Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

7 January 2014

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

	Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) Raymond Graham Michael Markham David Allam (Labour Lead) Brian Stead Janet Duncan **LBH Officers Present**: Matthew Duigan, Planning Services Manager Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger, Transportation DC Consultant Victoria Boorman, Flood and Water Management Specialist Sarah White, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services	
138.	**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** *(Agenda Item 1)* Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Carol Melvin and Councillor Brian Stead acted as substitute. Apologies for absence were received from Councillor David Yarrow, no substitute. Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Robin Sansarpuri and Councillor Janet Duncan acted as substitute.	
139.	**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 2)* None.	
140.	**TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF 20 NOVEMBER AND 10 DECEMBER 2013** *(Agenda Item 3)* Were agreed as an accurate record.	
141.	**MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** *(Agenda Item 4)* None.	
142.	**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)* All items were considered in Part 1.	
143.	**39 COPSEWOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD - 11007/APP/2013/2426** *(Agenda Item 6)* The item was withdrawn from the agenda by the Planning Services Manager ahead of the Committee meeting.	**Action by** Matthew Duigan
144.	**15 NICHOLAS WAY, NORTHWOOD - 16824/APP/2012/3220** *(Agenda Item 7)* The Chairman introduced the item and explained that the scheme had been previously considered at 30 October 2013 North Planning Committee meeting where most matters had been resolved. However, it had been established that a flood report had not been published to the public website in error and so had been subject to an additional consultation period. The Chairman explained that in this particular case, he had used his discretion to allow the petitioners that spoke at 30 October 2013 meeting to speak again on the flood report without a petition. It was noted that this was highly unusual as the Council's Constitution provided guidance that petitions were required to address Planning Committees. Officers introduced the report and explained that a geotechnical report had not been available to the public when the application was considered at 30 October 2013 meeting. As a result, a further period of consultation was undertaken and the application considered at this meeting would only focus on this consultation. It was noted that on the basis of all the information considered at both 30 October and 7 January 2014 meetings, the Council's Flood and Water Management Specialist considered that there was no material harm. Referring to the addendum sheet, Officers highlighted that the increase of the footprint from 380 square metres to 416 square metres did not alter their view. In relation to Condition 10, it was noted that the word 'surface' should be deleted from point 1 and that three additional pieces of correspondence had been received since the agenda had been published which were summarised in the addendum sheet. In accordance with the Constitution the petitioner addressed the Committee and the following points were raised: • The application was error prone, inconsistent and should be rejected. • The conditions in neighbouring gardens had been ignored by the structural engineering report. • The report had ignored the impact of the removal of 21 mature trees from the site. • The report had not investigated the cumulative impact of the	**Action by** Matthew Duigan & Adrien Waite

	scheme including the impact other basements locally and also the water run off down the slope from Copse Wood. • The report did not refer to how an underground trench would be maintained as these systems would become blocked over time. Therefore, trenches would be ineffective. • The report failed to apply the extra 30% climate change factor on the general increase in water run-off • The application mentioned that soak ways would be used. However, these would be inappropriate for the development owing to the strata of thick clay which would require very deep excavation. • The Council had still failed to demonstrate in the current report how the major reasons for refusal from the first application (regarding size and bulk) had been mitigated. • An application at Number 7 Nicholas Way had been recommended for refusal on the grounds of size, scale, bulk, siting, design and appearance although this had a smaller footprint than the proposal at 15 Nicholas Way. Therefore, why had a much larger proposal been recommended for approval? • At 30th October meeting, the Committee made a number of incorrect assumptions about the impact of the development based on the footprint only, and did not take into account the height of the proposal. For clarification, the Committee asked the petitioner to explain their comments about the trench system. The petitioner reiterated their concerns that the gravel trenches would become blocked over time by water borne debris and a maintenance programme could not be implemented as the trenches were located 9 feet below the depth of the basement. In response, the Council's Flood and Water Management Specialist confirmed that Officers had considered the ground conditions of neighbouring gardens and undertaken a site visit to number 15 Nicholas Way. The Officer also confirmed that the use of trench systems was considered best practice and had been used with success elsewhere. Noting the concerns about the maintenance of the trenches, the officer explained that these were unlikely to fill up because the trenches were lined with a geo-textile material to stop debris entering the trench system. Officers also commented that their analysis had incorporated the effects of climate change and how surface water run off could be controlled in the future. A representative of the applicant or agent was invited to address the Committee but opted not to. Discussing the application the Committee raised a number of points, including the implications of surface run off, the increased footprint of the proposal and the effectiveness of the water tanks incorporated into the design proposals. In response, the Committee were informed that surface water and ground water issues had been taken account of in principle in their recommendations about the scheme but that in many cases, the technical implementation of the scheme remained a Building Control matter. In relation to the footprint of the proposal, Officers	

	reiterated their comments from the addendum, namely that the increased footprint did not constitute a reason for the refusal of the scheme. With regards to the water storage, Officers confirmed that the design was sufficiently large that it would be able to sustain a large scale event and that the design allowed for the gradual discharge of the tanks during a period of dry weather. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed to approve the application with five votes in favour, with one against. **Resolved –** **That the application be Approved as per officer recommendation, addendum sheet and the changes listed above.**	
145.	**LITTLE BOURNE FARM, NORTHWOOD ROAD, HAREFIELD - 63630/APP/2013/3294** *(Agenda Item 8)* Officers introduced the report. It was noted that the building would not significantly increase the built up appearance of the site and would not result in an inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The Committee agreed that the application would not detract from the agricultural character of the immediate surrounding area and it was noted that there would not be an adverse impact along the adjacent highway. It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote agreed that the application be approved. **Resolved –** **That the application be approved, subject to the officer report and changes set out in the addendum. (Approved as per officer recommendation)**	**Action by** Matthew Duigan & Adrien Waite
146.	**209 SWAKELEYS ROAD, ICKENHAM - 38490/APP/2013/3223** *(Agenda Item 9)* Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum. Introducing the report, Officers confirmed that the application would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area and the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers. The Committee also noted that the proposal incorporated adequate parking provision and complied with the Council's standards. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved. **Resolved –**	**Action by** Matthew Duigan & Adrien Waite

	That the application be Approved as per the officer recommendation and the addendum.	
147.	**LAND FORMING PART OF NO 11 AND 11 DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 42254/APP/2013/2897** *(Agenda Item 10)* Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum. Referring to the overall scheme, officers explained that a previous application had been dismissed at appeal because education contributions had not been agreed. Officers confirmed that the proposal before the Committee now incorporated these and as it was in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the scheme was recommended for approval. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved. **Resolved –** **That the application be Approved as per officer recommendation and addendum sheet.**	**Action by** Matthew Duigan & Adrien Waite
148.	**UNIT B, NEW PETS AT HOME STORE, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 60026/APP/2013/2989** *(Agenda Item 11)* Officers introduced the report and the changes set out in the addendum. It was noted that the application concerned a change of use from Use Class A1 to mixed Use Class A1 / Sui Generis. Officers explained that they considered the proposal would not be harmful to the retail use of the site or harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers. The Committee welcomed proposals that made it more likely that retail premises would remain open. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved. **Resolved –** **That the application be Approved as per officer recommendation and addendum sheet.**	**Action by** Matthew Duigan & Adrien Waite
	The meeting, which commenced at 7:30 pm, closed at 8.16 pm.	

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, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.