

Minutes

## NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

11 December 2012

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b> Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Jazz Dhillon John Morgan David Payne Raymond Graham Brian Stead</p>
	<p><b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b> Matthew Duigan, Planning Services Manager Meghji Hirani, Planning Manager Manmohan Ranger, Highways Anne Gerzon. Legal Advisor Nav Johal, Democratic Services</p> <p><b>Others Present:</b> Councillor Scott Seaman-Digby (in part)</p>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Carol Melvin. Councillor Brian Stead was in attendance as substitute.</p>
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
3.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
4.	<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 Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items marked Part 1 would be considered in public and all items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>
5.	<p><b>LAND AT HIGH MEADOW CLOSE, PINNER - 196/APP/2012/1776</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p>

### **Erection of a 45 Bed Care Home (Use Class C2) with associated landscaping and parking.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes made as per the addendum.

Officers confirmed the location of the Council owned lay-by for additional parking, which was located on High Meadow Close. Officers also confirmed the number of beds in the previous care home had been 31.

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 Michael Barrett spoke on behalf of the petitioners and it was noted that Members had received a copy of his speech prior to the start of the meeting:

- A 45 bed care home was substantially larger in bulk and mass than the former building on the site. Although the Council's planning officer agreed with the developer, that a series of 'irregular blocks' diluted the bulk of the building, those that signed the petition strongly disagreed with this and felt the proposed development was too large.
- The building was of significant size and scale seeking to utilise the entire plot to the detriment of outside amenity space and to the neighbouring properties. The proposal hinged on the fact that the developers had reduced the number of beds from 50 to 45. Whilst petitioners agreed this was a step in the right direction they felt developers should be considering a smaller scale commercial operation of fewer bedrooms given how small the site and location was.
- Petitioners believed there was a lack of outdoor amenity space due to the scale of the build. They were concerned that the needs of the care home residents had not been adequately considered due to an over reliance in them being infirm and not being encouraged to venture outdoors. Given the size and scale of the building compared to the plot size, which was an awkward shape, and that it was surrounded by residential rather than commercial properties, the small current outdoor amenity provision exaggerated the scale of the building further and failed to support the built form in the context of the site.
- The petitioner spoke about lack of parking and the concern over emergency access. It was not a sustainable located site. The Council agreed with a 1A rating. A key reason stated by the Council for the closure of Frank Welch Court was due to a lack of public transport. The petitioner stated that it could not be denied that staff, visitors and services to the site would have had no option but to drive.
- Petitioners remained extremely nervous about the validity of the transport surveys that had been completed since the initial proposal. The overwhelming opinion of petitioners was that the care homes audited for parking had better public transport access than the High Meadow site.
- Daymer Gardens was a relatively narrow road. It was imperative that passage for residents and emergency vehicles was ensured and that overflow parking from the care home was avoided.

- Increased volume of traffic and overflow parking could compromise the road safety. The entry and exit from Daymer Gardens to Caitlin's lane was already very dangerous due to the impact of people parking opposite the junction which forced drivers to proceed to turn into Daymer Gardens on the wrong side of the road. An increase in parked cars in Daymer Gardens would further exasperate the safety issue.
- Petitioners were therefore keen for conditions to be imposed which protected against parking impact.
- The Planning Officer's report pointed to the potential for parking within High Meadow, the Council owned lay-by, to be made available for overflow use. Petitioners urged the Council to allow the home to use this but safeguard against irresponsible unsafe parking and also asked the Council to consider a further payment from the home for the maintenance of the area.
- The petitioner spoke about the travel plan which they felt was merely a document of intention that did not live and breathe. Members of staff would be encouraged, but not forced, to reconsider travel to work. Should the proposed development be approved, petitioners asked that the Council applied conditions insisting upon staggered shift patterns to attempt to avoid overflow parking.
- The Care Home would have no control over how many visitors came to the site or when they visited unless restricted and staggered visiting hours were applied. Petitioners asked that in the event that this proposal was approved, that a more rigid and 'policable' condition was applied beyond that which a travel plan offered.
- A number of petitioners had asked the lead petitioner to add that the process had been an unpleasant one due to the tactics the developers had chosen to adopt. This started with a poorly run neighbourhood consultation and led to residents who raised objections to the Council being contacted directly by the developer's representative requesting individual meetings. These were under the guise of being neighbourly when in fact the outcome had been a number of residents feeling under extreme pressure to change their objections and being contacted repeatedly by the developer's representative to do so.
- The petitioners urged Councillors to consider the developer's proposal carefully. There had been a considerable amount of 'spin', selectiveness and in the view of residents with much history and local knowledge of the site, a fair degree of misrepresentation and inaccuracy as the developers' sought to get the proposal passed at all costs.
- The Care Home proposal was for the vulnerable in the community requiring care and welfare, however the care and welfare of the whole community, which includes residents like the petitioners, should form a key part of the decision making.

Mr Graham Gardner, agent, spoke on behalf of the application submitted:

- It was noted that the Planning and Urban design officer had accepted the design.
- The developers had been working a year with the Council and residents to get the application right.
- Developers had used DWA which was a nationally recognised care

home architect for the development.

