

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 August 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Payne John Morgan</p> <p>Also present: Malcolm Ellis (Vice-Chairman) Standards Committee</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (North Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Sarah Hickey (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p>
236.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
237.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor David Payne declared a prejudicial interest in Item 6 as he was a school Governor at Bishop Ramsey Church of England School, Eastcote Road, Ruislip and left the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p>
238.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING - 14 JULY 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as a correct record subject to adding the amendment – For Clarification: That the legal agreement stopping further building at Highgrove House would remain in force until the planning is resolved.</p>
239.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

240.	<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>All items were considered in Public.</p>
241.	<p>BISHOP RAMSEY CHURCH OF ENGLAND SCHOOL, EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP - 19731/APP/2006/1442 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the changes in the Addendum.</p> <p>The Legal Officer explained that it was necessary to amend the legal agreement that had been entered into by the Council and the applicant in accordance with the officer's report. The amendment did not alter any of the heads of terms imposed by the Planning Committee but just brought the terms of the agreement in line with current drafting in respect of mortgagee clauses and was necessary to enable the applicant obtaining funding.</p> <p>The recommendation for the approval of variation to the Section 106 Agreement was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was approved.</p> <p>Resolved – That the variation to Section 106 Agreement be Approved.</p>
242.	<p>DAY CENTRE - PLOT 1, ACOL CRESCENT, RUISLIP - 65847/APP/2011/1132 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the changes in the Addendum.</p> <p>Officers highlighted that in relation to the application there were three central issues which required consideration, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The loss of community use 2. The impact on the visual amenity 3. The impact on adjoining properties <p>Officers confirmed that the development complied with above conditions. The recommendation for approval of the Section 106 Agreement / Statement of Intent was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to a Section 106 agreement and Statement of Intent</p>
243.	<p>22 THE AVENUE, ICKENHAM - 67376/APP/2010/2483 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to amended conditions 4, 15, 17 and 18 as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p>

- The Avenue is a private residential road situated within the Ickenham Village Conservation area. Most of the homes in the road were built between 1920 and 1940 and although many of these had been extended, the core structures were original housing stock which defined the character of the Conservation Area. No homes had been demolished to date.
- If one of the original houses were to be demolished and replaced with a larger modern structure, any new structure would be discordant with the area and set a dangerous precedent which would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
- The proposed development was significantly larger than the existing or surrounding properties and would visually dominate this part of the Avenue and would therefore be out of keeping with the street scene.
- The proposed development would increase the risk of flooding in the immediate area.

The applicant made the following points:

- Initially he had sought to extend his property and replicate the visual characteristics of surrounding properties. Unfortunately none of the designs submitted met his needs and none of the designs were carbon efficient.
- The proposed design would complement existing properties within the Conservation Area.
- The proposed design would meet sustainability targets.
- The proposed design took account of flooding concerns and incorporated undercroft void areas which would increase drainage.

In discussing the application, the applicant informed the Committee that no trees would be felled and the Avenue would remain unchanged. While the Committee agreed the proposed development would be a substantial site, it did not appear to have a larger footprint than a number of surrounding dwellings. Referring to the comments made by the Urban Design / Conservation officer, the Committee noted that overall the revised scheme was considered to be in keeping with the conservation area.

The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was agreed with 5 in favour, with two abstentions.

Resolved – That the application be Approved for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and Addendum.

244. **22 THE AVENUE, ICKENHAM - 67376/APP/2010/2487** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officer’s introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes listed in the Addendum.

The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was agreed with 5 in favour, with one against and one abstention.

Resolved – That the application be Approved for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and Addendum.

245.	<p>1-2 BELL CLOSE, RUISLIP - 63635/APP/2011/909 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the amendments in the Addendum.</p> <p>Although there was a petition in objection, neither the petitioner nor the agent attended the meeting.</p> <p>Having heard the officer presentation, Members agreed that the application represented an over-development of the site, which would result in a cramped, intrusive, visually prominent and inappropriate form of development. The proposal was also deemed to be out of character with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about vehicular access to the site. The Highways Engineer confirmed that this was inadequate and there was also inadequate provision for car parking for the proposed development. In relation to amenity space, Members agreed this was inadequate and requested officers to add this as an additional reason for refusal.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the Officer's report with an additional reason relating to the usability of the amenity space to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour lead.</p>
246.	<p>15 MOOR PARK ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 314/APP/2011/1151 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has been submitted to increase the value of the property and will not be used for habitation by the current occupiers. • The proposed development will result in an extension which would be significantly larger and extend further than any others in the road • The proposed development will be not be in keeping with the character of the area • The size, scale, bulk, height and design are out of keeping and disproportionate to the existing building. • The proposed development will contravene the current Unitary Development Plan. <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant had been in dialogue with the Council about the design • Contrary to the comments made by the petitioners, the client wished to remain in the property • The design would be sympathetic to the street scene • The agent suggested that the case officer had not been consistent ion their comments and urged Members to defer the decision until a site

	<p>visit had been made</p> <p>The Chairman explained that whether or not the client chose to use the proposed extension was not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Having discussed the application in detail, the Committee agreed that the proposal would not be subordinate to the original scheme, was an over development of the site and would be detrimental to the street scene.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>
247.	<p>2 HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 34684/APP/2011/359 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development did not incorporate sufficient parking spaces for the 2 flats. • Parking in Hilliard Road was already problematic and the proposed development would add to traffic congestion locally. • The proposed car parking space in the front garden would adversely affect the residential amenity currently enjoyed by Number 4 Hilliard Road. • The main reason for the objection concerned the loss of a three bedroom family home, which if approved, would set a dangerous precedent and lead to the conversion of other family sized properties in the road. <p>The agent did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>Having discussed the application in detail, the Committee agreed that the application be refused for the reasons stated in the officer report.</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 for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>
248.	<p>12 KEWFERRY ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 33988/APP/2011/684 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report which concerned an application for a single storey front extension.</p> <p>The application was recommended for Refusal in the officer report. As</p>

	<p>requested, an email from a Ward Councillor in support of the application was read out at Committee which questioned why the proposed design was out of keeping with the area given the proximity of some flats which dated to the 1970's.</p> <p>On the balance of the information provided, Members requested officers to arrange a site visit to inform the future decision.</p> <p>On being put to the vote, it was moved seconded and agreed that a site visit be arranged.</p> <p>Resolved – that the application be Deferred for a site visit.</p>
249.	<p>BUILDERS YARD, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD, 16194/APP/2010/2780 <i>(Agenda Item 14)</i></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.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.40 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556464. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.