

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 December 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne</p>
	<p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah Hickey and Nav Johal</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Michael White (item 7), Councillors' Douglas Mills and Susan O'Brien (item 11)</p>
73.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
74.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
75.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON 25 OCTOBER 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Agreed with the changes set out in the addendum.</p>
76.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p> <p>The Chairman noted that Item 12 had been withdrawn from the agenda.</p>
77.	<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>Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items marked part 2 were</p>

considered in private. There were no part 2 items to consider.

78. **11 HOYLAKE GARDENS, RUISLIP - 66856/APP/2011/2263** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 2 bed self contained flats with associated amenity space and parking involving 2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space into habitable use to include roof dormer and demolition of existing attached garage to side.

The proposal was for the extension and conversion of one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings to two, two bedroomed flats. This revised proposal was a reduced size and different design and layout from earlier schemes that were withdrawn and refused planning permission. The current scheme proposed horizontal, flatted division rather than houses.

Traffic and acoustic reports had been submitted with the application. The proposal complied with HDAS requirements for two storey side and single storey rear extensions, internal and external space standards and also those in the London Plan (2011) and the car parking provision and other policies set out in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan, Saved Policies September 2007. Planning permission was thus recommended subject to conditions.

The application site was on the north side of Hoylake Gardens and comprised a semi-detached property with a wider than average frontage (compared with other properties in Hoylake Gardens). The existing property was the end 1930's dwelling in the street, before a group of more modern 1980's properties begin. Hoylake Gardens originally comprised a small cul-de-sac of 16-18 dwellings, although this had now been extended to include an area of 1980's terraced properties with shallow rear gardens, some of which back onto the side of the application site. The site was within a short walk of Eastcote shopping centre, Eastcote underground station, main road, bus, and transport connections providing it with a PTAL rating of 3. The application site lies within the Developed Area as identified in the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (Saved Policies, September 2007).

43 Neighbours and the Eastcote Residents Association were consulted. A petition with 33 signatures and 7 letters of objection and one letter of support had been received.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- The road was a small cul-du-sac.
- A previous application had been refused on reasons to do with the parking implications and the changes in the street scene.
- The space was an important part of the developments in the 1930's and 1980's.
- The development had improved a lot since the original application had been made.

- The issue the petitioners had were around parking and the implications would be extensive.
- The appearance of the application looked to be fine.
- The plans submitted showed 2 car parking spaces plus 2 behind those. This showed a 'pinch point' and the cars in front would have to move to let the cars behind out.
- The minimum distance requirements submitted were enough to object to this application.
- The application was an overdevelopment in a small area.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- The area had extended from a cul-du-sac to its current form.
- The previous application was not refused on planning issues.
- The agents had spoken to neighbours prior to submitting the application and they had asked for comments before the new submission. There were no concerns to note from neighbours to the agents.
- The current proposal was modest and sympathetic to all.
- The officers report was very clear about loss of privacy and this did not exist.
- The distances required virtually conformed and the agent noted that the land was lower.
- There was no loss of light to surrounding properties.
- The design was sensitive and in-keep, and the design was done in consultation with officers.
- A life time home was being proposed.
- The double garage had been used as an office for around 20 years under permitted development.
- The street would benefit greatly and there would be far less disruption to the street than an office.

A Ward Councillor was present and spoke:

- The Ward Councillor stated that the outline design was not bad in comparison to the previous design.
- He did have a concern regarding the size of rooms but that was up to the officers to decide on whether the room sizes were adequate.
- There was a lack of manoeuvrability in the proposal for parking.
- There was already congestion in the area and the application may add to this.
- The Ward Councillor had an issue with regard to privacy but this had reduced considerably since the previous application was submitted.
- The main concern was parking.

Members were happy with the application but wanted clarification on the issues brought up by petitioners and the Ward Councillor regarding parking. Officers confirmed that the parking provided complied with Council standards, including the crossover point. Therefore the parking provided as per the application was acceptable.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be approved with the changes set out in the addendum and an additional condition to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour lead.

79. **LITTLE HAMMONDS, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 35910/APP/2011/718** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change of use of site from Class C3 (Dwelling House) to mixed use Class C3 (Dwelling house) and Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions), involving the erection of a single storey building at the rear for use as a meeting room (Use Class D1) with associated parking. Single storey side extension to the existing dwelling house (involving demolition of part of existing garage), new access road involving demolition of existing single storey side extension and the installation of 2 vehicular crossovers, new wall to front boundary and new fence to side.

