Minutes
NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6TH OCTOBER 2009

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Come into effect on: Immediately

	Members Present: Councillors Allan Kauffman, John Hensley, Janet Duncan, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, John Oswell and David Payne **Advisory Members / Co-optee Members present:** Ms Lesley Crowcroft - Eastcote Residents Association and Eastcote Village Conservation Area Advisory Panel. **Apologies for Absence** Apologies had been received from Councillor Eddie Lavery with Councillor John Hensley substituting and Councillor Anita MacDonald with Councillor Janet Duncan substituting **Officers Present:** Nigel Bryce, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah White and Charles Francis
	Declarations of Interest Councillor Markham declared a personal interest in Item 12 and left the room for this Item. Councillor Melvin declared a personal interest in Item 13 and left the room for this Item. Councillor Payne declared a personal interest in Items 7 and 9 and left the room for these Items.
	To confirm that the items of business marked Part I will be considered in Public and that the items marked Part 2 will be considered in private It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public except item 15 which was considered in private.
	Consideration of Reports: Reports were considered as set out below:

6.	**SOUTHBOURNE DAY CENTRE, 161 ELLIOTT AVENUE, RUISLIP** **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).** **66033/APP/2009/1060** The officer in his presentation advised members that amended information had been circulated as there had been some amendments made since the report had been published. In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting. A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners and a number of issues were raised. These included the bulk and size of the proposed development and the amount private amenity space. Concerns were raised in relation to access/egress and traffic congestion given the close proximity of a Doctors Surgery and Dance School to the proposed development. Further concerns were raised about the lack of comments from Thames Water in relation to drainage and sewage. The Ward Councillor also referred to a questionnaire which had been circulated to local residents (and then collected an hour later). It was reported the questionnaire had indicated the majority of respondents were opposed to the development and 66 letters of objection had been received. The Committee also raised concerns about the historic community use of the site. The Committee requested further information on alternative community uses and enquired whether any attempts had been made by the applicants to secure a community use for the site. **Resolved – That the application be Deferred - to enable more information to be submitted by the applicant on alternative community uses that could be provided for on site and on any attempts that have been made by the applicants to secure a community use for the site.**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

7.	**LAND AT REAR AND FORMING PART OF 63, 65 AND 67 LOWLANDS ROAD, EASTCOTE** **Two storey, detached four-bedroom dwelling with habitable roofspace with associated parking and new vehicular crossover** **56032/APP/2009/967** The officer in his presentation advised members that amended information had been circulated and there had been a further letter received in objection to the proposal on the grounds of loss of light to the garden, over dominant design, the position of the property not being sited 1 metre from the boundary of 63, 65 and 67 Lowlands Road and the distance of the dwelling from the adjoining gardens not being 15 metres. With the agreement of the Chairman, a Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting to the proposal (before the petitioner spoke). The original proposal was for two, 5 bedroom houses which had now been revised to a single 4 bedroom house. The proposal has a poor layout and appearance and will not harmonise with the area. In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting. Members raised a number of concerns including the size and bulk of the development, the difficulty in comparing its height to adjacent dwellings from the available plans and the size of the crossover. A Member also highlighted that part of the red line site was not in the applicant's ownership. In response, the Legal Officer explained that anyone can put in an application for planning permission provided the correct notification (service of notice) is undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the General Development Procedure Order 1995. Officers checked and confirmed that the correct part of the application form had been completed. A member suggested that as there were a number of concerns raised that the application be deferred for a site visit. It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit and for further plans to be produced showing the height of the proposed building in the context of existing buildings and the size of the cross over to be revised. On being put to the vote deferment was agreed.	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

	Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable a site visit to take place and also for officer's to produce further plans showing the height of the proposed building in the context of existing buildings and the size of the crossover to be revised.	
8.	**37 FRITHWOOD AVENUE, NORTHWOOD** **Two storey building comprising of 5 two-bedroom flats with associated parking in basement and habitable roofspace, involving demolition of the existing house (Outline application for approval of access, appearance, layout and scale).** **29009/APP/2009/1182** In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting. A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting to the proposal. The current proposal is only slightly modified from the previous application. The proposal has a poor layout and appearance and will cause significant overlooking of adjacent properties. Members raised a number of issues including vehicular access/egress to the site, the difficulty in discerning the levels of the proposed site from the available plans and the degree of overlooking created by a sloped application site. Members also referred to the ground floor and first floor plans and the amount of sunlight available to the study and bedroom 2. Officers confirmed that there would be sunlight issues to these rooms and room lights would need to be on at all times, which would be contrary to sustainable development plans. The Committee asked for an additional condition to be added to include the impact of the front projection of the development on the rooms (identified above) within the development In answer to an issue raised in relation to fenestration, members were informed that the application meets all the Council's guidelines and complies with 45° line **Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officers report and adding the condition for refusal as detailed below:**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