- 6 NHS doctors had been consulted and would be working with the care home. This showed that the applicants had a level of quality of care towards the people that would be staying at the care home.
- The proposed building had been carefully designed so not to impact on adjoining properties.
- The windows on the first floor would be located and angled so they did not impact or overlook adjoining properties.
- The foot print and proposed building overall was not too large for the site.
- The outside amenity space was more than adequate. It was almost 50% of the site and this was almost double the Council guidelines requirement.
- The rooms in the proposed application were larger than guidelines, and there were large lounge spaces for residents too.
- The application included a gym and other leisure facilities.
- Efforts had been directed at the elderly and residents, to ensure their health and wellbeing.
- It was noted that the site was not of ecological value.
- There was photo evidence which showed the site clearance was far more modest than suggested.
- The proposal had ample on-site parking, 15 spaces were being provided although guidelines suggested that 10 spaces was adequate.
- Evidence had been collated and agreed with the developer's views on parking and traffic management. The application would not have a huge impact on traffic flow in the area.
- Developers had accepted that public transport was limited but it was not a zero level. The closest bus stop was an 8 minute walk from the site.

Members commented on the good quality design of the application and felt that it was not overdevelopment of the site. Some Members felt that concerns had been met and the old care home would be replaced by a much improved care home.

Some Members felt the area would get congested during certain periods and the parking allocated was not sufficient for visitors. It was noted by the Highways Officer that surveys suggested that there would be approximately 3 additional cars on the road per hour as a result of the application being developed. It was further noted that this application provided more parking than similar applications which had been approved in the Borough.

Emergency access was discussed and it was noted that the developer had provided plans on emergency access and there was a dedicated ambulance lay-by on the site. Members clarified that CCTV would be secure by design.

Members also discussed the large site in a residential area and whether this was suitable. Members discussed the possibility of a site visit and whether this would be beneficial before reaching a decision on the application.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to vote was agreed by a majority. 4 Members voted in favour and 3

Members, Councillors' Graham, Morgan and Payne voted against.

**Resolved –**

**That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.**

6. **138 LINDEN AVENUE, RUISLIP - 11121/APP/2012/1922** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Erection of 1 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 4 bedroom two storey detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving the demolition of existing bungalow.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes made as per the addendum.

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 Ashby spoke on behalf of the petitioners:

- Petitioners felt the application would ruin the area.
- The lead petitioner questions the accuracy of the plans submitted and that plans focused on no.38 when in fact it was no.36 that would be overlooked if the application was approved.
- The road was private and any new people moving in would have no right to park on the road.
- The petitioner stated that no one had looked at no.140, that side of the application would mean that there was no privacy to no.140.
- It was an elderly person area and an application for two bungalows would be acceptable.
- There was enough housing for families in the area and two 2 storey houses were not required in the area.
- Families moving in the area would upset neighbours by causing noise and it was stated there were no schools nearby.
- The petitioner stated that the residents had not been consulted on this application.

The agent/applicant was not present.

Members asked officers to comment on the inaccuracies that petitioners mentioned. Officers clarified that it would be no.38 where there would be main impact, and there was not a material impact on no.36 as was indicated by petitioners.

Officers further clarified the impact on no.140 and stated the new property would be closer to no.140 than it currently was. This would be 1 metre, which was the minimum distance required. Any potential overshadowing on no.140 was discussed and officers stated that experts advised overshadowing diagrams would not assist in this instance as there would not be overshadowing on the property and any overshadowing would occur out onto the road.

Members asked officer clarification on parking and officers stated if the road

	<p>was private then the parking issues would be a private matter rather than for Council restriction. The application provided sufficient parking as per Council guidelines.</p> <p>Members felt this application was suitable for the area and were happy with the officer's report and recommendations.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum,</b></p>
7.	<p><b>BREAKSPEAR HOUSE, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 7610/APP/2012/2637</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Proposal to enclose the lightwell between the original manor house and the 2 storey car park to create 2 rooms to serve 2 individual flats within the original manor house.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report. Members noted this application was fully supported by the Council's Conservation Officer and were happy with the officer report and recommendations.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>
8.	<p><b>BREAKSPEAR HOUSE, BREAKSPEAR ROAD NORTH, HAREFIELD - 7610/APP/2012/2638</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Proposal to enclose the lightwell between the original manor house and the 2 storey car park to create 2 rooms to serve 2 individual flats within the original manor house (Application for Listed building Consent)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report. Members noted this application was fully supported by the Council's Conservation Officer and were happy with the officer report and recommendations.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as per the agenda.</b></p>
9.	<p><b>HOLLAND AND HOLLAND SHOOTING GROUND, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 16568/APP/2012/1423</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p>

**Single storey building for use as a corporate facility involving demolition of existing building.**

Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes made as per the addendum. It was noted that the application would be on the existing hard surface, and existing second building and car park would not be affected.

A Ward Councillor was present and spoke on behalf of the application submitted to the Council:

- The Ward Councillor was speaking on behalf of residents and had spoken to the Northwood Residents Association who were in support of the application.
- The application would bring economic benefits to the area, including employment.
- The current building was not fit for purpose.
- Other Ward Councillors had showed their support for the application.
- There was a high level of corporate business use for this site, for example, team building activities.
- It was noted that officers had done a remarkable job and had worked with the applicant in producing an acceptable proposal.
- The application would be of a real benefit to the Borough.
- It was a beautiful site with so many wildlife on the site.
- The Ward Councillor asked the Committee to approve this application.

Members discussed the application and agreed with the officer's recommendation. Members felt that this was an appropriate use of Green Belt land and were in total support of the application. This would not take anything away from the Green Belt land and should assist in enhancing the site.

Members discussed any possible noise increase from the discharge of weapons and officers advised that there would not be a noticeable increase in noise or parking on the site. That the site currently erected a marquee for busy periods and this accommodation was to be in place of the marquee. It was noted there had been no noise complaints regarding the site.

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.**

10. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 10*)

The recommendation set out in the officer's report and changes as per the addendum was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

**Resolved:**

	<p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report and changes as per the addendum be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.22 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.