The application sought permission to erect a meeting room building, to be used for D1 purposes (worship), together with associated access road and car-park, involving the sub-division of the site and a replacement single storey side extension to the original dwelling, alterations to the front wall of the site and the provision of a new public footpath extending to the Cricket Club Grounds.

There was no objection to the single storey extension to the dwelling or to the alterations to the front boundary wall. However, there was concern relating to the proposal for an independent meeting room/church which would not be ancillary to the existing residential use of the site. Due to the additional activities that would be generated, as a result of this use, this would fail to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding residential properties.

In addition it was considered the proposed formation of the access road and car-parking area with associated increase in traffic, would be out of keeping and detrimental to the surrounding residential area and character and appearance of the conservation area.

There was further concern regarding what measures were in place to prevent any intensification of use if a permission were to be issued or if/how these matters could be reasonably controlled.

23 neighbours and interested parties were consulted and 20 responses and a petition of 49 signatures had been received

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners/applicant:

- The purpose of the application was for the local congregation of Christians for families in the area.
- It was proposed that there would be 2 or 3 meetings a week at specific times.
- The group and meetings were there to promote values.
- The applicant initially approached Hillingdon in 2008.

- They had engaged with professional consultants who liaised directly with planning officers about the application.
- The applicants had consulted with residents and the project had been approached very carefully.
- The initial concerns had been overcome and there was little objection or concerns.
- The noise issues raised could be addressed. There would be no noise that would be heard from the outside. An amplifier was not going to be used.
- The impact on the environment was minimal as the meeting room would be inconspicuous.
- The application would benefit the village.
- The rear garden was very large, and large enough to accommodate the meeting room.
- There was a provision on new fencing and landscaping.
- The visual impact was insignificant.
- The applicant asked that the committee approve the application.

Members clarified the number of expected visitors and car park spaces that would be available. The applicant confirmed that they believed 9 parking spaces would be sufficient. The majority of people attending would be local and that there was a larger hall at another venue for larger meetings.

Members discussed the application and agreed it was a sensitive issue, and that they had to consider the application and decision based on planning issues. Members were sympathetic with the applicant and those that signed the petition in favour of the application but agreed that this was back land development and therefore should be refused.

Members asked officers for clarification on noise and parking as reasons for refusal as stated in the officer report. The applicant had stated that no amplifiers would be used, nor speakers or music. Also that the access road for the site was not near residential properties and should not affect residents. Officers explained that if the development was sold then the application for an A1 use would be transferred to the new owners and they could not put a condition on the use of how it was operated.

Members discussed with officers whether this was back land development. Officers explained that although it was a loss of a garden area it may not be considered a loss of garden-housing area.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda.

80. **1 HARVIL ROAD, HAREFIELD - 13701/APP/2011/2334** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission ref. 13701/APP/2004/193 dated 30-04-2004 to allow the private care hire/chauffer business to operate 24 hours a day (retention of part of shop

as private car hire/chauffeur business).

The application was for the variation of condition 1 (Hours of Operation of Private Car Hire/Chauffeur Business) and condition 2 (Opening Hours for the Office of the Private Car Hire/Chauffeur Business) of planning application reference 13701/APP/2004/193 to allow for 24 hour operation.

It was considered that the proposed variation of condition would result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to the neighbouring residential dwellings and was, therefore, recommended for refusal.

The application related to a ground floor commercial unit located at the junction between Harvil Road and Moorhall Road. The upper floor of the property was in use as residential flats, with the adjacent properties in use as retail at ground floor level and residential at first floor.

The application property and the adjacent retail parade was set back from the highway by the slip road and parking area, which ran parallel to Harvil Road and Moorhall Road. The site was situated within a developed area as identified in the policies of the Adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

30 neighbouring properties were notified of the proposed development. Two responses had been received, one in objection to the proposal and one in support. One petition had been received in support of the application.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners/applicant:

- The owner of the care hire firm explained how they had been operating since February 2011 and that in that time no complaints had been made directly to them.
- A petition had been signed by local businesses and people to ask that they be allowed 24 hour operation. This showed the demand for it.
- The applicant was not asking for cars to be allowed to be parked in front of the shops.
- The business had the use of 3 cars and requested that the office could be manned for 24 hours.
- In order to minimise noise and disruptions to others they did not allow cars to park in front of the office outside of hours. The drivers did not park or drive into the office often unless it was required.
- The business did operate after hours but this was not from the office but by the use of a mobile phone.
- A sign was on the office door so that customers could call a number to book a taxi if they needed one outside of the operating office hours.

Members discussed the application and agreed with the officers reasons for refusal as stated in the report.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda.

81.

