

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

8 August 2012

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Jazz Dhillon Carol Melvin John Morgan David Payne Raymond Graham</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger – Head of Planning Adrien Waite – Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger – Highways Engineer Nicole Cameron – Legal Officer Rory Stracey – Legal Officer Charles Francis – Democratic Services</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr Andrew Retter</p>	
62.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
63.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Alan Kauffman declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 13 – Land Forming Part of 111 Parkfield Crescent, South Ruislip and left the Committee Room for this item</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 15 – Enforcement Report and remained in the Committee Room.</p>	
64.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF 26 JUNE, 12 JULY AND 19 JULY 2012 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 26 June, 12 July and 19 July 2012 were agreed as accurate records.</p>	
65.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>	

	None.	
66.	<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 Part 1 with the exception of Item 15 which was considered in private.</p>	
67.	<p>32 EAST MEAD, RUISLIP - 68276/APP/2012/1240 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 1 bed self contained flats to include part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey extension to side to create 2 x 1-bed self contained flats, with associated parking and amenity space and installation of a vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn by the Head of Planning.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>
68.	<p>LAND REAR OF 24 COURT ROAD, ICKENHAM - 68420/APP/2012/633 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Conversion from World War II hut to 1 x 1-bed self- contained dwelling with associated amenity space.</p> <p>This item was withdrawn from the agenda.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>
69.	<p>LAND REAR OF 41-43 THE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD - 68458/APP/2012/779 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>4 x two storey, 4-bed, detached dwellings with associated amenity space and parking and installation of vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development would be detrimental to the character of the area • There already were more than 170 four bedroom homes for sale within a one mile radius of Northwood and so the development was not necessary • Local roads already suffered from traffic congestion and further development would have an adverse impact on parking. It was likely that if an additional four homes were built, the number of vehicles would exceed the 8 which were planned for. • There already were vehicular access problems in the road 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>(including to utility and emergency vehicles) and further development would exacerbate this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There already were drainage problems in Knoll Crescent and adding a further four large homes would put even more pressure on the existing infrastructure • If the development were approved, a large amount of earth would need to be removed which could affect the stability of surrounding ground, trees and homes. • The development might cause local subsidence issues. • If approved, a significant number of trees would need to be felled which would affect the visual amenity of local residents • Residents bordering the application site would lose their privacy • Local wildlife living in the green belt would be affected and should be protected <p>The applicant / agent did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee sought further clarification on a number of points including vehicular access and the drainage issues raised by the petitioner. Officers confirmed that the development would provide access for 2 cars per home which was the maximum standard which could be imposed and there would be sufficient room for service / emergency vehicles to access and egress the site. In relation to possible flood risk, officers confirmed that the site was not located in a flood risk area but if Members raised concerns, these could be addressed by adding a number of conditions to the application.</p> <p>Members agreed that the development constituted an over development and would be detrimental to the green belt.</p> <p>The recommendation as stated in the report 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 report and addendum.</p>	
70.	<p>JOEL STREET FARM, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 8856/APP/2012/767 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Change of use of stables to cattery (Sui Generis) involving the removal of existing roof, raising of existing walls and installation of new roof, two storey rear extension to rear of existing building to be used as Use Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) for use as a nursery involving demolition of existing barn and part change of use from cattery (Sui Generis), single storey side extension to existing building involving part demolition of cattle yard and covered area, alterations to parking, and installation of vehicular crossover to front.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

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

The petitioner made the following points:

- The proposal to demolish and then rebuild the barn was not acceptable for the locally listed complex
- The proposed development would constitute an over development within the green belt and be detrimental to the historic site.
- As the site was situated in the green belt an ecology study should be submitted
- There were inaccuracies in the officer report in relation to the traffic statement which required correction.
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on local traffic
- The application did not contain sufficient details or information about the change of use

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

The petitioner / agent made the following points:

- The site urgently required capital investment to stop it from falling further into a dilapidated state
- The barn was in a near state of collapse
- The proposal did not include increasing the foot print of the site
- The proposals incorporated income generation opportunities to recoup the investment which was anticipated to be around £250K.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The site had been neglected in recent years and investment was needed at the site
- The current proposals would have a detrimental impact to the green belt
- The application was inappropriate (in its current form).

In discussing the application, the Committee sought further clarification on a number of points which included local wildlife and traffic related concerns. Officers confirmed that most of the soft landscaping was maintained through regular mowing and most of the vacant buildings were used on a regular basis. As a result, there was no significant evidence of there being any damage to the local ecology. In relation to parking at the site, officers confirmed that it was proposed that the car park would be situated on a cellular system comprising of gravel laid over plastic cells. Members agreed that the site required further investment but it was essential that an application was sympathetic to the site.

