

Minutes**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

10 December 2013

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) Raymond Graham Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Yarrow David Allam (Labour Lead) Mo Khursheed</p> <p>Also Present: Cllr David Simmonds (Items 10 and 11)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger, Highways Officer Sarah White, Principal Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer</p>
122.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Robin Sansarpuri with Councillor Mo Khursheed substituting.</p>
123.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
124.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 OCTOBER 2013 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 30 October 2013 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
125.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed that Item 8 – 116a Hallowell Road, Northwood – 45407/APP/2013/2272 had been withdrawn from the agenda.</p>
126.	<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 I, with the exception of item 13 which was considered in Part II.</p>
<p>127.</p>	<p>LAND AT CROWS NEST FARM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH, HAREFIELD 1113/APP/2013/1065 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Installation of compost storage unit with solar panels and mobile bio-bed unit, involving demolition of existing compost storage sheds.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The application related to the erection of a replacement building to be used in connection with an existing waste facility in the former farmyard of Crows Nest Farm which was within the Green Belt. This building would be used for the composting of green waste and involve the use of a mobile bio-bed.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposals was invited to address the meeting. The lead petitioner, who was also the agent, spoke on behalf of the petitioners and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A green roof would not be sustainable. • Officers had made the suggestion to implement trellis work on the side of the building for a 'greener' effect. • Thanked the Committee and officers. <p>Members questioned whether the new building would reduce any smells. The lead petitioner/agent informed the Committee that there was a strategy that would reduce potential smells with the mobile bio-bed odour removal unit.</p> <p>Members confirmed they were happy to delegate the wording of condition 10 to the Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces.</p> <p>Members noted that no objection had been received from the Environment Agency and that the proposals were not cited near residential properties.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, including the rewording of condition 10 which was delegated to the Head of Planning, Culture and Green Spaces.</p>
<p>128.</p>	<p>56 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM 4496/APP/2013/2358 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Two storey six-bedroom detached dwelling with habitable basement and roofspace involving the demolition of existing dwelling.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The site had an extensive planning history. However, the current proposal was very similar to one refused in 2008 with the main difference being a light reduction in the size of the dormers above the garage block. It was considered that the proposal would</p>

raise the same issues as the previously refused 2008 application and would represent an obtrusive form of development out of keeping with the street scene.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposals was invited to address the meeting. The lead petitioner spoke on behalf of the petitioners and raised the following points:

- Previous applications had been refused for the same grounds.
- There was no improvement to the previous application.
- The garage was longer than previously proposed.
- The porch had been redesigned.
- The application was not a neighbourly development.
- There would be overshadowing and loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- 1st floor of the garage would protrude from the bulk.
- Key reasons for refusal were previously outlined in the application presented to Committee in 2008.

The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.

Members agreed with petitioners and stated there was no difference between the previous application in 2008 and this application. Members also questioned why overshadowing diagrams had not been included in the reasons for refusal. Officers agreed these would be included in the future if overshadowing was a reason for refusal.

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 officers' report.

129. **116A HALLOWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD 45407/APP/2013/2272** (*Agenda Item 8*)

2 x two storey, 3-bed, detached dwellings with habitable roofspace with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing Use Class B1/B8 buildings.

This item was withdrawn by the applicant.

130. **36 NICHOLAS WAY, NORTHWOOD 41018/APP/2013/1224** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Variation of condition No. 2 of planning permission ref 41018/APP/2011/1630 dated 12/09/2011 to regularise the position and appearance of the new house (Two storey, detached 5-bedroom dwelling with habitable roof space, associated parking and amenity space involving the demolition of existing 3- bed detached dwelling).

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

Officer explained that amendments had been made to the scheme that was originally approved. Site visits were undertaken by officers and it was determined that the building was erected in the correct location within the site. However, there were some discrepancies in the location of neighbouring buildings as plotted on the original plans.

