

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

1 June 2010

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Carol Melvin David Allam</p> <p>OFFICERS PRESENT:</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Matthew Duigan (Central and South Area, Deputy Team Leader) Charmian Baker (Planning Specialist Manager) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Keith Lancaster (Legal Advisor) Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p> | |
| 1. | <p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Allan Kauffman substitute Cllr Paul Buttivant Cllr Anita MacDonald substitute Cllr Jazz Dhillion Cllr Michael Markham substitute Cllr Pat Jackson Cllr David Payne substitute Cllr Tim Barker</p> | |
| 2. | <p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6 'Former Reindeer Public House, Northwood' as she had discussed the application with residents. She left the room and did not vote on this item.</p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 8 'Former Kings Arms Garage Site, Rickmansworth Road, Harefield' as he knew the petitioner professionally.</p> | |
| 3. | <p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - TO FOLLOW (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of 20 May 2010 were unavailable.</p> | |
| 4. | <p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> | |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 5. | <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> | |
| 6. | <p>FORMER REINDEER PH, MAXWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 18958/APP/2009/2210 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a part two, part three, part four storey building comprising of 1 one-bedroom flat, 4 two-bedroom flats and 7 three-bedroom flats, with associated surface and basement car parking, secured cycle parking, bin store and alterations to vehicular access.</p> <p>18958/APP/2009/2210</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"> • The residential amenity and car parking spaces for the proposal are inadequate. • There is uncertainty whether the proposal will be finished to the requisite standard. • The proposal will have a massive frontage and will look like a warehouse. • The proposal will block out the southern sunlight to current the Green Lane flats. • The proposal is contrary to BE23. The kitchen and bathroom window of one flat will overlook the car park. This property will be affected by noise and poor air quality. • The proposal lacks sufficient amenity space for children to play adequately or safely. • A significant proportion of the amenity space will be concrete. • The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site. • The (possibility of) Developers losses are not material planning reasons. • The provision of 13 car parking spaces is inadequate and is 5 short of the number required by the UDP policy. • The proposal will restrict access to the local roads. • The proposal does not make adequate provision for refuse collection. <p>Points raised by the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aim of the proposal is to provide high quality homes for those people wishing to downsize their property. • Following discussions with the Council, the proposal has been redesigned and reduced in size. • The proposed development will enhance the character and appearance of the street scene through the building design and use of landscaping. • The overall scale, height and massing of the proposal has been | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |

significantly reduced compared to the previously refused scheme.

- The proposal will help to regenerate the area.
- Careful consideration has been given to the materials employed in the design.
- The design protects the privacy of occupiers and owners through the use of obscure glazing and uses full height privacy screens on balconies where appropriate.
- The scheme will contribute £10,000 towards the expansion of community facilities and £28,000 towards local open space and recreation improvements.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- The objections raised by the petitioners were supported.
- The report is inaccurate.
- There is not a reasonable transition between the commercial centre and the residential development the proposal adjoins.
- There are insufficient car parking spaces in the proposal. Where will residents' guests park?
- The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.
- There is insufficient amenity space.
- The pitch of the roof is too acute and reducing the amount of available sales space is not sufficient reason to allow this.
- The proposal is not sympathetic to the area. It is out of character and the turret design will not match the street scene.
- There is insufficient amenity space for children to play
- The proposal is contrary to the UDP and LDF

In answer to a query about car parking and the likely effect on the local area, officers advised the Committee that 13 car parking spaces was adequate for this type of development given the provision of cycle spaces and good transport links (the London Metropolitan Tube Line) near by.

Members asked for further clarification on the amount of amenity space. Officers explained that the total amount of amenity space had been calculated by adding the balcony space, courtyard and side landscaping together but confirmed that the front garden space had been excluded from this calculation. In total the proposal provided 75% of the recommended amenity space but there was an 83³m shortfall.

In response to a query about privacy, officers confirmed that the full height (6ft tall) obscure glazing was proposed for those balconies where privacy issues were anticipated. Officers acknowledged that the courtyard would be overlooked but explained that the overlooking of communal space was typical of this type of development.

Further issues raised by Members included height, massing and the appearance of the proposal. In response, officers advised that there would be a diagonal height transition between the residential properties and Clive Parade. Officers confirmed the building was substantial and would be prominent but that a well designed proposal would not mean