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

	<p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as per the report, addendum and the following additional informative regarding ecology (final wording delegated to the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces and provided below)</p> <p>'You are advised that the Local Planning Authority would expect any re-submission to be accompanied by a habitat/ecological assessment relating to the site and existing buildings.'</p>	
71.	<p>25 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 56137/APP/2012/1119 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition Nos. 4 and 6 (Opening and Delivery Hours) of planning permission ref 56137/APP/2010/48 dated 10/05/2010 to allow staff to be permitted on the premises between 23.30 and 08.00 and also to allow the premises to have deliveries or collections, including waste collections between the hours of 08.00 and 22.00 daily (Change of use to Class A3 Restaurant and Class A5 hot food takeaway and elevation alterations).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The change in condition would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents. • There already were issues with litter and unpleasant odours and extended opening hours would exacerbate these problems • There already were a high number of fast food takeaways and additional operating hours were unnecessary • An extension to operating hours would further affect local residents through additional noise <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application was for a simple variation to two conditions (condition 4 – hours of operation and condition 6 – delivery times) • The hours of operation condition sought was different to the one used in the south of the Borough • Additional hours were being sought by the applicant to allow them to have greater flexibility to lock-up, clean and stock take • The fast food restaurant only had 3 deliveries per week which would minimise disruption to local residents. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In relation to the hours of operation, there did not appear to be any justification for wishing to open up any earlier than the current time. • Both conditions should be used to protect the amenity of local residents • It was unnecessary to collect refuse at 10 pm at night • To request the Committee to overturn the officer recommendations and refuse the application <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that (permission to accept) deliveries at 10 pm would cause additional noise disruption to local residents. It was also likely that if employees remained on the premises after 11pm, this would most likely be for cleaning rather than stock taking purposes</p> <p>Officers advised the Committee that it was not possible to agree a split decision on the application and Members would need to either accept or refuse the officer recommendations set out in the report.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote it was unanimously agreed to overturn the officer recommendation.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>Member Overturn. Refused due to detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers. Final wording of the refusal reason to be agreed by the Chair and Labour Lead outside of the meeting:</p> <p><i>'The proposed amendments to conditions 4 and 6 would lead to an increase in activity, noise and disturbance which would be detrimental to the amenity of the area and nearby residential occupiers contrary to Policies BE19, OE1 and OE3 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), the London Borough of Hillingdon's Noise Supplementary Planning Document, Policy 7.15 of the London Plan (July 2011) and the National Planning Policy Framework.'</i></p>	
72.	<p>56-58 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 17961/APP/2012/1008 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Part first floor and part two storey extension to existing rear element to create a studio flat.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the changes set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the application was invited to address the meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application was very similar to one which was submitted in 2010 • The application would result in the overlooking of neighbours • The proposed development would result in the loss of amenity to local residents and increased noise levels • The plans in the officer report were inaccurate • The refuse area was currently very dirty and the proposed application would worsen this situation • There would be insufficient parking space for the development <p>The Agent raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The officer report confirmed that there would be no overlooking and there was no highways impact • The design had been revised and a lower wall height had been incorporated to match the height of next door. • The proposed design would be complementary in style • The Committee were urged to take a pragmatic view to town centre development with this application • If the application were approved this would contribute to Hillingdon's Housing figures <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that a site visit would be beneficial before any decision was made.</p> <p>On being put to the vote, it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Deferred for a site visit.</p>	
73.	<p>9 CLIVE PARADE, GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD - 15297/APP/2012/993 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from Use Class A1 (Shops) to Use Class A1/A3 (Shops/ Restaurants and Cafes) for use as a coffee shop involving a single storey front infill extension, new shop front and installation of external seating to front.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded and on being put to the vote that the application be approved as set out in the officer report and the changes in the Addendum.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>Approved as per the report and the addendum, subject to the following changes:</p> <p>Condition 4 to be amended to include reference to the Use Classes Order (final wording delegated to the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces)</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>

	Condition 7 to be as per the report (amendment to condition 7 within the addendum was not accepted by members)	
74.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 111 PARKFIELD CRESCENT, RUISLIP - 68057/APP/2012/868 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Use of permitted two storey extension as a self contained house including erection of a single storey porch, associated car parking and amenity space.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred to the extensive addendum on the item. The Committee noted that the applicant had not been able to demonstrate that No. 111 Parkfield Crescent had a right of way over the adjoining rear service road and therefore the application had not demonstrated that the two parking spaces in the rear garden would be accessible.</p> <p>It was noted that an additional letter of objection from a ward councillor in the adjoining London Borough of Harrow in relation to rights of way had also been received. Furthermore, a response from Harrow Council had also been received, raising no objections to the proposal.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote that the application be refused as set out in the officer's report and addendum.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as per the report and addendum.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</p>
75.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</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>Resolved –</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Adrien Waite</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>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 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.