

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 June 2012

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan Raymond Graham Brain Stead Tim Barker</p>
	<p>OFFICERS PRESENT: James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Anne Gerzon and Nav Johal.</p> <p>OTHERS PRESENT: Councillor Judy Kelly</p>
31.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Edward Lavery and Councillor David Payne. Councillor Tim Barker and Councillor Brian Stead were in attendance as substitutes.</p>
32.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a personal interest in regard to item 8, Land Forming Part of Oakhurst, as the lead petitioner in this application was Chairman at the Conservative branch where he was a member. Councillor Morgan remained in the room for the duration of this item.</p>
33.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 17 MAY 2012 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>These were agreed to be an accurate record.</p>
34.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
35.	<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>

All items were marked Part 1 and therefore considered in public. There were no Part 2 items.

36.

LAND FORMING PART OF 12 GLADSDALE DRIVE, EASTCOTE - 65761/APP/2012/549 (Agenda Item 6)

LAND FORMING PART OF 12 GLADSDALE DRIVE, EASTCOTE - 65761/APP/2012/549 (Agenda Item 6)

Erection of a single storey, detached, two-bedroom dwelling with associated amenity space and parking

The proposal was a revised scheme for a single storey detached dwelling that would be set adjacent to the existing property, 12 Gladsdale Drive. An application was originally allowed on appeal where the main issue was considered to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal for the single storey building was allowed in June 2011, subject to conditions. A later application and appeal was dismissed in March 2012 for a larger building that would have come further forward of the existing property and, amongst other alterations, would have extended to the front and rear, and included a new front projecting bay window and second bedroom with side window.

The front building line and design of the currently proposed bungalow would be the same as that permitted on appeal. Additionally, this current proposal sought a second bedroom, altered side fenestration and an extension to the rear of the permitted building by 2.3m. This altered from the recently refused and dismissed scheme where a total length of 3.64m was proposed that would have brought it 1.6m closer to the road.

The current scheme would incorporate the side fenestration in the recently refused/dismissed scheme and which the Inspector considered to be acceptable in paragraphs 11 and 12 of his decision, subject to conditions relating to boundary treatment. In terms of the character of the area, the front building line and design of the proposed dwelling, in remaining the same as that permitted on the original appeal, was acceptable.

The latest appeal decision made no comment upon the principle of an additional rear extension, but upon the additional bedroom in the Inspector's concluding paragraphs. The additional 2.3m extension at the rear was not considered to result in a building which would be visually intrusive from public vantage points such as to warrant refusal of the application on this element alone.

This application was recommended for approval subject to conditions. These conditions were transferred from the originally allowed appeal decision, but included an additional landscaping condition, as recommended in the latest appeal decision. Also a further condition to ensure the removal of householder permitted development rights in order for the Council to retain additional control over the resulting development.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition

received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting. Mr Mr Hugo Myatt spoke on behaviour of the petitioners:

- It was stated that this was the 7th application on this site and the petitioners 3rd appearance to address Committee on this matter.
- This application was a re-hashed version of the previous application.
- It now seemed to petitioners that Committee was likely to approve the application. This was after re-assurance from the Council's planning department that approval would not be granted.
- Petitioners considered this application as garden-grabbing.
- The application was giant, ugly and there would be light impairment to the property.
- Petitioners asked what guarantees would there be that the developer would not ask for more applications on this site.
- It was stated that green gardens would be turned into parking spaces.
- That wildlife would be killed.
- The application was out of harmony with the rest of the area.
- That the application was an 'eye-watering' offence.
- The sales pitch for this development boosted 'off street parking for multiple cars'.
- Petitioners were shocked at the site and what was proposed to be developed.
- The application would look cheap and shoddy.
- There would be no direct access to the road.
- If the application was approved then it would set a precedent; that more green area would be taken away.
- Petitioners had received verbal assurance from the planning department that this would not be approved.
- Petitioners asked, that if approved, conditions were included on the landscape and that no further extensions be allowed on the site.
- The petitioner showed Committee pictures of before and after of the site.

Mr Robert Clarke, agent, spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- Mr Clarke stated that officers had given Committee a full briefing of the application and information from the Inspector.
- The last appeal was critical and gave 3 reasons for refusal. Only one reason for refusal was held and this new application had resolved that issue.

Members and officers spoke about the application in detail. Officers clarified the refusal reason regarding the windows on the application in a previous appeal. This ground was not upheld in the appeal by the Inspector, therefore the Council could not sustain this reason for refusal.