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p>it was out of keeping with the street scene. Officers stated that they felt the scale of the proposal was acceptable in this case. Members also raised concerns about the design and layout of the car park and remained concerned about how the traffic light system of entry and egress might work.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be Refused for the reasons listed below. On being put to the vote, refusal was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The proposal, by reason of its overall scale, siting, and design would constitute an inappropriate development of the site, resulting in an unduly intrusive, visually prominent and incongruous form of development, which would fail to respect the established character of the Northwood Town Centre Green Lane Conservation Area and the area generally. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE4, BE13 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's HDAS (Supplementary Planning Document) 'Residential Layouts'.</p> <p>2. The proposal fails to provide amenity space of sufficient size and quality so as to be commensurate with the size and layout of the development. As such the proposal would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future residents, contrary to Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), and the Council's HDAS (Supplementary Planning Document) 'Residential Layouts'.</p> | |
| 7. | <p>BUCON HOUSE, STONEFIELD WAY, RUISLIP - 63619/APP/2010/381 (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>New single storey warehouse, incorporating site re-levelling, re-using and improving existing road access point with associated parking, 2 lorry servicing bays and covered cycle facilities, including demolition of existing single storey warehouse with ancillary two storey offices and surrounding outbuildings.</p> <p>63619/APP/2010/381</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report and addendum subject to amending Condition 9 by inserting the number "13" between the words "out of" and "spaces" and adding an additional informative as follows:</p> <p>You are advised that there would be a need for the applicant to enter into a section 278 Agreement with the Council to carry out any works on the highway. The applicant is also advised to</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | <p>contact the Council's Highways Department to discuss any works to the Highway which are to be carried out through the Council at the developer's expense.</p> | |
| <p>8.</p> | <p>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2009/2442 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of existing listed building incorporating new two storey extension with habitable roof space comprising 3 one-bedroom flats and part use as Class A1 (Retail) for use as convenience goods store, to include associated parking, involving demolition of existing single storey detached building and extension to listed building.</p> <p>3877/APP/2009/2442</p> <p>At the start of the item, the Chairman explained that the petition which had been submitted enabled a representative of the petitioners to speak on agenda Items 8, 9 and 10 which were all related. If the petitioner did so, then the agent would have a right to reply on each occasion. The petitioner waived this right and chose to speak on Item 8 only.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The officer recommendations for refusal were supported. • The suggestion that the applicant would use 8 metre long lorries for deliveries was unrealistic. The petitioner managed a food retail store nearby, which was a quarter of the size of the proposed development. This still required deliveries by a 10 metre long lorry, 4 times per week. The applicant has underestimated the number of deliveries required. • There is a need to protect the historic town centre. • The number of deliveries required will cause traffic problems and might impede emergency vehicles using the local hospital. • The applicant has a history of using vehicles larger than 8 metres when delivering to retail outlets within the Borough at Eastcote, Ruislip Manor and West Ruislip. <p>Points raised by the agent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main issue raised by the petitioner is the size of the delivery vehicles. The applicant now proposes to use 8 metre lorries which overcomes this concern. • The smaller turning circle of these lorries will ensure the tree with the preservation order at the rear of the proposed development will not be affected by vehicular movements. <p>Members asked officers for further clarification about vehicular movements during deliveries. Officers explained that using a sweep entry method, 8 metre delivery lorries could be used in the short term. In the long term however, tree growth would make these unsuitable. Officers confirmed that 10 metre delivery lorries would collide with the protected tree.</p> <p>In response to a query about enforcing the use of smaller lorries, the</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p>Highways Engineer explained that the applicant had a proven history of using larger vehicles for most deliveries and these ranged between 12.6 to 14.25 metres. The point was made, that smaller lorries would ensure that more deliveries were required.</p> <p>The Legal Officer advised that the ability to objectively monitor the situation to establish any breach and the relatively onerous nature of monitoring on a ongoing basis could be problematical and that the imposition of a condition dealing with the issue may risk appeal.</p> <p>Given the alterations to the rear car park design and loss of 3 car parking spaces to facilitate delivery vehicles, Members queried where potential customers might park? Officers explained that customers would need to park in the surrounding area on nearby roads.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as recommended in the report with the changes and additions as set out in the Addendum and the following additional reason for refusal:</p> <p>The delivery vehicle operations at the site would involve the need for a high and consistent level of management intervention throughout the life of the development which would not be sufficiently robust in the long term to ensure the safe operation of the site. The development is likely to result in delivery vehicles waiting and/or loading/unloading on the adjoining highway. The delivery operation would block the one way system resulting in cars exiting the site via an entry only access and entering via an exit only access, which would result in driver confusion and unexpected vehicle movements for other highway users. The development is therefore considered to be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety and prejudicial to the free flow of traffic on the adjoining highway, including access by emergency vehicles to and from the adjoining Harefield Hospital, contrary to Policy AM7 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p> | |
| 9. | <p>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2009/2443 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of existing listed building incorporating new two storey extension with habitable roofspace comprising 3 one-bedroom flats and part use as Class A1 (Retail) for use as convenience goods store, to include associated parking, involving demolition of existing single storey building (Application for Listed Building Consent.)</p> <p>3877/APP/2009/2443</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |

| | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | <p>put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p> | |
| 10. | <p>FORMER KINGS ARMS GARAGE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, HAREFIELD - 3877/APP/2009/2444 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of the existing detached car wash facility building (Application for Conservation Area Consent.)</p> <p>3877/APP/2009/2444</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |
| 11. | <p>39-41 RUSHDENE ROAD, EASTCOTE - 51162/APP/2010/124 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Revised layout plan for the site frontage involving a replacement crossover to access the off-street parking area and landscaping (amendment to application 51162/APP/2009/466).</p> <p>51162/APP/2010/124</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p> | <p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Matthew Duigan</p> |
| 12. | <p>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> | |
| 15. | <p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> | |

The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm closed at 9.00 pm

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.