

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

28 January 2021

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggart, Allan Kauffman, Carol Melvin, John Oswald (Opposition Lead), Jagjit Singh and David Yarrow</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) and James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
113.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
114.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
115.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS DATED 9 DECEMBER 2020 AND 14 JANUARY 2021 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings dated 9 December 2020 and 14 January 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
116.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
117.	<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 the items of business marked Part 1 (items 1-11) would be considered in public and the items of business marked Part 2 (items 12-14) would be considered in private.</p>
118.	<p>25 DENE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 46479/APP/2020/3055 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Replacement of existing buildings with a 2.5 storey building comprising 5 x 3-bed and 3 x 2-bed self-contained flats, parking, landscaping works and widening of vehicular crossover to front.

Officers introduced the report advising Members that the application was recommended for approval. The proposal was deemed to be well-designed, well-prepared and of high quality. It was considered that the development would not be detrimental to the amenity of local residents and would not be harmful to the Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The Committee was informed that Highways officers, Conservation officers and Tree & Landscape officers had raised no objections to the scheme. Thorough reports had been submitted in relation to the basement, daylight and sunlight, water, trees and flood management.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of petitioners objecting to the application. Key points included:

- The proposed development was a threat to the local area;
- Approval of such a development would set a precedent for future developments;
- The proposal would not be in keeping with the character of the ASLC;
- The intensification of the site to create a new build of 8 flats, in a bulky building constructed very close to both side boundaries, would fail to harmonise with the other properties which were mainly detached single family houses;
- The proximity to neighbouring properties would be detrimental to immediate neighbours and the local environment;
- The increase in the number of vehicles would create further parking stress and present a safety risk;
- The proposed building would adversely impact the outlook and daylight of properties in Foxdell and Firs Walk and would infringe on the rights of residents by directly overlooking them;
- The 10% flat redevelopment principle should not apply in an ASLC;
- A related proposal at 5 & 6 Firs Walk sought to significantly increase the density of that site; the two proposals represented gross over-development;
- The strain on existing services, particularly water supply and drainage, would negatively impact on existing properties;
- Petitioners had not been adequately consulted during the application process.

A written submission was read to the Committee on behalf of the agent for the application. Key points included:

- The proposal was policy compliant;
- Gavacan Homes had worked closely with planning officers for over a year to establish an acceptable scheme;
- A Heritage specialist who was also a former Historic England Inspector and trained architect had been commissioned to assist in addressing concerns raised by the Conservation Officer in relation to the previous design and its relationship with the neighbouring locally listed building and the ASLC;
- A high-quality development was now proposed which respected the historic setting, introduced a new building sympathetic to the original and to the Dene Road frontage and created a landscape regime that added to the area's verdancy;
- Planning officers were in support of the new design and the Conservation Officer had commended it;
- The proposed development delivered a number of benefits including better use

of the site by providing a net increase of 7 units, a mix of housing including family sized accommodation and units which exceeded minimum space standards;

- The proposal would not result in more than 10% of properties in Dene Road being redeveloped into flats;
- The building would be no further forward than the existing and the roof line would be the same height;
- The site had capacity to accommodate the proposal – parking and amenity provision complied with local standards and all units would receive plentiful daylight and sunlight;
- The building footprint sat well within the 45-degree lines of the neighbouring properties to protect them from overshadowing and loss of privacy;
- 13 parking spaces were proposed, including Blue Badge and Electric Vehicle provision and the increase in traffic would be minimal;
- A Construction Management Plan would be approved prior to the commencement of works at the site.

With reference to the nearby conversion to a flatted development referred to by the petitioner, Members enquired how many additional flats were proposed at that site. The Head of Planning was unable to confirm definitively but indications suggested there would be 5 flats.

The Committee welcomed the inclusion of 3-bed family homes at the application site. Members enquired how the current proposal differed to previous proposals which had been rejected. It was confirmed that the current proposed development was smaller and further from the boundary with neighbouring properties. The proposal complied with policy in all respects.

In response to questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that obscure glazed screens to balconies would be incorporated to ensure there was no overlooking. Members heard that the majority of the proposed quality control conditions had yet to be discharged. In respect of drainage, Councillors were reassured that a comprehensive report on this matter had been received.