Officers commented that there were no grounds for refusal with this application. Condition 6 included a full landscape scheme and they could ask that the application withdraw all permitted development rights to prevent further extensions. That on appeal an Inspector may not put those grounds in place.

Officers clarified that the application was not in a flood risk area. There had been no contact with the Environmental Agency as it was not considered a

relevant factor.

It was further clarified that most of the trees in the area were off the site and therefore could not be removed without permission from the landowners. This was not considered to be a risk. Officers advised that a tree protection fencing could be included as a condition and the details of this could be agreed.

Members had a great deal of sympathy with residents and petitioners with regard to this application. It was stated that the Council had been let down by the Government and Inspectors. The development would have an adverse impact on the Green Belt. It was shoe-horned into a small area. The windows would give inadequate lighting. Members felt that they were at a point where they had no choice but to allow the application as the applicant would appeal if it was refused, and the appeal would be won. Members felt that, with regret, they had no alternative but to approve this application.

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

Resolved –

That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum, and additional standard boundary treatment condition.

37. **LAND FORMING PART OF OAKHURST, NORTHGATE, NORTHWOOD - 67012/APP/2011/2712 (Agenda Item 8)**

Erection of two storey 5 bedroom, detached dwelling with basement to include associated amenity space, parking and the installation of a vehicular crossover

The proposal was for a five bedroom detached house on the garden area at the side of 'Oakhurst', a locally listed building. A fence had been erected, subdividing the site into two and this part of the site was last used as a builders compound in conjunction with the construction of two houses at the rear of Oakhurst, which had now been built and were occupied. An application for a similar house on this site was previously dismissed at appeal on tree grounds. The Inspector's decision was subject of a judicial review which was also dismissed. The Tree Officer confirms that these grounds were still valid and the application should be refused on these grounds.

The Council's Sustainability Officer also advised that given the length of time that had now lapsed, the ecology information needed to be up-dated, particularly as regards the Badger setts on and close to the site, as although these appeared not to be occupied when they were last surveyed, Badgers were a transitory species and setts could be quickly re-colonised. The scheme also did not make provision for an education contribution. It was recommended accordingly.

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

Mr Brian Fredericks spoke on behaviour of the petitioners:

- The last application was turned down and the appeal was dismissed.
- Planners had gone back on agreement.
- The previous applications were turned down as were unsuitable.
- There was not any space on the site for more than a garden.
- Planners had refused previous applications.
- The petitioner saw 2 badgers in his garden this week and has been seeing badgers regularly in the area for the last 12 years.
- He last saw a badger the night before at 10pm and he can see them every night.
- He suggested that no further applications on this site be approved.

The agent/applicant was not present.

Members clarified with officers what the status of this application was and what the Committee could determine. Officers required a decision by the Committee as if the application went to appeal then the position of the Committee would be required.

The recommendation as stated in the report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved –

That the Planning Inspectorate be advised that had an appeal not been submitted the Local Planning Authority would have refused the application for the reasons set out in the report.

38. **LAND ADJACENT TO AND FORMING PART OF 30 HARVEY ROAD, NORTHOLT - 67335/APP/2011/1968** (*Agenda Item 9*)

2 x two storey, 2-bed semi detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space

This proposal was to develop the side and rear garden of a ground floor maisonette to provide a pair of semi-detached two-bedroom houses on a corner plot and follows a refusal of planning permission (reference 67335/APP/2010/2355) for a pair of semi-detached dwellings and a linked one bedroom bungalow.

The impact of proposed dwellings upon the character and appearance of the area and the impact upon residential amenity was considered acceptable. The scheme failed to include details of the off-site highway works required to remove the bollards and associated footway construction, which was required to enable access to the parking. However the applicant had offered to deal with this matter by way of a S106 agreement which was considered acceptable in this instance. As such the application was recommended for approval.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting. Mr Ms Caroline Wood spoke on behaviour of the petitioners:

- Ms Wood lived at no. 30A and owned the property outright as a leaseholder.
- It was stated that the site allocated for parking was not as allocated in the plans provided.
- The space allocated for parking was not big enough and the 4 spaces would go into the garden area.
- The removal of the bollards would make the area a lot less safe for children who play in the area.
- The residents of no. 30 would have their garden reduced by more than 50%.
- There were mature trees on the site that needed to be protected.
- Berries were in the site and would be removed; this was food for insects.
- In addition there was a lot of insects and wildlife that would be destroyed if the application was approved.
- The application will affect the entrance stairs at no. 30A.
- There was currently an unrestricted view from outside no 30A and the application would result in 3.5m gap and then a brick wall. This will cause a considerable loss of light.
- It was the opinion of local residents that the application would not enhance the area.
- It was a cramped area.
- The petitioners questioned the need of the proposed development.
- Petitioners asked the Committee to consider the location and that the development would be isolated.
- Asked Committee to note that there was a much bigger demand for parking in the area than previously.

