Public Document Pack

RESTRICTED MINUTES DOCUMENT

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

26 March 2013

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW

	Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) David Allam (Labour Lead) Carol Melvin John Morgan June Nelson David Payne Raymond Graham **LBH Officers Present**: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Sport & Green Spaces Meghji Hirani, Planning Contracts and Planning Information Syed Shah, Highways Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services **Also Present**: Councillor John Hensley (in part) Councillor David Simmonds (in part)	
26.	**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** *(Agenda Item 1)* Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jazz Dhillon, Councillor June Nelson attended as substitute.	
27.	**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 2)* Councillor Allan Kauffman declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to item 8, Ruislip Gardens, Primary School, Stafford Road and left the room for the duration of this item.	**Action by** Charles Francis
28.	**TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF 12 FEBRUARY 2013** *(Agenda Item 3)* The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February were agreed as an accurate record.	Charles Francis

29.	**MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** *(Agenda Item 4)* The Chairman announced that the application for Item 10, Eastcote Hockey Club, King College Road, Ruislip - 2414/APP/2012/2812 had been withdrawn by the applicant.	
30.	**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** *(Agenda Item 5)* 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.	
31.	**HAREFIELD ACADEMY, NORTHWOOD WAY, HAREFIELD - 17709/APP/2010/2844** *(Agenda Item 6)* **Erection of building to house a swimming pool and hydrotherapy pool and associated landscaping and access arrangements** Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes made as per the addendum. Officers explained that there was demand for a pool and hydrotherapy pool in Harefield and this resource would be available for use by the wider community. Officers confirmed that the application site lay within the green belt and this was the specific reason it needed to be determined by Committee. Members asked how the pool would be heated. Officers confirmed that an energy assessment would be required and the conditions for this were set out in condition 9 of the officer report. The Head of Planning also confirmed that the applicant was required to submit an energy statement should the application be approved. 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, the changes set out in the addendum.**	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani
32.	**GLEBE PRIMARY SCHOOL, SUSSEX ROAD, ICKENHAM - 8004/APP/2012/3183** *(Agenda Item 7)*	**Action by**
	Demolition of existing school and erection of a new 3 form entry school including nursery together with associated hard play, Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and parking and other associated works. Installation of temporary hard play area and classrooms during construction	James Rodger Meghji Hirani

	A Ward Councillor was present and spoke with regard to the application: • Concerns had been raised about the impact of parking by the Residents Association. • It was noted that a parking Management Scheme proposal pertinent to the application would be introduced as a result of a Cabinet Member Petition scheme • The height, scale and bulk of the proposal would have a visual impact on local residents. Members agreed the proposal was excellent and noted that it would provide a purpose built three form of entry primary school for 630 pupils and a registered nursery for 90 nursery pupils. Some concern was expressed about the scale of the environmental audit and why this extended beyond the scope of the site. The Head of Planning explained that as part of the works, a pedestrian route audit would be conducted which would lead to recommendations to improve pedestrian safety. Members noted that the Traffic Generation and Traffic Plan had taken 5 years to complete and general concerns were raised about traffic issues and how these might develop as pupil numbers increased. Officers explained that traffic around schools was an issue which affected every school. Members noted that in relation to the External Consultees section of the report, mention had been made of bridges leading to the estate which had weight restrictions. The Committee requested officers to add an informative about weight restrictions on the bridge leading to the school. The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed. 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. Condition 17 was deleted and an additional informative was added relating to weight restrictions on the bridge leading to the school.**	
33.	**RUISLIP GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL, STAFFORD ROAD, RUISLIP - 4183/APP/2012/3090** *(Agenda Item 8)*	**Action by**
	Part demolition of the existing building, erection of a new two storey extension, re-organisation and expansion of existing car park, extension of hard play area, introduction of a drop-off/pick-up facility and associated works.	James Rodger Meghji Hirani

	Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in the addendum. Introducing the report, officers explained that the proposal fully complied with the aims of the National Planning Framework, London Plan and Local Plan. It was noted that Sport England had confirmed that there would be no significant loss of useable playing fields as a result of the proposals and it was not considered that the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable visual impact on the surrounding area. Officers confirmed that the school would operate during the construction phase. Referring to the addendum, officers noted that this should be amended to read 55 car parking spaces and disabled parking. Officers confirmed that condition 17 needed to be removed from the addendum as this did not relate to this school. It 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.**	
34.	**SOUTH RUISLIP LIBRARY, PLOT B, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 67080/APP/2012/2973** *(Agenda Item 9)* **Variation of condition 2 (i.e. changes to the approved plans involving alterations to the internal layout including the removal of the second staircase to 'Block 1' to provide a total of 15 one-bedroom and 16 two-bedroom flats) of planning permission ref. 67080/APP/2010/1420 dated 08/03/2012 (Erection of a part three and a half, part four storey block and a three storey block comprising a total of 19 one-bedroom and 12 two-bedroom flats, together with associated parking and amenity space).** Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in the addendum. It 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.**	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani
35.	**EASTCOTE HOCKEY CLUB, KINGS COLLEGE ROAD, RUISLIP - 2414/APP/2012/2812 - WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT 25.3.2013** *(Agenda Item 10)*	**Action by**
	Construction of an all-weather, sand dressed multi-purpose sports playing pitch, with associated floodlighting, fencing and car parking	James Rodger Meghji Hirani

	Resolved – **The item was withdrawn by the applicant.**	
36.	**51 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 21977/APP/2012/2194** *(Agenda Item 11)*	**Action by**
	Two storey building with habitable roofspace to create 5 x self-contained flats with associated parking and landscaping and installation of vehicular crossover, involving demolition of existing detached dwelling. Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in 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. The petitioner raised the following points: • The street consisted of single family homes and the proposed scheme would be out of character and appearance with the surrounding properties and set precedence. • Parking would be a problem as visitor parking would have to park on the road and cause access and egress of vehicles difficult at No.49b. • There was no need for luxury apartments to be created or offered on the road. • The number of recent examples of older houses being demolished and replaced by new, larger buildings had already eroded the traditional residential character of the road and therefore object to more of the same; • No. 49b was a two storey property with a single storey rear element. The proposed three storey building would result in a loss of light to this property. • The proposal would overlook No.49b house and garden as the plot sits about a foot higher; • Planning applications for flats/apartments had been turned down on the road because they did not suit the street scene; • Rubbish and recycling would be a problem. • The site was located in a predominantly low-density residential area where occupiers could reasonably expect a level of amenity concurrent with a detached house. The use of the property as flats would introduces noise, disturbance and nuisance to the detriment of neighbouring homeowner's amenity. The agent made the following points: • The contextual drawings illustrated that the proposal would fit in with the street scene • The development would provide generously proportioned accommodation • The photographic montages illustrated that the height, mass and	James Rodger Meghji Hirani

	scale of the development were appropriate • Mature planting surrounding the development would be retained • An education contribution via section 106 agreement would be made • The applicants would restrict the age of potential residents to 55 years or older • The proposal would not set a precedent for development in the area and would not open the floodgates to further development. • The developer had complied with the parking requirements for the specific type of development A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and made the following points: • The ward councillor endorsed the concerns which had been raised by the petitioner in objection to the scheme • The officer report and addendum sheet had omitted to include the comments of a ward councillor whom had written to the Planning Department with concerns about the proposal • The plans did not appear to show refuse of cycle storage arrangements for the development • The plans and diagrams did not appear to show defendable space in front of the building • The proposal incorporated too much hard standing at the front of the building • The bulk, size and scale of the development would be detrimental to the area. In response to the points raised about refuse and cycle storage, officers confirmed that these were shown in the diagrams in the plans pack provided. In relation to hard standing at the front of the proposal, officers explained that a compromise would always have to be reached in providing sufficient car parking space and the degree of hard standing which was required to ensure the development complied with policy. The Head of Planning informed the meeting that the car parking proposals met the requirements of the London Plan and in his view could not be defended at appeal. In discussing the application, several members of the Committee expressed the view that they thought the proposal would create parking and landscaping problems. Concerns were also expressed at the bulk of the rear of the building, the depth this extended and the visual impact this would have to properties to the rear of the development. The Committee asked officers about the effect this would have on the side window of 49b the Drive and whether this was a habitable room. Officers were unable to provide an answer about whether the side room in 49 b was habitable or not. As a result it was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously that standing orders be suspended and the meeting be adjourned for 15 minutes to ascertain whether the room in the adjoining property, 49b was a habitable room or not. When the meeting resumed, officers confirmed that they had been unable to establish the status of the room and officers would need to inspect the	

