

## Minutes - DRAFT

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

20 December 2011

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) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Janet Duncan Michael Markham Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (North Team Leader) Sarah Hickey (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor Richard Lewis, Councillor Michael White and Councillor Andrew Retter</p>	
87.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Jazz Dhillion. Cllr Janet Duncan acted as substitute.</p>	
88.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a personal interest in Item 16 and left the room and did not take part in this Item.</p>	
89.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF 17 NOVEMBER 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as a correct record subject to amending the start time of the meeting from 6 pm to 7 pm.</p>	
90.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Item 12 was withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning.</p>	
91.	<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</i></p>	

	<p><i>Item 5)</i></p> <p>All items were considered in public with the exception of Items 14, 15 and 16 which were considered in private.</p>	
92.	<p><b>39 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 67201/APP/2010/1803</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6)</i></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitted plans were inaccurate.</li> <li>• The proposed depth of the extension was unclear.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in significant overshadowing onto the rear garden of 37 Highfield Drive.</li> <li>• Number 41 is in a lower position than 39. Had the gradient difference been taken into account?</li> <li>• The proposed development would be out of character with the existing houses in the road.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in increased noise and disturbance to neighbours from heavy lorry movements during the construction phase.</li> </ul> <p>The agent / applicant did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>Members asked officers to respond to the technical points raised by the petitioner.</p> <p>Officers reported that the agent had supplied the survey drawings included in the agenda and as far as they were aware, these were accurate. Measurements had been taken to determine what the depth of the extension would be and officers confirmed these were accurate.</p> <p>In relation to the overshadowing diagrams, officers confirmed that this information had been taken from Ordnance Survey maps. The officer report had taken overshadowing into account and its likely impact was deemed to be acceptable. Officers explained that rights of light matters were outside the bounds of the Committee as these were civil matters.</p> <p>In relation to the levels at which the development would take place, officers explained these requirements were set out in condition 7 of the officer report.</p> <p>Referring to the plans for the proposed development, Members agreed that the gap between 37 and 39 Highfield Drive appeared to be considerably less than the 2.8 metres stated. Concerns were also raised about the lack of an accurate existing floor plan and the potential depth of the rear extension.</p> <p>Officers suggested that a digital measuring device could be used to verify the measurements of the rear extension shown on the plans.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>In view of the concerns raised, the item was deferred subject to the outcome of a site visit.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred for a site visit.</b></p>	
93.	<p><b>47 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD - 18371/APP/2011/2505</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The roof line of the proposed development would be well above number 53 Copse Wood Way and result in an unacceptable blocking of the street scene.</li> <li>• The building line of the proposed development was set 1.5 metres further forward of the current building line. This would set an unacceptable precedent for future development along the road.</li> <li>• The proposed plans were not in keeping with the Copse Wood area of special interest.</li> <li>• The proposed development with large scale deep excavations would affect the foundations of neighbouring houses, resulting in possible flooding of back gardens and homes to the back of the garden of 47.</li> <li>• Vehicular movements related to the creation of the basement would cause vibrations and shocks to the foundations of nearby dwellings.</li> </ul> <p>The agent did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioner. The following points were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increased roof height compared to neighbouring properties would adversely affect the street scene.</li> <li>• The advancing building line would create a precedent and would result in a creeping effect along the road.</li> <li>• There was a need to ensure the size, nature and density of the area was maintained.</li> <li>• The massive excavations would affect drainage locally.</li> <li>• It was suggested that an independent survey could be commissioned about the effects of damming up the water table (in relation to the construction of the basement).</li> </ul> <p>In response to a series of questions from the Committee, officers confirmed the new ridge height would be approximately 1 metre above the height of the existing property but would visually link up with number 53 due to the changes at ground level.</p> <p>In relation to the building line of the proposed development, officers</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>highlighted that these were different to the building line across the road and there was no rigid building line for the road.</p> <p>With respect to the proposed basement, officers confirmed that the concerns raised about the impact on the water table or structural impact such a development might have could not be addressed through the Planning Act. If members were minded to grant permission to the application, then the only mechanism available to the Committee to afford protection to neighbours would be by conditioning the build to address these concerns, and to request Building Control ensure compliance.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved with an additional condition relating to the basement to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.</b></p>	
94.	<p><b>18 DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 272/APP/2010/2564</b> (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>No petitioner, agent or Ward Councillors attended the meeting.</p> <p>While the Committee agreed leisure facilities were an acceptable use in the Green Belt, the proposal was considered to be detrimental to the visual amenity and open character of the Green Belt.</p> <p>On this basis, Members agreed that the application should be refused.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused as per the officer’s report</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
95.	<p><b>ORENDA AND 68 THIRLMERE GARDENS, NORTHWOOD - 59962/APP/2011/2101</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the changes as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would not fit in with existing buildings and be detrimental to the surrounding area.</li> <li>• The proposed development would pose a danger to road safety as the parking area and crossover would be close to the T-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

Junction and would face existing properties and driveways.

