

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 February 2012

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Jazz Dhillon Michael Markham Carol Melvin Dominic Gilham Michael White</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (North Team Leader) Manmohan Ranger (Principal Traffic Engineer) Sarah White (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Richard Lewis</p>	
115.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillors John Morgan and David Payne with Councillors Dominic Gilham and Michael White acting as substitutes.</p>	
116.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
117.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 20 December 2011 and 10 January 2012 were agreed as accurate records.</p>	
118.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
119.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART 1 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS</p>	

	MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)	
120.	<p>KINGS COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS, KINGS COLLEGE ROAD, RUISLIP 2414/APP/2011/2661 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>The application was withdrawn by the applicants.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
121.	<p>LAND AT 30 - 32 CHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD 13800/APP/2011/1140 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officer's introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>Officer's highlighted that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 4th October 2011 and had also been the subject of a site visit by the Committee.</p> <p>Officers explained that a previous scheme for a 24 bedroom care home on the application site was refused by the Council in 2010, and a subsequent appeal was also dismissed earlier this year.</p> <p>The Inspector found that that scheme would have resulted in a development that would fail to harmonise with the area and would create a cramped street scene, thereby harming the character and appearance of Chester Road and the Area of Special Local Character.</p> <p>The Inspector did however find that there would be no harm to highway safety, that the Council's renewable energy requirements could reasonably be controlled by condition, that access for the disabled was satisfactory, and that a healthcare contribution was appropriate.</p> <p>The Inspector also found that the relationship with the adjoining neighbours in terms of the impact on their amenities would be acceptable. Therefore the Committee were informed that the only reason for refusal of the Council that he supported was in respect of the impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a ward Councillor spoke in objection to the item.</p> <p>The ward councillor made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flanks of the proposed building were bulkier in depth than the adjoining property at No 28 and exceeded the present building, affecting the privacy of residents in Roy Road and this would be exacerbated by the removal of trees. • The proposed care home would bring total occupancy to 58 people plus staff, causing an increase in road traffic with little off-road traffic catered for. • The traffic survey commissioned by the applicants had been 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>held at strange times which did not coincide with the times at which local roads would be busiest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The traffic survey had only been conducted on the main roads and had ignored the likely impacts (of displaced parking) on side roads. • A large commercial enterprise in a wholly residential area would not be sympathetic to the area <p>In discussing the application, officer's confirmed that no parking survey had been conducted on a Sunday. Officer's reported that the Council's own parking survey had yielded the following results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Road : 31 parked, 46 vacant, and 40% occupied • Kemps Drive: 3 parked, 5 vacant, and 38% occupied • Wychwood Way: 16 parked, 9 vacant, and 64% occupied <p>and this survey re-inforced the information provided by the applicants that indicated the parking situation in the area was not so severe that the application could be refused.</p> <p>With reference to access and temporary parking for emergency vehicles, it was noted that there was parking available to the front of the site and emergency services could park in the access point of the proposed development should this need arise.</p> <p>The recommendation: the application would have been approved had an appeal not been received was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with 6 votes in favour and 1 against.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>The application would have been approved had an appeal not been received.</p>	
122.	<p>41 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 22761/APP/2011/2735 (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>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>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ongoing recession meant that the change from Class A2 to Class A1 was not welcome as there already were 10 salons on the High Street and if permission were granted, then all the existing salon owners would suffer loss of trade • The street scene required a variety of shops to attract new customers to the area and a further salon was not required. • A new salon would not bring anything new (in terms of treatments) to the area. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A change of use would not safeguard the area. <p>The applicant made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were 6 vacant properties in the High Street which had been empty for a long time. • The proposed application intended to offer customers a wide range of supplementary treatments in addition to health and beauty care. • The catchment area of the High Street was sufficiently large to support another salon. • A further salon would provide customers with greater choice <p>Officers advised the Committee that its decision had to take account of material planning considerations and could not take retail competition into account.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that no trade had a right to a monopoly, competition was necessary for any High Street to thrive and market forces would dictate that only the most successful traders would survive. Members noted that the shop unit had been vacant for some time and agreed it was better to grant a change of use rather continue to have an empty shop unit. The Committee agreed that given the current economic climate, the start-up of new businesses should be applauded.</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 per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</p>	
123.	<p>97 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE 15559/APP/2011/2885 (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 discussing the application, the Committee agreed it was preferable to have shop units in use rather than remain vacant. Officers explained that the nature of the application meant this was likely to be the last non-retail use which could be approved on the High Street.</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 per the officer’s report and the changes set out in the addendum.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
124.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 26A WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP 67242/APP/2011/2651 (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. The Committee agreed that the proposal would constitute an over development of the existing site and</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger &</p>

	<p>be detrimental to the area, would result in the loss of amenity space for the donor property and would also result in the loss of off-street parking to that property.</p> <p>The Committee also raised concerns about the poor access to the property (given this was situated on a hill near to an elongated round about) and the lack of provision shown for the protection and long term retention of a protected Ash tree.</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 as per the officer’s report</p>	Meg Hirani
125.	<p>32 HIGH STREET, NORTHWOOD 19105/APP/2011/1749 (Agenda Item 11)</p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. Officer’s confirmed that the application related to a change of use of an existing vacant retail unit (A1) to A2 an estate agents and this was located in an area of special local character as identified in the Hillingdon IDP.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed it was preferable to have shop units in use rather than remain vacant.</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 per the officer’s report</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
126.	<p>ICKENHAM CRICKET CLUB, OAK AVENUE, ICKENHAM 2556/APP/2011/2608 (Agenda Item 12)</p> <p>Officer’s introduced the report. In discussing the application, the Committee noted that the revised scheme had been reduced in size and included a slight alteration to the general internal layout.</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 per the officer’s report</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.55 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.
