scale and form of the proposal does not harmonise with the area.
- The proposal will not enhance the area.
- The size of the garden will be too small for the development. The proposal is meant to be a family home and there is nowhere close by for children to play.
- The extra extension will remove the bathroom window.
- The rear bedroom windows are very small and will there be sufficient natural light to this room?

Points raised by the applicant:

- The application is within the regulations. This is not the original design and advice and guidance has been sought from the Planning Department.
- There are a series of errors in the report. There still is a small window to the bathroom.
- The garden is small but there is lawn to the sides of the property and the applicant has discussed this with their neighbours.
- The applicant was unaware of any parking problems.
- The applicant does provide domiciliary care but no care is conducted at the property.
- The applicant is the only household in the immediate area with children and there is a park less than 100 metres away from the property.

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

- The proposal is within a conservation area and (if approved) the design is not uniform and will not harmonise with the area.
- The proposal stipulates the materials used will match existing properties. It will be very difficult to source and match materials exactly and this will have a detrimental impact on the street scene.
- The loss of light to 4 Pikes End is marginal but is material to the home affected.

Members asked officers to clarify the number of bedrooms. In response, officers suggested that the number could be anywhere between 2 and 5 and that homes with 4 bedrooms or more require

	<p>100metres squared of amenity space. Officers confirmed that the proposal did not impact on amity space.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote approval was agreed by 4 votes in favour with 2 votes against.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be Approved.</b></p>	
8.	<p><b>THE FERNS, WITHY LANE, RUISLIP - 6885/APP/2009/2650</b> (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing industrial building and erection of a block of 5 flats with associated parking (outline application).</b></p> <p><b>6885/APP/2009/2650</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The officer report focuses on the density count of the number of (residential) units but this has been incorrectly calculated.</li> <li>• The number of units is 196 not 349 stated in the report.</li> <li>• The current definition of a studio flat and 1 bedroom flats is misleading and needs to be changed.</li> <li>• The design complies with the roof terrace guidance.</li> <li>• No objections have been raised about the design.</li> <li>• The proposal is supported by local residents.</li> </ul> <p>Two Ward Councillors addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application is a good use of the available land.</li> <li>• The amenity issues raised in the report can be overcome through negotiation.</li> <li>• The loss of existing industrial floor space or land outside designated Industrial and Business Areas (LE 4) should not be an obstacle to the application.</li> <li>• The proposal does not impact upon the character of the area or the amenity.</li> <li>• The proposal will enhance the area.</li> <li>• Officers have not raised any objections about the appearance of the design.</li> <li>• The Non standard reason for refusal – NON2 relating to the number a significant number of children of school age is not applicable given the proposal contains a mixture of studio and 1 bedroom flats.</li> </ul> <p>Members asked officers to clarify the density calculations for habitable rooms raised by both the petitioner and Ward Councillors. In response,</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>

	<p>officers explained the report used the standard calculation whereby any room over 20m squared was counted as two habitable rooms. In addition to density considerations, officers made it clear that the application also did not comply on amenity or distance from the boundary issues. During the course of discussions, Members raised the lack car parking space as an obstacle to the proposal and asked whether there had been any pre-application discussions with the applicant. Officers confirmed that no discussions had taken place.</p> <p>On the basis that there was no seconder for refusal, it was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be brought back to a future Committee and to ask officers to incorporate further information on density calculations and specifically information on how many London Boroughs adopt the same density standards.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be Deferred.</b></p>	
9.	<p><b>91-97 HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM - 14964/APP/2009/896</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use of first and second floors from Class B2 industrial use to 4 four-bedroom flats with side/rear external access staircase and rear first floor walkway and installation of new rear first floor walkway and staircase (Part Retrospective Application).</b></p> <p><b>14964/APP/2009/896</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution representatives of the two 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"> <li>• The proposed change from B2 will be detrimental to the area and contrary to BE 13 and BE19.</li> <li>• The proposal has insufficient amenity space.</li> <li>• The proposal has insufficient car parking and the number of spaces will be reduced from 5 to 3.</li> <li>• The site has an extensive planning history.</li> <li>• The use of the staircase and flat roofs involves overlooking of surrounding properties (including into the main bedroom window and rear garden of 199 the Greenway) and gardens.</li> <li>• The metal staircase overhangs the adjacent land which is not owned by the applicant.</li> <li>• Refuse facilities have not been provided and waste and refuse is scattered over the pavement.</li> <li>• The works are out of character with the area.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant / agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Two Ward Councillors addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development will increase housing density and will be an over development.</li> <li>• There will be insufficient amenity space.</li> <li>• The external staircase affects the visual amenity of local residents and will increase overlooking of adjacent properties.</li> <li>• There is insufficient parking for the proposal and parking conditions will worsen with the West Ruislip Development.</li> <li>• The proposed plans are inaccurate.</li> </ul> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused on the reasons set out in the report and the Addendum. On being put to the vote refusal was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons as set out in the report and Addendum.</b></p>	
10.	<p><b>41 RUSHDENE ROAD, EASTCOTE - 51162/APP/2010/247</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey rear extension with glass panelling to rear.</b></p> <p><b>51162/APP/2010/247</b></p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>
11.	<p><b>41 RUSHDENE ROAD, EASTCOTE - 51162/APP/2010/246</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey rear extension.</b></p> <p><b>51162/APP/2010/246</b></p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>
12.	<p><b>9 BURWOOD AVENUE, EASTCOTE - 41436/APP/2008/49</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Elevational alterations to side and rear elevations, involving the installation of 2 side windows, and increase in width of the rear element of the single storey part side extension by 700mm and replacement of its mono-pitch roof with a dummy-pitch roof, of planning permission ref. 41436/APP/2004/936 dated 07/10/2004:</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>



	<p><b>Erection of a part two storey, part single storey side extension and installation of a new vehicular crossover.</b></p> <p><b>41436/APP/2008/49</b></p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	
13.	<p><b>9 BURWOOD AVENUE, EASTCOTE - 41436/APP/2008/3396</b> <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p><b>Front canopy extension (Retrospective application).</b></p> <p><b>41436/APP/2008/3396</b></p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</b></p>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm, closed at 9.45 pm.</p>		

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 is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.