	The applicant has failed to demonstrate in terms of a daylight/sunlight assessment that the study rooms in plots 1 and 3 and 2nd bedrooms in plots 2 and 4 will be provided with appropriate levels of sunlight/daylight to service these rooms. In addition, the proposed development by reason of its design and layout would fail to provide adequate outlook to these rooms. As such, the development would provide an inadequate living environment for future occupiers, contrary to London Plan Policy 4.A3, Policies BE20 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS: Residential Layouts.	
9.	**TEXACO, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE** **Retention of internally illuminated free-standing totem sign** **3689/APP/2009/40** In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the Eastcote Conservation Panel objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting as the application was located in a Conservation Area. It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed that the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the report. **Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani
10.	**35 BUSHEY ROAD, ICKENHAM** **Single storey side/rear extension including reduction in height of roof and 1 rear and 1 side rooflight (Part retrospective application)** **48449/AAAPP/A2009/793** It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed that the application be Approved subject to the conditions set out in the report. **Resolved – That the application be Approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and to request the Enforcement Team monitor the work**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

11.	**42 LAWRENCE DRIVE, ICKENHAM** **Single storey rear extension with roof lantern** **23057/APP/2009/1053** The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. To amend Condition 4 to read as follows: *'The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area'.* **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 and change to condition 4 as detailed above.**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani
12.	**76 PARK WAY & 59-61 WINDMILL HILL** **Change of use of 61 Windmill Hill and 76 Park Way from Class A1 (Retail) to Class A3 (Restaurants and Cafes), with new shopfronts and alterations to existing shopfront at 59 Windmill Hill** **16366/APP/2009/1873** Members raised a concern about food preparation and the impact this might have on air quality. Officers advised that as no new cooking facilities were proposed the extended restaurant would utilise the existing flue and ventilation equipment serving the existing restaurant. The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the conditions in the report and addendum sheet and as amended: To the drawing numbers, replace drawing numbers. 04 and 06 with 04 Revised. A and 06 Revised. A and add Drawing. Number. 07 received 2nd October 2009. To add additional condition 7: '*Prior to the commencement of works on site, full details of the provision to be made for the secure and covered storage of refuse and recycling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided on site prior to the premises being brought into use and thereafter maintained.*	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

	To add additional informative (28) Food hygiene Add additional informative '*You are advised that this permission only allows the change of use of the premises to Class A3 restaurant use. Use which includes an A5 takeaway use would require further permission.'* **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.**	
13.	**41 GREEN LANE, NORTHWOOD** **12112/APP/2009/1591** **Change of use of basement and ground floor from Class A1 Retail to Class A3/A4 Restaurants/Cafes and Drinking Establishments, to include new door and ventilation duct to rear** A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and raised a number of issues in relation to the report including the widespread support from all the Ward Councillors for the application, the vacancy rates on the High Street and the comments received from various consultation bodies. Members discussed the historic use of the site and the vacancy rates on the High Street. Officers advised that the vacancy rate information contained in the report was based on survey data from July 2009 and it would be unlikely that updated information would change the officer recommendation. Members agreed that vacant shop premises are detrimental and would be contrary to Hillingdon's policies. It was noted that the application was very similar to agenda Item 12 and a Member suggested that approving this application would be in the best interests of the local community. **Resolved – That the Recommendation be overturned and application Approved and for Conditions to be retuned and agreed by committee.**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

14.	**PAUL STRIKLAND CANCER CENTRE. MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL** **Extension of existing fencing and new access gate** **63630/APP/2009/1291** 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.**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani
15.	**ENFORCEMENT REPORT** The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. **Resolved –** **1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.** **2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.**	**Action By:** James Rodger Meg Hirani

The meeting closed at 9.35 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 are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.