Members enquired whether flatted developments were allowed in an Area of Special Local Character. It was confirmed that these were not prohibited provided they enhanced the area and the design was of high quality. The Committee heard that the proposal would not exceed the 10% policy in respect of flatted developments.

In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the Flood and Water Management Officer had requested a detailed report and had been satisfied with the proposal.

Members supported the officer's recommendation to approve the scheme which was high quality and policy-compliant. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

119. **33 GATEHILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 22910/APP/2020/2870** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Part two storey, part single storey front/side/rear extension to existing chalet, and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include retention of 1 x existing front dormer and 1 x existing side dormer, plus 1 x proposed rear dormer and 1 x

proposed rear rooflight.

Officers introduced the application noting that the proposed extensions were large and would constitute a substantial change. Members were informed that the Conservation Officer had concluded that the development would erode the quality of the original property and was therefore unacceptable. It was felt that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the original house, the street scene and the Area of Special Local Character.

A written submission had been received from petitioners in objection to the application and was read out to the Committee. Key points included:

- Overbearing Street Scene – the property was set at an elevated position and had a narrower frontage than other properties. It was set further forward than the other properties. If the application were approved, the original building would be lost and the new building would be overbearing on the street scene;
- New Build Not Subordinate – the proposed development would double the footprint, add double storey extensions to the front, extend the property on both sides, add a 3-storey block at the rear and incorporate a colossal new roof structure with several crown roofs;
- Hijack of Non-Owned Land – the site had been incorrectly redlined as land owned by Gatehill Estate Northwood Limited had been incorrectly included within the redline;
- Privacy concerns – the privacy of no.31 Gateshill Road would be compromised as only windows in non-habitable rooms would be conditioned to be obscure glazed. Residents of Ravenswood Park would be dependent on the applicant not felling boundary trees and shrubs.

Members were in agreement with the officer's recommendation commenting that the proposed development was excessive and unacceptable. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

120. **28B KINGSEND, RUISLIP - 73975/APP/2020/3392** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Addition of a first floor to provide 2 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking and amenity space.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the information in the addendum which included comments from the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Panel and a proposed fourth reason for refusal. Members heard that the proposed development would alter the character of the existing building and would not enhance the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The development would be over-dominant, impact negatively on the amenity of 28a Kingsend and on the street scene and would fail to safeguard a protected tree. The 10% rule in terms of flattened developments would also be breached as detailed in the addendum.

Petitioners had submitted a written representation in objection to the application which was read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points included:

- The original bungalow at 28B Kingsend had been a modest single storey bungalow. It had been progressively extended on all sides over the years resulting in a large irregularly shaped footprint;

- The property had recently been divided into two bungalows -28B and 28C. The proposal would add another storey with a much higher roof structure;
- The additional storey would dominate the outlook for many surrounding properties;
- The site was predominantly landlocked;
- The site was located over 45m from Kingsend accessible via a single track gated driveway. This single car track with no dedicated footpath was intended for 1 or 2 cars, not to access a block of flats;
- Residents adjacent to the property would feel hemmed in;
- Properties at 21, 23, 23A Ickenham Road were already curtailed by the presence of the Methodist Church with its excessively high roof, the church hall and outbuildings;
- The proposed development would be located just a few feet from rear garden fences with overlooking to gardens and patios;
- Access to the site for emergency vehicles and refuse collection would be problematic – there were no bin stores or cycle storage at present;
- Petitioners objected to the proposal due to the unsuitable location, bulk and close proximity to boundaries of many adjoining properties. The development would be visually intrusive, overbearing and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. It did not respect design guidelines in terms of form, volume, elevation treatments, outlook and vehicular access. Its bulky appearance would fail to harmonise with the character of the Ruislip Village Conservation area.

