

Eview andMinutes



NORTH Planning Committee

23 May 2018

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

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Scott Farley, Becky Haggar, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Devi Radia, Robin Sansarpuri and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Matt Kolaszewski (Principle Planning Officer), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Richard Michalski (Transport & Highways Officer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p> |
| 3. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> |
| 4. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Tuckwell declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 10 – Northwood Health & Racquet Club, as he was a member of the David Lloyd club, but not the location in question. Councillor Tuckwell confirmed that he would remain in the room and would deliberate on the item.</p> <p>Councillor Flynn declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of item 10 – Northwood Health & Racquet Club, in that he was a member of the David Lloyd club in question. Councillor Flynn confirmed that he would leave the room when the item was due to deliberation.</p> |
| 5. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 5 April and 10 May 2018 be approved as a correct record.</p> |
| 6. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that Item 6: 27 Ducks Hill Road, had been withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 7. | <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 1-15 were marked as Part I, and would therefore be considered in public. Items 16-18 were marked as Part II, and would therefore be considered in private.</p> |
| 8. | <p>27 DUCKS HILL ROAD - 40711/APP/2017/4475 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p> |
| 9. | <p>11 SANDY LODGE WAY - 16948/APP/2018/55 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey building with habitable basement and roof space to create 1 x 3-bed and 3 x 2-bed self-contained flats with associated parking and installation of vehicular crossover to front, involving demolition of existing dwelling house.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and addendum, which set out comments from a Ward Councillor and proposed additional and amended conditions to address the Ward Councillor's concerns that related to privacy of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>In order to protect neighbours' privacy, a condition was proposed to ensure that all side windows facing no. 9 Sandy Lodge Way were obscure glazed and non-openable below a height of 1.8m. The remaining concerns of the Ward Councillor were confirmed as addressed within paragraph 7.07 of the officer's report. Condition 8, which dealt with landscaping, was also proposed to be added to, to set out areas of defensible space in front of ground floor habitable windows, to protect the amenities of future occupiers.</p> <p>The Committee was informed that, with the addition of the above conditions, the impact of overlooking on neighbouring properties was negligible. The proposal was considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and for these reasons it was recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>A petitioner addressed the Committee, key points of which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The petitioner was the owner and resident of no. 9 Sandy Lodge Way, and was speaking on behalf of over 50 local residents who had signed the petition against the proposed development. • The application sought to demolish a family style home and replace it with four flats with a large basement and associated parking, in a large development which was out of character with the western side of Sandy Lodge Way and adjacent roads. • Residents were concerned that further flatted developments within the area would create a poor neighbourhood environment and reduce the standard of living and enjoyment of the area. • Residents were disappointed by the application, in light of planning policy which identified the need for more family homes with garden space within the Borough. • The current owners already had permission to develop two detached houses on this plot, meeting the planning policy aims, and at the previous Planning Committee meeting at which those houses were approved, the owners expressed the desire to build the two family houses as they had struggled to find suitable homes in the area. The subsequent decision to develop flats on the site |

contravened that claim, and suggested a purely financial motive contrary to planning policy aims.

- In terms of density, Sandy Lodge Way was already at the limit of 10% flatted developments, and the proposed development would take the number of flatted developments over 10%. Together with a further flatted development at 8 to 10 Sandy Lodge Way, whose application predated this one, the number would be closer to 15%.
- The officer's report had not accounted for the fact that almost all of the current flatted developments were in a relatively condensed part of the street, along a stretch of road directly opposite to the proposed development. This included 4 flatted blocks next to each other, rather than being evenly split along the road, which had directly resulted in loss of privacy, loss of family accommodation, and change of street scene.
- A consultant had noted that the proposed basement would extend to the full width of the plot and it was requested that extensive up-to-date analysis should be conducted, or further impact assessments provided, to assess the impact of such a development.
- The basement was apparently to be used as a games room, although also included three light wells and a bathroom with a shower, which would appear to be unnecessary for a two-bedroom flat that already had two bathrooms and a separate toilet. This suggested that the flats were to be marketed as three-bedroom properties whilst under the guise of a two-bedroom property, without the appropriate safety features.
- There were concerns that the development would cause overlooking and would result in a loss of light into the nearby bedrooms, currently used by young children. There were also safeguarding concerns due to loss of privacy.

The petitioner concluded by requesting that the application be refused.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee, the key points of which were:

- The agent had worked closely with the architect on this scheme from the time of the original planning application for two detached houses, approximately two and a half years ago.
- The current scheme was on a similar footprint to the permitted development of the two detached houses, except that the gap between the houses was proposed to be filled in.
- The ground floor depth and spacing was similar, though was marginally further from no. 9, compared with the previous scheme.
- Parking would be at the front of the properties. A large oak tree at the rear was proposed to be retained.
- The buildings were designed in a traditional mock-Tudor character with herringbone brick infill panels, similar to No. 9 and other properties in the area.
- The roofs were steeper than the previous detached houses, to add character, and were linked by lower flat-roofed elements that fragmented the scale of the building.
- To add further interest there were projecting gables extending over the front and rear bays, with hipped roofs. The use of dormer windows had been avoided.
- Overall, the elevations maintained a two-story scale that largely disguised the accommodation in the roof and basement, included to optimise the use of the site without adding to the building bulk. A small part of the roof was now used for accommodation.
- The basement extended less than halfway to the depth of the building, with a basement under each of the two ground floor flats.