	adjoining property and report back before any decision could be taken. The Head of Planning suggested to the Chairman that as officers were unable to provide this material fact at the meeting, that the application be withdrawn from the agenda. It was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed that the application be withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning. **Resolved –** **That the application be withdrawn from the agenda.**	
37.	**HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 9011/APP/2012/3074** *(Agenda Item 12)* **Erection of a single storey extension (conservatory) to Ward 'E' of Harefield Hospital, totalling 32 square metres floorspace for medical and health care use with associated landscaping** Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as set out in the addendum. 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.**	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani
38.	**THE OLD ORCHARD, PARK LANE, HAREFIELD - 3499/APP/2012/2773** *(Agenda Item 13)* **Installation of replacement extraction plant and close boarded fence (Retrospective)** Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as set out in the addendum. Officers explained that the application sought retrospective planning permission for the installation of a replacement extraction plant and close boarded fence. The Committee were informed that in its current form both the fence and extraction plant had an adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining property. The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed. **Resolved –** **That the application be refused as per the agenda.**	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani

39.	**REAR OF 54 SWAKELEYS DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 53998/APP/2012/1741** *(Agenda Item 14)* **1 x two storey 5-bedroom detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and 1 x two storey 5-bedroom detached dwelling, with associated parking and double garage and alterations to existing driveway and installation of new vehicular crossover to front.** Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as set out in the addendum. The Committee heard it was considered that the two houses would not result in a conspicuous form of development adjacent to the Green Belt and would not unacceptably encroach on the open setting of Swakeleys House. Officers confirmed that the proposal was considered to be an acceptable form of development and complimentary to the surrounding area. Members noted that since the last application, the development had increased in size from 2, 4 bedroom dwellings to 2, 5 bedroom dwellings and were concerned that the development had increased in size. In response to these concerns, the Head of Planning explained that the development was situated in a spacious setting and the planning Inspectorate deemed it to be an acceptable. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed 3 votes in favour, 2 against and with 2 abstentions to approve the application. **Resolved –** **That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.**	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani
40.	**SOUTHBOURNE DAY CENTRE, 161 ELLIOTT AVENUE, RUISLIP - 66033/APP/2009/1060** *(Agenda Item 15)* **Erection of a two storey building to provide 23 one and two-bedroom apartments, together with associated parking, involving the demolition of existing day centre building (Outline application). Deed of Variation to S106 Agreement determined at Committee 27th October 2010** Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes made as per the addendum. The Committee were informed that with the assistance of Housing, a Registered Provider had agreed to purchase the flats as a shared ownership tenure. Officers confirmed that they considered this was an acceptable means of providing affordable housing units and that the deed of variation should be amended accordingly. The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani

	Resolved – **That the application be approved as per the agenda and the changes set out in the addendum.**	
41.	**ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 16)* The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. **Resolved:** **1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report.** **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.** *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).*	**Action by** James Rodger Meghji Hirani
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.17 p.m.	

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 and Officers.

This page is intentionally left blank