13 SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM - 19121/APP/2011/2066 (*Agenda Item 10*)

Change of use from Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and Class B1 (Business) to Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) to include 3 x 1-bed, 1 x bedsit and 1 x 2-bed self-contained flats involving conversion of roof space of rear building with a dormer to front and alterations to elevations of front building.

This application sought full planning permission for the change of use of an existing A2 and B1 use to additional residential units. The application site was within the boundary of Ickenham Local Centre as designated in the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

The applicant had failed to provide sufficient marketing history of the properties to show the use as offices was no longer required. The offices were presently occupied by 5 local businesses. The evidence submitted showed that some of the units were unoccupied however this was insufficient to justify the loss of office space within the Core and Secondary Shopping Areas of Ickenham Local Centre. It would therefore be contrary to Policy H8 of the UDP.

Furthermore, the accommodation would provide an inadequate standard of living for future occupiers due to the residential units size and layout and was therefore considered contrary to Policies H8 and BE19 of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2011) and guidance within Section 4 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Layouts. It was therefore recommended for refusal.

37 local owner/occupiers were consulted, 2 replies were received objecting to the proposal. A petition had also been received with over 200 signatures against the proposal.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- The petitioner ran a business in the building where the application was proposed.
- If approved the business would be forced out of the property.
- They employed 4 local people at that site, 3 of which walked to work.
- The plan did not support local businesses and employers.
- The site was the only business space in the village.
- The application would bring cramped flats which would add nothing to Ickenham.
- New flats were already being built nearby.
- The site was a valuable resource for local businesses in the area.
- The plans were damaging to Ickenham.

- The petition contained over 220 signatures.
- Ickenham Residents Association had objected to the proposal.
- Virtually ever shop space in the area was full.
- If it was lost then it would be lost for good, and would also result in a loss of jobs which was not good in this economic climate.

The agent spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- The majority of the space was vacant and therefore the loss of existing use was minimal.
- 3 vacant units were marketed for over a year with no interest, others were similar.
- The prices were competitive but they had no offers, some interest.
- There was a high level of surplus office space and better space available in other areas.
- The applicant was making losses due to the space being left empty.
- Due to the change in the economic times there was a greater need for homes and less for office space.
- A residential use would be re-instating its former use.
- The agent discussed the flat sizes and required standards, and that an outlook to a car park was not unusual.
- Right of light laws was briefly discussed.
- The agent asked for a deferral to adjust any minor amendments that were required on the application.

Officer and Members discussed the size of the flats which was open to interpretation. Officers had visited the site themselves. Right of light was not an issue for Members of the Planning Committee to decide and they needed to make their decision on planning merits.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda.

82. **LAND TO THE REAR OF 51 AND 53 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 66982/APP/2011/2221** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Erection of 2 five-bedroom, two storey detached dwellings with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space.

Planning permission was sought for the erection of 2 five-bedroom houses on a backland site to the rear of Nos. 51 and 53 Pembroke Road. The scheme was considered unacceptable in terms of the principle and the layout and design of the proposal. As such the proposal was recommended for refusal.

The application site comprises land located to the north of Nos. 51 and 53 Pembroke Road and was formed from the rear parts of the gardens of these properties. The site was some 0.15 hectare in area. To the north, the site was bound by the rear gardens of Nos. 5, 6 and 7 Green Walk. These properties on Green Walk were within the Ruislip Manor Way

Conservation Area. The site was bounded to the east by the rear garden of 55 Pembroke Road and to the west, by the side boundaries of 32 Brickwall Lane and 49 Pembroke Road.

The land slightly undulates and there were mature trees and hedges to the north, east and west boundaries. The surrounding area was residential in appearance and character. The site was within the developed area as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

Planning permission was refused in September 2010 for the erection of 2 five-bedroom, two storey detached dwellings.

The occupiers of 61 neighbouring properties and the Ruislip Residents Association were consulted. 2 petitions were received, one in favour of the proposal and one against.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- They were meeting again, for the 9th time, to speak on an application to build on a back garden.
- The petitioner was speaking on behalf of the 97 neighbours who would be affected but the proposals.
- Many more signatures could have been collected for the petition against the application.
- There was total opposition against the plans which was bricks, concrete and tarmac replacing gardens.
- Urban areas were rapidly being overdeveloped.
- Gardens were places for children to play and families to relax.
- An almost identical plan was submitted last year and refused.
- It would overlook and dominate neighbouring properties.
- Consideration needed to be given to wildlife and plants.
- The petitioner asked that we keep our gardens as gardens and green spaces as green spaces.