- The building had a similar overall footprint to the two detached houses, and the traditional style with deeper roof pitches was felt to sit better on the site than the pair of narrow houses with their shallower roof pitches.
- A small recessed area had been added to the road frontage on Grove Road to add interest and to break the elevation.
- In terms of height, the eaves line remained as per the two houses. The ridge running parallel to Grove Road was reduced in height from 8.05m to 7.7m, with the apex (top of the two hips) at 8.3m.
- The front Ridgeline was 0.25 meters higher than previously, and marginally above the height of no. 9, but this was felt to add to the diverse roof line and was not out of keeping with the character of the area.

The petitioner concluded by commending the officer's report and scheme to the Committee.

The Chairman confirmed that he had received additional comments from Councillor Melvin, Ward Councillor for Northwood, who agreed with the Ward Councillor's comments as set out in the addendum.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement responded to the objecting petitioner's assertion that the development would have an adverse impact on the amenity of their property. The Committee was informed that the application could not be refused due to impact on neighbouring amenity, as there was an extent planning permission for two detached houses. The permitted left-hand house already affected the newly reconfigured layout of the adjoining property, and as that impact would not be worsened by the new flatted development, refusal could not be made on that basis.

With regard to the petitioners' reference to Hillingdon's guidance on the 10% flatted development, pages 39 and 40 of the officer's report were highlighted. It was confirmed that this was guidance, not policy, and inspectors had advised that the first consideration should be whether a proposed scheme had an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene. Only if it did, were officers to review the 10% guidance. In the case of this application, officers had concluded that the scheme did not result in an unacceptable visual impact on the street scene.

Members discussed the scheme, with concerns raised over the impact on the street scene, due to size and bulk. However, the majority of the Committee felt that the scheme was presentable, and moved the officer's recommendation. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, agreed by 7 votes in favour, with 1 abstention.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to conditions as set out in the addendum.

10. **39 WIELAND ROAD - 22452/APP/2018/822** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Part two storey front extension, first floor side/rear extensions, first floor side extensions, single storey rear extension, enlargement of rear dormer, detached outbuilding to rear for use as a gym/games room and alterations to elevations

Officers introduced the report, confirming that 39 Wieland Road was a substantial five bedroom, two and a half story detached house located on a residential street within the Gatehill Estate. The area was characterized by large, individually designed properties located within large plots, and the site fell within an area of special local character wherein any form of new development was required to be of a similar scale and

reflecting the materials, design, features, architectural style, and building heights predominant within the area.

The Council's conservation officer had been consulted and had considered that the proposal was overly large and would result in a discordant collection of structures that would detract significantly from the original house. The proposed extensions would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the special architectural qualities of the host dwelling and as such would fail to contribute positively to the area of special local character. In addition, the applicant had made no provision for the long term protection of trees at the rear of the property. For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, the key points of which included:

- The petitioner was speaking on behalf for the Gatehill Residents Association.
- Gatehill Farm Estate was located in the north of the London Borough of Hillingdon and had been designated as an area of special local character, with specific policies created to preserve and enhance the area.
- 39 Wieland Road had been substantially extended in the past, and the proposed triple storey extension to the front at ground, first and second floor level, was unacceptable in terms of size, treatment and character. There are no other instances of anything similar on the estate and so it would be out of character.
- The planning application proposed numerous extensions to the side, the rear, and the roof which fail to be subordinate, symmetrical or matching to the original house in any way.
- The redevelopment would be an incongruous and damaging addition to the architectural composition of the property and the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area, and would have a detrimental impact on the protected trees.
- The application was inappropriate, and so it should be refused on the grounds of size, scale, design, bulk, and prominence.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation, which was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

11. **18A ELGOOD AVENUE - 47802/APP/2017/4059** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Pergola to side (Retrospective)

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application sought retrospective approval for the erection of a structure described by the applicant as a pergola, located to the side of the dwelling. The pergola was a substantial open-sided covered patio which had been raised to the level of the house, 5 metres deep and 2.9 metres high, with a gently sloping pitched roof.

Officers confirmed that the structure was located within the Gateshill Estate, which was an area of special local character, and while not particularly visible from the street, was located on a prominent corner position of the road, and was highly visible ground and first floor windows within neighbouring properties.

Constructed with a polycarbonate roof and with open sides, the pergola was deemed to

be disproportionate and to not relate well to the form of the existing house, was incongruous, and not considered to be subordinate to the existing dwelling and wider character of the area of special local character.

