

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 August 2014

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Manjit Khatra, John Morse, Jas Dhot and David Yarrow</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Jonathan Bianco</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture Adrien Waite, Major Applications Planning Manager Syed Shah, Principal Highways Engineer Nicole Cameron, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p>
33.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies from absence were received from Councillors Peter Curling and Councillor Henry Higgins with Councillor Manjit Kahatra and Councillor Alan Chapman acting as substitutes</p>
34.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor John Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as he had raised the particular issue with the planning officers some 18 months previously</p> <p>Councillor Jas Dhot declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7 as the lead petitioner was known to him personally.</p>
35.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
36.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>

37.	<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 items 9 and 10 which were considered in Part 2.</p>
38.	<p>LAND WEST OF WOODFIELD TERRACE AND DOVEDALE CLOSE, HAREFIELD - 66148/APP/2014/430 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Construction of a 5-bed detached 'eco' house with associated garage and pool (Outline Planning Permission with All Matters Reserved).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, highlighting the changes set out in the addendum. Officers also proposed that the additional informative be added to the report as follows:</p> <p><i>'You are advised that should the development be allowed at a subsequent appeal it would represents chargeable development under both the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (£35 per sq.m) and Hillingdon's Community Infrastructure Levy (£95 per sq.m). Given the application is for outline consent it is not possible to estimate the potential liability at this time. The actual Community Infrastructure Levy would be calculated were your development to be permitted at appeal and a separate liability notice will be issued by the Local Planning Authority.. '</i></p> <p>The Committee were informed that outline planning permission was being sought for the erection of a house with access being provided to the site by the creation of a new road leading from the existing driveway between 69c and 69d Dovedale Close.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, the representative of the petition 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"> • Although the lead petitioner attended the meeting, he opted not to address the meeting as he agreed with the contents of the Officer report. <p>The applicant made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal had taken into consideration Officer comments as well as the Appeal decision. • The proposal was a highly evolved design which included features such as a green roof, insulated timber frame, slate walls and dusk activated blinds. • The design was a raised above ground height so that flora and fauna could thrive underneath it. • Parking would be restricted to areas of hard standing. • Ecologist reports had found no evidence of endangered species on the site. • A number of trees would need to be removed, if the application was successful and an impact assessment would also be provided. • The site was not located within the Green Belt or a nature conservation area. <p>The Committee raised concerns about whether or not specific circumstances existed at the site to justify development. Officers explained that in their view, the introduction of any habitable dwelling would harm the site.</p> <p>In the course of discussions, the Committee agreed that the proposal would have an</p>

urbanising influence on a site adjacent to the Green Belt and would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. In addition, the Committee agreed that the size and scale of the development would be detrimental to the area.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and agreed unanimously that the application be refused.

Resolved -

That the application be refused.

39. **92 CATLINS LANE, PINNER - 53741/APP/2014/1685** (Agenda Item 7)

Conversion of existing dwelling house into 1 x 3-bed dwelling house and 1 x studio flat with associated amenity space.

Officers introduced the report and provided a brief summary of the application. During the course of their presentation they verbally corrected the report as follows:

Page 92 last paragraph corrected to read 'no.94 is lower than no. 92' and Page 30, last paragraph delete 'as part of the consent'

It was also proposed that an informative relating to the Community Infrastructure Levy, be delegated to Officers as follows:

'You are advised that should the development be allowed at a subsequent appeal it would represent chargeable development under both the Mayor's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) (£35 per sq.m) and Hillingdon's CIL (£95 per sq.m). At this time is estimated that the liability would be £875 for Mayoral CIL and £2375 for Hillingdon CIL. The actual Community Infrastructure Levy would be calculated were your development to be permitted at appeal and a separate liability notice will be issued by the Local Planning Authority. Should you require further information please refer to the Council's Website www.hillingdon.gov.uk/index.jsp?articleid=24738'

Officers highlighted that since the agenda had been published, the Planning Department had received a further three written objections.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition in objection to the application addressed the meeting.

The petitioners made the following points:

- The proposal would divide a semi detached property and would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
- If the proposal was approved, it would set a dangerous precedent in the area.
- The sub division of the existing property would mean there would be insufficient local car parking and it would also increase the levels of on street parking.
- The proposal would mean there would be a loss of privacy to adjacent dwellings, and these occupants would be forced to sit against their fence lines to have any privacy outdoors.
- The proposal would have a detrimental effect on property prices locally.
- The proposal would be contrary to planning policies.

The agent made the following points:

- The car parking space would be situated on a plastic grid.

- The proposal would incorporate a bike space for the studio.
- Small flats were acceptable in special circumstances, and the Committee was asked to consider the proposal in these terms.
- The proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the area and was no different from a number of other garages which had been converted into accommodation locally.
- The agent agreed that the one of the windows was oversized and should be changed.
- The agent circulated amended plans for the proposal and asked the Committee to consider these at the meeting.
- The agent stated the amended plans which had been circulated at the meeting aimed to revise the internal layout of the proposal and thereby meet the Lifetime Homes standard.

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

- The ward Councillor confirmed that he supported the concerns raised by the petitioners in objection to the proposal.
- The proposal was too small and did not comply with Planning standards.

Before the Committee entered into general discussion, the Chairman sought legal advice on the amended plans which had been circulated by the agent. The Legal Officer advised the Committee not to consider the plans which had been circulated at the meeting and advised the Committee that it should only determine the application which had been included in the agenda papers.

Noting the petitioner's comments, the Committee agreed that property prices were not a material planning consideration. Discussing the proposal, the Committee agreed that owing to its small size, it would provide an inadequate and sub standard form of accommodation which would be harmful to the amenity of future occupiers. The Committee agreed that the proposal did not incorporate adequate off street parking provision for the existing and proposed development and its external appearance would not been in keeping with the character of the area.

The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.

Resolved -

That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer report, addendum and additional informative.

40. **PARK FARM, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 272/APP/2014/379** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Two storey, 2-bed, attaché dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.

Officers introduced the report and provided a brief summary of the main issues.

The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

	<p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be approved for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>
41.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</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>
42.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</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 meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.00 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on Democratic Services Officer 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.