Officers informed the Committee that the building sat slightly further forward of the neighbouring building than might have been expected, by 0.3 metres, and the separation from the neighbouring properties approximately 0.2 metres less than was expected. Officers stated that the 0.2 metres reduction in separation distance itself did not warrant a reason for refusal, however, the gables had been erected with what the Council's Conservation Officers considered to be substantive differences from the approved plans which were harmful to the area of Special Local Character.

Members noted that reason 1 for refusal should read 'deterioration' rather than 'determination'.

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 lead petitioner raised the following points:

- Was a resident of No.34 Nicholas Way.
- Deviations from the plans were deliberate.
- Planning previously granted in 2011.
- Gables were 1 metre higher than previously approved.
- Over sized windows were never submitted for approval.
- The property was oversized and bulky.
- The front dormers were the wrong size.
- Was setting a precedent for other developers in the local area.
- The roof was higher than No.34 Nicholas Way.
- The building was sited incorrectly.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- There had been 4 site visits from enforcement who were satisfied with the alterations.
- The footprint and position of the building were all as approved.
- There had been an error in the detailed design stage, although, it would be hard to spot the difference.
- The gable was the same width and depth as approved.
- There were several errors in the officers' report.
- The house at No.38 Nicholas Way was being demolished.
- Other properties had equal gables and hips.
- The Council had approved 16 Copsewood Way which was identical.
- The owner of the property was not a developer.

Members discussed the application and were not satisfied with the amendments made and concurred with the statement from the Council's Conservation Officer.

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 officers' report.

<p>131.</p>	<p>ICKENHAM MANOR HOUSE, LONG LANE, ICKENHAM 32002/APP/2013/2732 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Demolition of 2 garages and the erection of building to accommodate a double garage and studio, adjacent to existing barn.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The proposals were seeking approval for the demolition of 2 existing garages and the erection of an outbuilding to accommodate a double garage and studio. The existing barn would be retained and attached to the proposed structure.</p> <p>A local Ward Councillor spoke regarding the proposals and made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building was an historic grade I listed house. • Ickenham Manor House was a family home, 2nd generation. • The building was in a secluded location. • Other listed buildings in the Borough such as Barra Hall and Breakspear House had planning approval. • Was formerly part of a group of buildings. • A site visit should be conducted; this would give Members of the Committee an opportunity to see what was existing and what was proposed to change. <p>Members discussed the application and agreed it would be appropriate to conduct a site visit prior to a decision being made.</p> <p>The recommendation to defer for a site visit was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – Deferred for a site visit.</p>
<p>132.</p>	<p>ICKENHAM MANOR HOUSE, LONG LANE, ICKENHAM 32002/APP/2013/2733 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Demolition of 2 garages and the erection of building to accommodate a double garage and studio, adjacent to existing barn.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The proposals were seeking approval for the demolition of 2 existing garages and the erection of an outbuilding to accommodate a double garage and studio. The existing barn would be retained and attached to the proposed structure.</p> <p>A local Ward Councillor spoke regarding the proposals and made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building was an historic grade I listed house. • Ickenham Manor House was a family home, 2nd generation. • The building was in a secluded location. • Other listed buildings in the Borough such as Barra Hall and Breakspear House had planning approval. • Was formerly part of a group of buildings.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A site visit should be conducted; this would give Members of the Committee an opportunity to see what was existing and what was proposed to change. <p>Members discussed the application and agreed it would be appropriate to conduct a site visit prior to a decision being made.</p> <p>The recommendation to defer for a site visit was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – Deferred for a site visit.</p>
133.	<p>WILLIAM OLD CENTRE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD 67902/ADV/2013/72 <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p>Installation of 3 x non illuminated fascia signs, 1 x internally illuminated fascia sign and 1 x internally illuminated monolith.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The signage would have an appropriate appearance and would not be detrimental to the amenity of the area or pedestrian or highway safety.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the, vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved.</p>
134.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p>The recommendations as set out in the officer report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed. 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><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 meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.05 pm.</p>
	<p>These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the</p>

	<p>resolutions please contact Danielle Watson on Democratic Services Officer - 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.</p>
--	---

This page is intentionally left blank