- The car parking area was too large and would be highly visible, noisy and unattractive.
- The proposed development would exacerbate problems the area was already having with drains.
- The design meant that the buildings would have higher roofs and steeper pitches than surrounding buildings which in-turn would have a negative impact on the outlook, privacy and light to surrounding houses.
- The suggested siting of rubbish bins would not enhance the appearance of the area.
- The proposed development would be a overdevelopment of the site
- There would be insufficient amenity space for three bedroom properties

The agent made the following points:

- The proposed design would enhance the local area.
- The car parking had been sited at the front of the property to create a single point of access / egress.
- The amount of hard standing had been reduced since the original application.
- The proposed design adhered to the Council's Core Strategy and the amenity space conformed to the Council's standard.
- The density of the dwelling was much improved on the previous application.
- The proposed design would not be an overdevelopment of the site, it respected the character of the area, fitted in well and was attractive.

In response to a question concerning the balconies at the first floor level to the rear of the proposed design, officers explained these would be screened and so there would not be an overlooking issue.

Members highlighted that they were aware of the request for a parking management scheme for Thirlmere Gardens so there was the possibility there might not be sufficient parking for visitors. In response, officers explained that the proposed design provided two car parking spaces per unit and as a result; the design complied on parking grounds.

Members also enquired whether the proposal was likely to have significant drainage implications. Officer's explained that Thames Water had been consulted on the proposal and no objections had been received.

The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by four votes in favour, two against and one abstention.

**Resolved – That the application be Approved as per the officer's report**

96.	<p><b>PEMBROKE HOUSE, 5-9 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 38324/APP/2011/786</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved as per the officer's report and the changes set out in the Addendum.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
97.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 90 EXMOUTH ROAD, RUISLIP - 67944/APP/2011/2742</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the constitution a Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development was an over-development of the site</li> <li>• Converting a single four bedroom dwelling to two, two storey / two bedroom dwellings would be detrimental to the area</li> <li>• There already was a lack of car parking on this corner and the rear car parking was unrealistic as the rear service road was gated. As a result, residents were more likely to park at the front of the property.</li> <li>• The size of the rooms within the proposed development meant that there was concern about the amount of light which would be available to the occupants.</li> </ul> <p>In response to the points raised by the Ward Councillor, officers advised that car parking concerns and inadequate light to the rooms were insufficient grounds by themselves to refuse the application.</p> <p>Following further discussions, Members felt that the proposed single storey side extension would constitute an over development of the site. It was also noted that the floor area of one of the proposed dwellings did not meet the required standard and Members deemed this to be an over-intensive use of the site.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused as per the agenda with an additional informative.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
98.	<p><b>THE HALLMARKS, 146 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 3016/APP/2010/2159</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn by the Head of Planning for reconsideration by the Highways Officer.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
99.	<p><b>22 CRANBOURNE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 64691/APP/2011/2064</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

	<p>In accordance with the constitution a Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the application. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development was over-dominant compared to the adjoining property.</li> <li>• The proposed development was out of character with surrounding properties and created the perception that the detached property next door was a terraced property.</li> </ul> <p>In response to the comment about a terracing effect raised by the Ward Councillor, officers advised there was no requirement to set this back from the current building line. A possible option available to the Committee included requesting a flat roof only and the removal of the fake pitched roof to the front of the side extension. A further option included deferring the decision until a site visit had taken place.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That Authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to Approve on the receipt of amended plans removing the false pitch roof to the front of the side extension .</b></p>	<p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
<p>100.</p>	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report and compliance period being changed by the committee was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
<p>101.</p>	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>

	<p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report and compliance period being changed by the committee was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	
102.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 16)</b></p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report and compliance period being changed by the committee was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger &amp; Meg Hirani</p>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.55 pm.</p>		

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.