

## Minutes



**NORTH** Planning Committee

**18 September 2019**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Martin Goddard, Becky Haggard, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, John Oswell and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Matt Kolaszewski (Planning Team Manager), Kerrie Munroe (Legal Advisor) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
64.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
65.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
66.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
67.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that a late enforcement item had been added to the agenda, which would be considered in Part II.</p>
68.	<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> <p>It was confirmed that items 1-9 were Part I and would therefore be considered in public, while item 10 was Part II and would therefore be considered in private.</p>
69.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 43 THE DRIVE ADJACENT TO 68 AND 113 KNOLL CRESCENT - 70975/APP/2019/1984</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>2 x 2-bed, one and a half storey, semi-detached dwelling houses with</b></p>

**associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of existing outbuilding**

Officers introduced the report which detailed the requested permission for a pair of semi-detached, two storey two bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space, involving demolition of an existing outbuilding within an area of land to the rear of 41 and 43 The Drive, Northwood. The new dwellings would be accessed off the southern arm of Knoll Crescent. A recent site visit had shown that 43 The Drive was now a separate entity and had recently been sold.

Officers asserted that the proposal would harm the open and verdant character of the Site, and would detract from the character and appearance of the overall street scene. For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

The addendum was highlighted, which set out an additional reason for refusal that related to the protection of trees on the site.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the applications. Points raised included:

- Residents were dismayed that another application had been submitted that was so similar to previously refused applications.
- 3 appeals relating to applications at the site had been dismissed in the last 4 years, and there was no logical reason that Members could approve the application when it was so similar to that of an application refused last year.
- The applications constituted back land development in an area where there has never been permission to build houses.
- The building described as a swimming pool is not used for that purpose and had been built in an attempt to circumvent previous refusal decisions, and should be removed now that the land is not in the curtilage of No 43.
- The same applies to the garages which were built under permitted development for the amenity of No 43 and no longer have any legitimate reason to exist.
- If approved, development would exacerbate drainage problems and low water pressure issues in the nearby areas.
- Parking for residents is a problem due to the crossover gate created to access the site from Knoll Crescent. Now that the site is no longer linked to No 43, there is no reason for this access.
- Attempts to develop the site should cease, to allow it to revert to its previous state as an open and verdant part of the landscape. Greenery and wildlife on site should be protected.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

70. **10 WOODGATE CRESCENT - 30997/APP/2019/2153** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Variation of condition nos. 2 (Approved plans) and 4 (Windows) of application 30997/APP/2018/660 to allow for minor material amendments (First floor side extension, first floor rear extension, single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and installation of a rear dormer to create additional habitable roof space) to allow changes to the design of the dormer windows, the installation of 2 rooflights to the single storey rear extension and the excavation**

**of a basement.**

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the application sought to vary conditions of a previously approved application. The proposed alterations were considered to be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the wider Area of Special Local Character, and the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, and welcomed the officers' report and recommendation that the application be refused. However, it was felt that there were grounds for additional reasons for refusal to be added. These were:

- There are large conifers on the site which overhang neighbouring properties. However, no tree survey has been submitted, contrary to policy;
- Policy states that there must be soft landscaping above the basements, though this has not been proposed;
- The proposed basement is extensive and Hillingdon's emerging Local Plan states that basements that extend the length or width of the property above should not be allowed;
- The proposed works to the garage and basement will result in a four-story building which raises concerns over stability. No structural report has been submitted, contrary to policy; and
- The applicant has not submitted ground water surveys and concerns remain regarding flooding risks.

In response, officers advised that the referred to policy regarding basements and flooding was in place to ensure sufficient room to incorporate flood prevention measures. In this instance, the proposed basement did not extend so substantially that there was no room for these measures, hence the Council's Flood Water Management Officer was satisfied that the basement under the garage would not cause flooding issues.

Regarding the trees, officers were satisfied that the proposed alterations as part of the application under determination would not cause harm to any trees on site.

In relation to soft landscaping and stability, these matters could have been dealt with by condition, if the application was recommended for approval. However, the application was recommended for refusal, thus there were no conditions being applied.

Members requested that officers attempt to source detailed surveys, including groundwater and stability surveys, from the applicant should they be minded to submit another application. Officers advised that an informative could be added, under consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, specifying the expected information to be submitted with future applications.

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

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the application be refused; and**
- 2. That the Head of Planning be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to add an informative setting out the Council's expectations for information to be submitted as part of any future**

applications.

71. **66 PARK WAY RUISLIP - 62072/APP/2019/409** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Part change of use of ground floor premises from Travel Management Company (A1) to Tuition classes (Use class D1) & office use at rear and alterations to roof**

Officers introduced the report and addendum, confirming that the application sought to change the use to that of a teaching facility involving five small rooms which would hold up to six persons each. However, evidence from similar uses would suggest that it was unlikely that more than 20 pupils would be on the premises at any one time.

The site was situated within the Secondary Shopping frontage on Park Way. The Council's Planning Policy Manager considered that the proposal would bring benefits to the town centre and should be supported, while the Highway Authority was satisfied that the proposal would not exacerbate congestion or parking stress, and would not raise any highway safety concerns. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

Members requested further detail on the guidelines for capacities within educational sites. Officers advised that this was a matter for the Department of Education and did not constitute a material planning consideration.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

72. **166 HIGH STREET RUISLIP - 4079/APP/2019/1642** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Change of use from A1 (Shops) to A5 (Takeaway) and single storey rear extension with associated alterations.**

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the application sought permission for the change of use to a takeaway, with the erection of a single storey rear extension, a new staircase, and the provision of an extractor flue. The proposed change of use to an A5 take away was considered inappropriate within a primary shopping area, and the proposal also failed to provide sufficient information to ensure that there would be no detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Members requested confirmation of how long the unit had been vacant. Officers advised that this was unknown, due to a lack of information from the applicant, though the unit appeared to have been in use as of April 2018. The shopping area itself had a low rate of vacancies, and officers highlighted the distinction between primary and secondary shopping areas.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

73. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**RESOLVED:**

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, be agreed; and,**
- 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 purpose of it 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 7.00 pm, closed at 7.49 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.**