The addendum was highlighted, which confirmed that the applicant had submitted a letter that had been circulated to all Committee members prior to the meeting, together with new photographs that had been included within the officer's presentation.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, the key points of which were:

- The petitioner was speaking on behalf of the Gatehill Residents Association, who believed that the application breached many of the Council's planning policies, both in general, and specific to Gatehill Farm Estate .
- 18a Elgood Avenue was positioned at the lowest possible part of the road on the Gatehill Farm Estate, where the east and west part of the road were raised, and so the structure was highly visible from both the ground floor and the first floor rooms of neighbouring properties.
- The structure was disproportionate in size and did not relate to the existing house in shape or form.
- The structure was large-scale and built with unsympathetic materials which were harmful to the character of the area. The roof was polycarbonate with open sides, appeared incongruous, and was not considered to be subordinate to the existing dwelling.
- The structure was detrimental to the wider character of the area of special local character and on that basis should be refused.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation, which was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

12. **NORTHWOOD HEALTH & RACQUET CLUB - 272/APP/2018/451** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Erection of a combined heat and power unit enclosure

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the site was a multi sports and health complex within a countryside conservation area, which formed part of the Greenbelt. The proposal was small in relation to the rest of the site, and fully complied with the aims of the national planning policy framework, London Plan, and Local Plan policies, which sought to encourage the provision of new and/or enhanced sports facilities. It was considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable impact on the visual amenities of the site, and would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers and neighbouring residential properties.

The addendum was highlighted, which proposed to delete conditions 4 (landscaping) and 5 (sound insulation/mitigation) as these were not required. Officers concluded by stating that the application was recommended for approval.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

13. **40 THE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD - 13554/APP/2016/4477** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Regularisation of roof alterations

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the proposal sought to retain an unauthorized small side-facing box dormer and two rear-facing gable end roof extensions. The side-facing element of the L-shaped dormer would be removed, whilst the rear facing section would be retained.

It was deemed that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area, would provide adequate levels of sunlight and daylight to the property, and would not result in the loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be approved.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

14. **PEMBROKE HOUSE, PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 38324/APP/2018/164** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of the Secretary of State's Appeal Decision ref: APP/R5510/W/16/3155076 dated 11/11/2016 (LBH ref: 38324/APP/2016/407 dated 24-06-2016) (Erection of detached building to accommodate refuse storage at ground floor and office accommodation above) for minor elevational variations, relocation of refuse store and infilling of undercroft to create garage

Officers introduced the report. It was considered that the proposed alterations would not have any detrimental impact on the character or appearance of the building, would not be highly visible from the street scene, and would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be approved.

Members suggested that the Head of Planning and Enforcement be granted delegated authority to add a further condition to prevent future residential use of the site.

The officer's recommendation, inclusive of the additional condition as set above, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be approved; and**
- 2. That the Head of Planning and Enforcement be delegated authority to add an additional condition mandating that the property should only be used for the purposes as set out on the plan.**

15. **MONTROSE COTTAGE, DUCKS HILL ROAD - 73100/APP/2018/625** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Two storey side/rear extension and conversion of dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 1-bed self-contained flats, involving demolition of existing garage and conservatory and installation of external staircase

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was a re-submission following a prior refusal. While the new proposal had in part addressed some of the previous reasons for refusal, the proposal remained unacceptable.

The revised proposal now included an external staircase, which was open and in a prominent position that, due to overall size and height, was incongruous and which failed to harmonize with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The proposal was deemed to be detrimental to the character, appearance, and visual amenity of the street scene in the surrounding area. In addition, the proposal failed to provide sufficient parking provision for the proposed units which would therefore result in an increase in on-street car parking in an area where such parking was at a premium. This would result in conditions that would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and to highway and pedestrian safety. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be refused.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

16. **CLUB HOUSE, MIDDLESEX STADIUM - 17942/APP/2018/249** (*Agenda Item 14*)

Creation of first floor level and raising of roof

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that permission had previously been granted in 1999 for a building extension (not implemented) and the installation of a number of football pitches (since implemented). Permission was now being sought for a further extension to accommodate a training academy on site.

The site was located in a Greenbelt, and while certain developments were acceptable in principle within Greenbelt land, training academies were not listed as such, and so the principle of the development was not acceptable.

In terms of design, the proposed roof alterations would not appear to be subordinate features and therefore would result in incongruous and disproportionate additions that would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, and to the visual amenity of the street scene.

In addition, the existing facility was often used for events, and the additional 360 square metres of what could be used as event space could generate significant traffic movements. Highways officers were not satisfied that there had been an adequate and up-to-date assessment of the transport impact, and the increased floor space was considered likely to generate large traffic volumes and parking demand that would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.

For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

17. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 769 - 20 BURWOOD AVENUE EASTCOTE**
(Agenda Item 15)

Tree preservation order no. 769 (tpo 769): 20 Burwood Avenue, Eastcote

Officers introduced the tree preservation order, and recommended that order be approved.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

18. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 16)*

RESOLVED:

1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.

2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition 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).

19. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 17)*

RESOLVED:

1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.

2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition 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).

20. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 18*)

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.**
- 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition 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 7.30 pm, closed at 8.35 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.