

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 November 2010

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Jazz Dhillon, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, David Payne and Brian Stead.</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Natasha Dogra, Democratic Services Meg Hirani, Planning and Enforcement James Rodger, Planning and Enforcement Sarah White, Legal Services</p>	
37.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr Alan Kauffman with Cllr Brian Stead substituting.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
38.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
39.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record by the Committee.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
40.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
41.	<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 to 12 were marked Part 1 and would be considered in Public. Item 13 was marked Part 2 and would be considered in Private.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
42.	<p><b>108-110 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP 9488/APP/2010/1507</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the variation of condition 5 (hours of use) of planning permission ref: 9488/APP/2009/2609 dated</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p>09/02/2010 for the change of use of car showroom to Class A3 (Restaurant and Cafe.)</p> <p>A petition in objection to the proposal had been received, but petitioners were not present to address the Committee.</p> <p>Members commended Officers on a very comprehensive report. Members stated that the area in which the longer opening hours of the building were proposed was a quiet and private area at the moment. The proposed opening hours of the building would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding dwellings. The longer opening hours of the building as proposed would not be beneficial to the surrounding area. The Committee agreed that the proposal would be unsettling for residents.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the Officers’ recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	
43.	<p><b>36 HIGH STREET, NORTHWOOD 3189/APP/2010/2180</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the change of use from Class A1 retail shop to Class A3/A5 restaurant/takeaway, to include minor alterations to shopfront, alterations to part rear roof from mono-pitch to flat roof, new high level windows to side, installation of a rear extractor flue and refuse area to rear, involving removal of 2 rooflights from existing flat roof.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in objection of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The application proposed would have a negative effect on the area.</li> <li>▪ There were currently enough takeaway shops to cater for the local residents.</li> <li>▪ Residents would have preferred retail shops opening instead of takeaway shops.</li> <li>▪ There was a degree of noise and smell pollution from the excessive number of takeaway shops on the parade.</li> <li>▪ The waste management strategy was unworkable, as disposal bags would need to be taken through the restaurant to the rear waste bins.</li> </ul> <p>Members highlighted the Petitioner’s wish for more retail shops to open on the parade in place of takeaway restaurants, however Members recognised that the parade had four empty units which retailers could open if they so wished. The Committee also recognised that this particular unit had been out of use for 18 months and at the moment the building was an eyesore and had a detrimental effect on the parade</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p>of shops.</p> <p>The Committee raised concerns over the waste management scheme and did not think it was healthy or safe to carry waste disposal bags through the restaurant. Officers informed the Committee that should approve be given; conditions would be attached so that the applicant could only open the unit if adequate waste arrangements were made.</p> <p>The Committee also raised concerns over a tree situated at the rear of the unit close to the waste bins. Officers suggested that Specialist Tree Officers be invited to look at this aspect more closely and add conditions should approval be given. Members deemed it necessary for the Council's Environmental Protection Unit to be involved when any conditions were being discussed. Officers suggested that an informative be attached to the application which stated that EPU Officers be consulted when conditions were being drawn up, which the Committee were in favour of.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed approval in the proportion of four Members for approval and two Members against.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the Officers' recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	
44.	<p><b>63 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD 19815/APP/2010/2148</b> <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i></p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the new wall and gated entrance at boundary (part retrospective application.)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residents of the area wished to preserve the character of the local area.</li> <li>▪ The gates were visually unpleasant.</li> <li>▪ The proposal would have had a detrimental effect of an area of special local character.</li> <li>▪ Visually the proposed gates did not match the surrounding dwellings and failed to fit in with the character of the area.</li> </ul> <p>The Agent representing the Application was present and was invited to address the Committee. The following points were raised by the Agent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed gates and wall were not of a great height and so were not intrusive.</li> <li>• Surrounding properties were obstructed by bushes, tree and similar foliage. This dwelling did not have a curtain of privacy and so gates had been proposed.</li> <li>• The approval of the gates would have allowed for a varied street scene.</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p>Members discussed the application and believed the proposal was out of character with the surrounding area. The Committee agreed that the proposal would decrease significance from the area of special local character.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the Officers’ recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	
45.	<p><b>2 HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD 34684/APP/2010/2013</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the part two storey, part single storey rear/side extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use with rear dormer and conversion of enlarged dwelling to 1 three-bedroom, 1 two-bedroom and 1 one- bedroom flats, involving demolition of existing attached garage.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in objection of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal did not cater for a suitably large amenity area</li> <li>▪ The building would be out of character with the surrounding area</li> </ul> <p>A Ward Councillor was present and was invited to address the Committee. The Ward Councillor raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road on which the application was proposed was a straight road of Georgian houses. Therefore, the proposal would be out of character with the surrounding area.</li> <li>• There was an issue of parking: the parking on the road was already very tight. With the proposal it would be even more difficult to park on the road, which may result in people parking on the pavements.</li> <li>• There was a lack of amenity space.</li> </ul> <p>Members raised concerns over the parking issue and were wary of the fact that it was already difficult to park down the road. The lack of amenity space was also noted by the Committee. The Committee noted that the floor space only measured up to 102sqm, which was under the Council’s requirement of 120sqm. Members asked that this additional reason be added as a reason for refusal.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the Officers’ recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>

46.	<p><b>62 FAIRACRES, RUISLIP 24895/APP/2010/2170</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, enlargement of front and rear dormer windows and conversion of garage to habitable space.</p> <p>Members discussed the impact the proposal would have on the surrounding area and agreed that the effect would be negative. Members noted the application to be unduly bulky and unsympathetic on the surrounding dwellings. There was a degree of overshadowing on surrounding gardens during the morning time.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the Officers’ recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
47.	<p><b>GRASS VERGE OPPOSITE RECREATION GROUND, MOORHALL ROAD, HAREFIELD 67032/APP/2010/2380</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the installation of a 11.8m high mobile telecommunications pole and ancillary equipment cabinet (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</p> <p>Members discussed the proposal and deemed it to be unnecessary as there was an existing telephone mast in the close vicinity. The proposal would add unnecessary clutter and street furniture to the area.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the Officers’ recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
48.	<p><b>PATH ADJ. RECREATION GROUND OPPOSITE FIELD END JUNIOR SCHOOL, FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP 61143/APP/2010/2442</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers presented the report which described the replacement of existing H3G 13m replica telegraph pole telecoms mast, with 15m replica telegraph pole telecoms mast with ancillary cabinets at ground level. Original to be removed (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</p> <p>Members discussed the proposal and recognised that the application was simply for a replacement. Officers relayed to the Committee that although a consultation had taken place no objections had been received.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being</p>	<b>Action by</b>

	<p>put to the vote, the Committee agreed approved unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved as per the Officers' recommendation and as per the addendum.</b></p>	
49.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the recommendation be enforced. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed enforcement unanimously.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the recommendation be enforced as per the Officers' report and as per the addendum.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>
50.	<p><b>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
51.	<p><b>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.15 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Natasha Dogra on 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.