A written submission had been received from the agent and was read to the Committee. Key points included:

- The application site lay between Kingsend Road and Ickenham Road. Ickenham Road properties were over 45m away, Kingsend properties 35m away and Sovereign Close properties over 30m away from the property;
- The application site was not easily visible from Kingsend road and was dominated by a large modern flatted development. It could only be seen through a narrow gap between No.28 and 30 Kingsend Road. Even with the addition of two flats on the first floor, the property would be overshadowed by the large Methodist Church building;
- The property was barely visible from Ickenham Road – a pocket-sized view of the property could be seen through the gap between the Church and 21 Ickenham Road. Even with the addition of two flats, the property would be in line with a series of large two storey buildings and would be inconspicuous compared to the sprawling building block of the Church;
- There was a pocket-sized view of the property from Sovereign Close. However, Sovereign Close was a small cul-de-sac with no passing pedestrians. The application site was a back-land development surrounded by large mature trees which provided a natural screen;
- The development would not adversely impact the character of Ruislip Village. Changes to proposed windows had been made to include a reduction by half in the size of the lounge and bedroom windows, removal of three small windows, replacement of bathroom windows and the 3rd bedroom with skylights and the removal of the kitchen side window;
- The protected tree was approximately 8m from the property. The applicants were willing to obtain a tree report from an expert to confirm that the proposed development would not harm the cedar tree;
- The development would be similar in size and character to nearby properties

and would not be incongruous. The site was barely visible from the road therefore could not be detrimental to the character and visual amenity of Ruislip Village. The proposed windows had been changed to ensure that the development did not impact negatively on the privacy of surrounding properties.

A written submission in objection to the proposal had been received from Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne. This was read out to the Committee. Key points included:

- Ward Councillor Corthorne supported the officer's recommendation for refusal commenting that the proposal would result in overdevelopment within the Conservation Area and would not harmonise with the local area. It would also result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity;
- Some inaccuracies in the officer's report were highlighted – the percentage of flatted development in Kingsend already exceeded the 10% that the Planning Inspectorate previously deemed an appropriate upper limit. This had been acknowledged in previous appeals – the correct figure was 13% whereas the report stated 8%. The report also failed to reference the objections of the Ruislip Conservation Panel.

Members concurred with the officer's recommendation for refusal citing considerable concerns regarding overdevelopment and overlooking. The Committee noted that there were four good reasons for refusal set out in the report and the addendum.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

121. **ST JOHNS SCHOOL, POTTER STREET HILL, NORTHWOOD - 10795/ADV/2020/64**
(Agenda Item 9)

Installation of 1 x wall mounted LED Logo sign.

Members noted that this was a small change therefore an officer's presentation was not deemed necessary. No objections or concerns were raised and the Committee was in agreement with the officer's recommendation to approve the application.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

122. **KINGDOM HALL OF JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES, OAKDALE AVENUE, NORTHWOOD - 11385/APP/2020/2982** (Agenda Item 10)

Conversion of part of the ground floor of an existing place of worship to form 2 x studio flats and alterations to fenestration.

Officers presented the report noting that the studios would only be in use on an ad hoc basis by visiting dignitaries of the Church. It was explained that the studios would be occupied by ministers connected to the charity who would only use the studios for part of each week. No alterations in terms of scale were proposed and the application met policy standards; however, it was noted that there was no exterior private amenity space. A legal agreement was proposed to restrict the use of the studios to visiting

ministers only.

Members noted that the application site was in Northwood Hills rather than in Northwood as stated in the report. The Committee requested clarification regarding soundproofing between studio 2 and the motor repair shop. It was confirmed that Condition 5 necessitated the submission of sound insulation information prior to commencement of development work.

In response to Members' requests for clarification, it was explained that paragraph 4 on page 70 of the agenda pack was advising Members of a potential reason for refusal; it did not mean that the applicant had failed to agree. A legal agreement was required to ensure that the studios were used on an ad hoc basis only and were not for general residential use.

Members were in agreement with the officer's recommendation and raised no further concerns. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

123. **SECTION 106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT** (*Agenda Item 11*)

RESOLVED: That the Section 106 Quarterly Monitoring Report be noted.

124. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 12*)

RESOLVED:

1. **That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was 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 purposes of it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 and 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **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** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

125. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13*)

RESOLVED:

1. **That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was 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 purposes of it**

issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 and 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **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** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

126. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 14*)

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was 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 purposes of it issuing the formal beach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 and 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **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** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.40 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on Telephone 01895 250636 or email (recommended): epenny@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.