The agent/applicant was not present.

A Ward Councillor was present and addressed Committee:

- The Ward Councillor said that the application stated it was on land and part of the garden of no. 30. This was inaccurate and the proposed development would be on all garden and not on land.
- The plans did not clearly show that it would be adjacent to maisonettes.
- Although there was space between the existing maisonettes and a proposal was acceptable – this proposal would go very much against the street scene.
- The area was suitable for one house and not two.
- There were concerns with the access.
- The Ward Councillor was concerned that the mature trees could be lost.
- It was felt this was a case of garden grabbing.

Members and officers discussed the plans presented to them and the access to the properties. Members also asked for clarification on the existing parking area. Officers explained that there was currently no existing parking area and this would be new.

Ownership of the land was discussed. Officers stated that any development outside of the owned land would need to be negotiated with the owners.

Members proposed a site visit would be beneficial before a decision could be made as they wished for more clarification on the car park spaces, on the impact of removing the bollards and on the plans submitted to them.

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

Resolved – That the application be deferred in order than Members could carry out a site visit.

39. **REAR OF 64-66 HALLOWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD -
2200/APP/2011/2927** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of use of the existing ancillary outbuilding to 4 x 1-bed residential care units, to include alterations to elevation.

This application was deferred at the meeting of the 26th April 2012 for a site visit. Members visited the site on the 29th May 2012. The proposal involved the conversion of an existing outbuilding, previously used as a kitchen, laundry and storage facility in connection with the main use of the site as a care home, to provide an extension to the care home in the form of four further units, each comprised of a sleeping area, living area and en-suite facilities.

There were no extensions proposed to the existing built development on the site and the alterations to the fenestration details were considered in-keeping with the building to which they would relate. It was considered that the addition of four units was unlikely to have a significant additional traffic or parking impact on the surrounding area sufficient to warrant the refusal of planning permission on these grounds alone.

Due to the noise disturbance that could be experienced by the occupants from the adjoining railway and the additional activities that would be generated in association with the use the submission of a noise assessment report (which was absent from the previous refused application), was considered critical to both determination of the application and a positive recommendation. The Council's Environmental Health Officer had reviewed the contents of the noise report submitted with the current application and considered the conclusions contained therein to be acceptable.

The applicant had been able to satisfactorily demonstrate how the development will safeguard the amenities of both the future occupants of the development and of the nearby residential occupiers and thus the proposal would comply with policies OE1 and OE5 of the UDP (Saved Policies September 2007). On this basis the proposal was recommended for approval.

Petitioners had made representations to Committee on 26 April 2012 and a new petition had not been submitted. Therefore there was no right to address Committee.

Members stated that conditions on new occupiers had not been looked into at all. The sound proposals would only work when all the doors and windows were shut which was a concern. The proposed application was isolated. This

	<p>proposal was the same as someone requesting an out-building rather than a care home.</p> <p>It was noted that those living in the proposed building would need to come from outside their rooms to the main home for meals etc. In addition Members felt that the application did not meet the Council's Accessibility Policy requirements. For example the application was not suitable for wheelchairs.</p> <p>Members agreed there was further concern due to the proximity to railway lines; the building may shake and be noisy. Members felt that this was not suitable living conditions.</p> <p>Members further commented that the size of the rooms was a concern and the accessibility from the out building to the main block was a large concern. The pathway minimum requirement was not big enough and it was not covered.</p> <p>It was agreed that Members were not happy with the accessibility, vibration, amenity of occupants, remoteness, and went against Policy OE01 and General Policy BE19. Members further stated that they felt concerns regarding the noise impact were not looked into fully and they were not convinced the suggested sound control would work in this case.</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 officer recommendation is overturned and the application be refused.</p>
40.	<p>54 ST MARGARETS ROAD, RUISLIP - 42371/APP/2012/645 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn from the agenda.</p>
41.	<p>80 BRIDLE ROAD, EASTCOTE - 68430/APP/2012/674 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Two storey rear extension, single storey front extension, conversion of basement to habitable space and raising of roof to allow for conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front rooflights and 6 side rooflights.</p> <p>The application site was located on the south-east side of Bridle Road and comprised of a two storey detached house set back from the main highway with a long rear garden. The house had a hipped roof and a front projecting gable with bay windows and a pitched roof canopy over the front entrance.</p> <p>There was an integral garage and the property had 5 bedrooms. To the rear of the property was a raised terraced with railings and steps leading down to the garden. The application proposed of a two storey rear/side extension with part-single storey rear extension, single storey front extension, loft conversion including raising the height of the roof and rear dormer window</p>

and roof lights. A basement area was proposed under the existing rear extension and proposed rear extension.

