Public Document Pack

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

27 August 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), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Morse, Jas Dhot and David Yarrow **LBH Officers Present**: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, Syed Shah, Highway Engineer, Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager, Tim Brown, Legal Advisor Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer.
43.	**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** *(Agenda Item 1)* There were no apologies for absence.
44.	**DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING** *(Agenda Item 2)* None.
45.	**MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT** *(Agenda Item 3)* None.
46.	**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 4)* All items were considered in Part I, with the exception of items 9, 10 and 11 which were considered in Part II.
47.	**LAND FORMING PART OF 147 CORNWALL ROAD, RUISLIP 70023/APP/2014/1815** *(Agenda Item 5)* 1 x two storey attached 2-bed dwelling with habitable roof space and 1 x two storey detached 2-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of vehicular crossover to side. Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. Members agreed that the proposals would result in the unacceptable loss of garden space, and result in buildings and structure which were detrimental to the character

	and appearance of the area. Inadequate amenity space would be provided for future occupiers and one of the proposed buildings would have an unacceptable relationship with the other. The proposed vehicular crossover raised highways safety concerns and the proposal would result in the loss of a tree which had a positive impact on the amenity of the area. In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the agent addressed the meeting. The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points: • The property was situated on the corner of a junction. • The garden was situated in Rosebury Avenue. • There was confusion as to why the property had an address of Cornwall Road when most of the proposals were situated within Rosebury Vale. • Existing residents had lived in Rosebury Vale for a number of years. • There would be limited garden space. • There would be a loss of parking. • There would be loss of privacy for the 4 residents in close proximity. • The proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding area. • There would not be enough room on the footway for residents with mobility scooters. A representative of the applicant was not in attendance. Members agreed that the proposal was an over development which was not acceptable. 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 and addendum.**
48.	**JOEL STREET FARM, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 8856/APP/2013/3802** *(Agenda Item 6)* Demolition of the existing Dutch barn and erection of a replacement building to be used as a Class D1 (nursery), demolition of existing detached stables, alterations to existing buildings and associated parking and landscaping (resubmission). Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. The application related to Joel Street Farm in Northwood, which comprised a complex of locally listed buildings within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The buildings were currently used for a variety of purposes including a veterinary clinic, cattery and offices. Members were informed that an earlier proposal was refused and that since this time the applicant had been engaging in a significant level of pre-application discussions

with Council officers in particular the Council's Conservation Team.

In terms of principle the proposed development represents the partial redevelopment of a previously developed site within the Green Belt. It was not considered overall that the scheme would have any adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the existing situation and accordingly the development was appropriate in this respect.

With regard to highways matter, the Council's Highways Engineer was satisfied that adequate parking was provided subject to a travel plan and measures to ensure staggered drop off which were secured by a legal agreement.

In terms of conservation the application had been subject to extensive discussions with the Council's Conservation Team who considered the proposal was acceptable with regard to the locally listed building. It was also noted that securing a viable use on site was likely to be beneficial to the long term maintenance of the locally listed buildings.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the agent addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- The existing floor plan was incorrect and was half the size.
- The internal layout of the Day Nursery showed that the kitchen area was still near to the toilets, and was open plan.
- There did not appear to be required hygiene standards for preparing food and milk for babies and young children.
- It would not be safe with toddlers walking through the kitchen area.
- There were very strong grounds for a proper Health and Safety review to be undertaken which did not appear to have been requested by the Officer.
- The conditions for the cattery, previous application, were that the lack of access to water and a place to clean litter trays was not acceptable.
- Before any determination was made the Health & Safety Team must be consulted.
- The application stated that the nursery would take 45 children, requiring approx 117 m2 of floor space, the actual floor space available was 251m2.
- There was concern that the nursery would apply to increase the numbers of children thus adding more vehicle trips to the site.
- None of the toilets appeared to be suitable for wheelchair users, this should be amended.
- Joel Street was a very busy main distributor route. The Traffic survey stated that there was a Bus Stop outside the Farm, but there was no controlled pedestrian crossing for parents crossing to the Nursery.
- A pram store had not been provided.
- A recent Sustrans survey of the area, Joel Street was considered unacceptable for cycling.
- The majority of parents will attend the nursery by car.
- 150 Joel Street, almost opposite the application site would be opening soon as a Day Nursery with 38 children attending each day; this had not been considered within the traffic report.
- The number of trips generated by other users of the site had not been taken into

	account; the nursery had been taken in isolation. • This was an insidious eating away at Green Belt land and should be stopped. A representative of the applicant raised the following points: • The appearance of the area would be improved. • Concerns regarding parking and traffic were considered to acceptable. • Proposed nursery would not be detrimental. Members discussed the petitioners concerns and decided that it would be more appropriate to defer the application for a site visit so that Members could view the site before making a decision. It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit and for further details to be provided. **Resolved- That the application be deferred for a site visit and for further details to be provided.**
49.	**40 COOMBE DRIVE, RUISLIP 17682/APP/2014/456** *(Agenda Item 7)* Single storey side/rear extension, part two storey side extension and part two storey rear extension to allow for conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 2- bed self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space. Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application. Members noted that the proposal would have an unacceptable appearance in respect of the street scene and the appearance of the original building. Further it would provide unsatisfactory living conditions for future occupants and inadequate on-site parking provision. 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.**
50.	**GEORGES YARD, SPRINGWELL LANE, HAREFIELD 2078/APP/2014/1582** *(Agenda Item 8)* Erection of 2 agricultural buildings. Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. Members noted that the use of the buildings was appropriate with the Green Belt and they had been sensitively sited to reduce their impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, surrounding residential occupiers would not be adversely affected by the proposals and an area of tree planting would assist with screening the structures. The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

	Resolved - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.
51.	**ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 9)* **Resolved -** **1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report were agreed.** **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.**
52.	**ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 10)* **Resolved -** **1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report were agreed.** **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.**
53.	**ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 11)* **Resolved -** **1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report were agreed.** **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 meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.00 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the 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.

This page is intentionally left blank