

## Minutes



### **NORTH Planning Committee**

**16 September 2020**

**Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London**

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggar, John Oswell, John Morgan, Allan Kauffman, Jagjit Singh and Steve Tuckwell (In place of Carol Melvin)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager) and James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
65.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Melvin. Councillor Tuckwell was present as her substitute.</p>
66.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Dhot declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 7, Land to the side of 17 Woodside Road, in that he had been contacted by the applicant. Councillor Dhot confirmed that he had not entered into discussion with the applicant, and would remain in the meeting and take part in the discussion and voting for the item.</p>
67.	<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 20 August 2020 be approved as a correct record.</p>
68.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that Agenda Item 8, Telecommunications at Jun Bridle Road and Cheney Street, Bridle Road, Eastcote, had been withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.</p>
69.	<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 1-10 would be considered in public, while Item 11 would be considered in private.</p>

70. **LAND TO THE REAR OF 18 MOOR PARK ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 21577/APP/2020/1792** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the application, and highlighted that a previous application for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, with two new vehicle crossovers onto Grove Road, had been refused in January 2020.

Officers confirmed that the application was contrary to policy DMH6 of the Local Plan Part 2, as the application would result in the loss of the residential rear garden, and the impact of the proposed dwelling on the immediate locality was considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. The proposed infilling of the gap would also appear out of character with the pattern, scale and form of development within the surrounding area. The proposal also failed to make adequate provision for the retention and long-term protection of off-site trees.

For these reasons, the application was recommended for refusal.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners objecting to the application, key points of which included:

- This was the second application made on this piece of land in the last two years. This application was for a 5 bedroom dwelling that could easily be made into a 6 or 7 bedroom dwelling through use of the additional rooms (as shown in the plans).
- The application was contrary to policy DMH6 and BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local plan Part 1, and would result in the loss of gardens that were important to local character, that were used to provide safe and secure amenity and play space, that supported biodiversity, and that helped to reduce flood risk and the effects of climate change.
- The application did not adhere to policies stating that backland development must be more intimate in mass and scale and lower than frontage properties, and that trees, shrubs and wildlife habituate must be retained.
- The application's references to construction of a new house at 1A Grove Road had no merit, as the property at 1A was a new house built on a plot that had previously held a residential property. In contrast, the application sought to erect a new house in an area where no houses had previously been built.
- The proposed development would fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the street scene.

The Committee supported the refusal reasons as set out, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

71. **LAND TO THE SIDE OF 17 WOODSIDE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 29754/APP/2020/1397** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the application and highlighted the addendum, confirming that a proposal for a detached dwelling in this plot had been considered under a pre-application submission in April 2020 Subject to details, the Council's Conservation Officer considered the proposed separate dwelling more suited to the site than the

previously approved extension.

Though the site was located in the Gatehill Farm Estate Area of Special Local Character, it was considered that the design and appearance of the proposed dwelling would respect the character and style of the Gatehill Farm Estate. The dwelling frontage would be 8.3m, though the plot was 20m at the rear, resulting in an average width of over 14m. The materials to be used in the construction had been conditioned to ensure they were of high quality. The Conservation Officer had confirmed that the proposal would set a good design precedent with the area. It was considered that the application would not result in an unneighbourly form of development and would provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupiers.

For these reasons, the application was recommended for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the report and as amended as shown on the addendum.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners objecting to the application, key points of which included:

- Over 150 residents had signed petitions objecting to the application, which was felt to be contrary to policy DHMB 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, regarding width of new houses.
- The proposed new dwelling had a frontage one third of the plot widths of the surrounding properties, and would not be of a similar scale, form or proportion as adjacent houses.
- The application was also felt to be contrary to policy DHMB 5, which mandated that developments within Areas of Special Local Character should reflect the character of the area and its original layout. The proposed development would fail to harmonise with the existing street scene.
- Allowing the development would set a harmful precedent for future developments within the Area.
- Concerns remained over the protection of mature greenery and trees affected by the build, with the Council's tree officers advising that they would be unable to check compliance moving forward.
- The proposal would require contractors to work on top of the root protections areas of trees.
- The report did not include comments or conditions relating to flood mitigation, or future development of the current property at the site.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of the agent/ applicant and petitioners in support of the application, key points of which included:

- In June this year, a planning approval had been granted by this Committee on the same site for a two storey side extension to the existing property at 17 Woodside Road. Since, then the current application had been submitted, with the Council's own Conservation team stating that *'A separate dwelling would be more suited as it would better respect the original dwelling and would not result in adding bulk to an existing built form'*.
- The proposal adhered to policy DHMB6. The overall site was one of the largest sites on the Estate.
- The planner's pre-application report asked the applicants to consider three design issues, that had subsequently been addressed as follows:
  - The crown roof had been amended to a traditional pitched roof;
  - The wedge-shaped planform had been amended to a rectilinear one;
  - The first floor rear glazing had been reduced and made more traditional in appearance.

- The materials to be used in construction would be complimentary to the two existing houses to the immediate left and right.
- The Council's Conservation officer considered that the proposed design respected the character and appearance of the Estate.
- The proposed new dwelling would be congruent with existing building lines on both plan and elevation.
- Sides of the two properties would be 3m apart. On the border with property no. 15, at its nearest point, the new build would be in excess of 1.5m away, and heavily screened by vegetation.
- There would be no breach of the 45-degree rule, at either the front or rear of the site.
- The proposal would be built on brown field land that was currently occupied by a double garage, with redundant paths and hard landscaping to be demolished.
- The Council's landscaping officer had considered the extensive arboricultural report and had not raised any concerns. Applicants had already agreed to a condition requiring soft landscaping proposals to be submitted, should approval be granted.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of Councillor Bianco, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, key points of which included:

- The application was the subject of great concern to many Northwood Hills residents, and the objections raised by petitioners were fully supported by the Ward Councillor.
- The application appeared to be contrary to many of the policies that the Council had developed to keep such areas special, not least of which was to avoid cramming in new houses on part plots and potentially creating new precedents which others could then seek to take advantage of elsewhere.

Officers addressed concerns over trees, flooding, width of plot and the principle of backland development. With regard to trees, it was highlighted that the Council's landscaping officer had not raised any objections, subject to adherence to the relevant conditions as set out in the report and addendum. With regard to flooding, the site was located in a critical drainage area, but conditions had been proposed to mitigate flood risk. Such conditions could be amended and strengthened, if the Committee was minded to approve the application.

The development was not considered to be backland development, and while it was accepted that the width of the plot was narrower at the front than at the rear, average widths were deemed to be acceptable. The comments of the Council's Conservation officer were highlighted, who had stated that the current proposal was considered to be an improvement on the previously approved scheme.

Members discussed the application, and concerns were raised that the application was contrary to policy DHMB 6, and would result in adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene due to the width of the frontage resulting in a cramped looking development. In addition, Members were concerned over the loss of the boundary treatment and the development's impact on neighbouring properties.

For these reasons, the Committee moved that the application be refused, with delegated authority granted to the Head of Planning to draft the wording of the refusal. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the application be refused; and</li> <li>2. That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to draft the wording of the refusal.</li> </ol>
72.	<p><b>TELECOMMUNICATIONS AT JUN BRIDLE ROAD &amp; CHENEY STREET, BRIDLE ROAD, EASTCOTE - 75666/APP/2020/2552</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
73.	<p><b>LAND AT GARAGE BLOCK SOUTHBOURNE GARDENS, RUISLIP - 72211/APP/2020/1728</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application sought only minor changes to a previously approved application, which included a 0.5m increase in depth of the front lobby at ground floor level only, and alterations to the approved roof, incorporating a small crown, set between the two side ridges.</p> <p>The proposals were not considered to significantly increase the scale of the building or bring the built form above first floor level any closer to the neighbouring properties to that previously approved.</p> <p>It was therefore recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>The Committee supported approval for the reasons set out, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
74.	<p><b>HUME WAY, RUISLIP - 54873/APP/2020/2457</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the proposal was considered to be an obtrusive form of development which would add visual clutter to the street scene, would not harmonise with the character of the area and would be detrimental to local visual amenities.</p> <p>This application was therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>The Committee supported refusal for the reasons set out, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</b></p>
75.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</li> <li>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 it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</li> </ol>

	<p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and <b>paragraphs 1, 2 and 7</b> of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains <b>information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime</b> and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.11 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on Telephone 01895 250636 or email (recommended): [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). 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.**