The proposed two-storey rear extension would wrap around to the side of the property and measure 3m deep and the full width of the property. The two storey side extension would be 3m wide and no closer to the side boundary than the existing house and an overall depth of 6m where it wrapped around to the two storey rear extension. The ground floor rear extension would extend 1.6m deep off the proposed 3m deep two storey rear extension. The single storey rear extension would have a hipped roof 3.75m high and 3m at the eaves. This extension would serve a reception room.

The existing front canopy entrance would be removed and replaced with a front extension measuring 3.35m high with a pitched roof, 2.45m at the eaves, 1.80m deep and 5.55m wide. This extension would extend the existing garage and porch. The basement extension would have a floorspace of 89sq.m and would be accessed through an external door to the rear of the property.

The existing ridge height of the roof would be increased by 1.15m to allow for conversion of the loft space. The proposed roof would have a hipped roof with a rear dormer window and velux windows to the sides and front elevations. The rear dormer window would be 2.50m wide, 2.45m high with a pitched roof and 3.25m deep. The proposed house would create an enlarged reception room on the ground floor, an additional bedroom and enlarged bedroom, both with en-suites on the first floor and two additional bedrooms in the roofspace. The materials would match the existing house.

Members discussed the application and confirmed with officers what properties were either side of the proposed application. On one side was a bungalow and on the other side was a two-storey property. The street had a variety of roof designs, most of which were two-storey. The height difference between the application and adjoining properties was discussed further.

It was noted that this application was being presented to Committee as a Ward Councillor had requested this.

Members discussed the option of a site visit before determining the application. It was noted that there was no interest from the public with regard to the application and it met all planning requirements.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed by a majority. 5 Members voted in favour and 2 Members, Councillors' Graham and Dhillon abstained.

Resolved –

That the application be approved as per the agenda.

42. **VYNERS SCHOOL, WARREN ROAD, ICKENHAM - 4514/APP/2012/949**
(Agenda Item 12)

Application for additional first floor accommodation on the existing

single storey changing room block and a two storey entrance/stair core.

This application sought full planning permission for the erection of a new two-storey entrance lobby and first floor extension (including provision of a mezzanine level) to the existing single-storey changing rooms at Vyners School in Ickenham. The additional space would allow the creation of a first floor sixth form study area.

Vyners School was currently a mixed six form of entry 11-18 comprehensive school. It had 1,121 students on roll and this figure fluctuates slightly from year to year, depending on the size of the sixth form. The school currently had a successful sixth form but, due to space constraints, was unable to offer sufficient private study space, which resulted in some students having to leave the school premises during private study time. Accordingly, the additional accommodation, located within the existing school grounds, would provide a dedicated sixth form private study area.

Whilst the site was located within the Green Belt, the proposal complied with local, regional and national planning policies, which sought to encourage new and enhanced educational facilities. Furthermore, due to its location it would have very limited impact on the openness and visual amenity of the surrounding Green Belt and, as such, it was considered that very special circumstances exist so as to justify an exception to current Green Belt policy.

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

Resolved –

That the application be approved as per the agenda.

43. **RUISLIP GOLF CENTRE, ICKENHAM ROAD, RUISLIP - 10737/ADV/2012/26** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Installation of 1 x internally illuminated totem sign, 4 x externally illuminated fascia sign, 1 x internally illuminated fascia sign and 2 x other signs.

The application sought planning permission to display various signs and alterations within the curtilage of the site and on the main club house building. The main issues for consideration in determining this application were the impact of the signage on highway and public safety and the impact on the visual amenity of the area.

The proposed signs located on the grass bank would replace existing signs and thus there would be very little visual impact or change when viewed from Ickenham Road. There were currently various signs on the existing club house building. The proposal would result in an increase in the number of signs at the site. However, it was considered that this increase would not result in visual clutter, given that the proposed additional signage would be small in scale and would not be readily visible from the road due to their location on the front elevation of the building facing towards a car park.

	<p>Overall it is considered that the proposed signs would not cause harm public safety or the the visual amenity of the area in accordance with UDP policies BE13, BE19, BE27, BE29 and OL5.</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>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.35 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.

This page is intentionally left blank