The agent/applicant spoke on behalf of the application and petition in favour submitted:

- A petition submitted by the applicant in support of the application.
- The applicant explained how the previous application which was refused, and appeal lodged and refused did not reject a residential development of some sort.
- The inspector did not give a reason for refusal as the effect on adjoining properties.
- The applicant had met with planning officers, and with the inspector's report and discussed new plans and drawings with amended detailed requirements.
- It was a 2 and half hour long meeting and he asked officers if they would accept the application to which they stated yes.
- The applicant had no indication that the recommendation by officers would be to refuse the application.
- He felt that opinion was carrying more weight than those of experts.

- He felt that officers in the planning department had conflicting comments.
- The applicant had met with the Head of Planning whose only reservation was it was on a rear garden, and not that it was against LB Hillingdon policies. In recent times the Council had allowed at least 3 garden developments.
- The applicant felt his application was totally compliant.
- He felt that there were no reasons stated that meant it could not be approved.

Two Ward Councillor's were present and spoke:

- The Ward Councillor's objected to the application that was proposed and supported the officers' recommendation for refusal.
- It would result in a loss of private garden area and have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area.
- The proposal was not in scene with the rest of the area.
- It would dominate the surrounding areas.
- The access road into the site was out of keep with the area.
- There were additional issues to consider with regard to an already over utilised Pembroke Road.
- Those that had signed the petition in favour of the application did not live near by.
- The majority of those that signed the petition against lived in close proximity and therefore showed the true feelings of residents.
- The loss of wildlife needed to be considered.
- PPS3: Local Authorities were best placed to make the decisions on development in back gardens.
- The London Plan provided more concrete reasons for refusal the application.
- The publication recently published showed that such back garden development was unwelcome, including in Outer London, which Hillingdon was very much part of.
- This development was not the right development for Pembroke Close.

Members and Officers discussed the recent guidance published on back land development. This policy could be referred to in its draft form but the weight put on it should be mindful that it was a draft policy.

Members discussed the planning inspector's report from the previous application which was refused by the Council and on appeal and the inconsistencies that it contained.

Members felt that this was back land development and with guidance, including the recent draft publication, that the application did not fit criteria.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the application be refused as per the agenda.

83.	<p>5 POPLAR CLOSE, RUISLIP - 61775/APP/2011/1204 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>This item had been withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning.</p>
84.	<p>168 WHITBY ROAD, RUISLIP - 38420/APP/2011/2410 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Single storey side extension to existing property.</p> <p>The application property was an end of terrace, two storey dwelling situated on the south-eastern side of Whitby Road. It was sited adjacent to a vehicular access that leads to the rear garages of the properties in the road, and an area of open space beyond.</p> <p>6 adjoining and nearby properties notified of the application and The Eastcote Residents Association had been consulted. No responses or comments had been received.</p> <p>This application was reported to committee as the applicant was an employee of the Council.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</p>
85.	<p>43 THE CHASE, ICKENHAM - 67155/APP/2011/1564 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Single storey rear extension with habitable roofspace to include a gable end window and 1 side roof light, involving demolition of existing lean-to extension to rear.</p> <p>The application property was a detached chalet brick built bungalow with two large dormer extensions on both sides of the roof slope which had been constructed under permitted development.</p> <p>The application site was situated in a residential area comprising detached and semi detached bungalows. The properties on this street had varying styles, many had been altered through planning permission or under permitted development rights.</p> <p>The application sought planning permission for the erection of a rear extension with habitable roof space.</p> <p>The extension would extend 3.6m from the rear elevation of the property. It would result in the continuation of the roofslope of the existing property above the extension, and would have a gable end on the rear elevation. The eaves height would be 2.4m and the ridge height would be 5.65m (the same as that existing).</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 per the agenda.</p>
86.	<p>103, 105 AND 107 DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 64345/APP/2011/1945 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Erection of a pair of linked part 2 part, 3 storey blocks with accommodation in the roof space, to provide, 12 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom apartments, involving demolition of 103, 105 and 107 Ducks Hill Road (Outline application).</p> <p>The application sought outline planning permission for the erection of a pair of linked part 2, part 3 storey blocks with accommodation in the roof space, to provide 12 x two bedroom and 1 x three bedroom flats. The proposal involved the demolition of the existing three detached dwellings and all other associated structures on the site. Access, scale, appearance and layout were to be determined, with landscaping matters reserved.</p> <p>Members and officers discussed the parking provision. The application set out 26 spaces with 4 disabled bays. This provision included visitor parking, for the 13 flats proposed.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved with the changes set out in the addendum and subject to a unilateral undertaking/S106.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.05 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.