

Minutes**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE****13 May 2015**Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW
HILLINGDON
LONDON

	MEMBERS PRESENT: Councillors: Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) Peter Curling (Labour Lead) Jem Duducu Duncan Flynn Carol Melvin John Morse John Oswell
	OFFICERS PRESENT: James Rodger - Head of Planning and Enforcement Adrien Waite - Major Applications Manager Syed Shah - Highways Engineer Tim Brown - Legal Officer Ainsley Gilbert - Democratic Services Officer
171.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>) Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Ray Graham. Councillor Brian Stead was present as his substitute.
172.	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>) Councillors John Morgan and Duncan Flynn declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 12 and 13, concerning the Woodman Public House in Eastcote.
173.	TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 24 MARCH 2015 AND 14 APRIL 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>) The minutes of the meetings held on 24 March and 14 April 2015 were agreed to be accurate.
174.	MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>) There were no such matters.

175.	<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>It was confirmed that items would be considered in public.</p>
176.	<p>GARAGES ADJACENT TO 29-33 DOLLIS CRESCENT, RUISLIP 45159/APP/2015/527 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the demolition of nine garages and their replacement with a two storey building to contain two two-bedroom flats. Four parking spaces would be provided, and one existing garage retained on site. The proposed flats would provide acceptable living accommodation, whilst the proposals were considered to fit into the street scene well. The impact on neighbouring properties was considered to be low. Officers drew attention to the addendum report, and explained that the application was recommended for approval by officers.</p> <p>Councillors were pleased that disused brownfield sites were being developed, to provide much needed housing.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report and subsequently amended by the addendum report.</p>
177.	<p>LAND AT JUNCTION OF FIELD END ROAD AND HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE 59310/APP/2015/767 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the replacement of a 17.5 metre telecommunications pole with one of 20 metres, the replacement of two cabinets, and the installation of one additional cabinet. This was considered to be unacceptable because of prominence of the proposed mast, and the additional street clutter which would be caused by the new structures. Officers drew the committee's attention to the informative regarding the siting of masts on Council owned land, contained within the addendum.</p> <p>Councillors agreed with the Eastcote Conservation Panel that the repositioning of the mast by a few metres to prevent a temporary loss of service was not acceptable.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be refused, for the reasons outlined in the officers report, with the informatives set out in the report and the addendum report.</p>

178.	<p>OPPOSITE RECREATION GROUND, MOORHALL ROAD, HAREFIELD 60622/APP/2015/1092 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the replacement of an 11.8 metre telecommunications pole with a 15 metre high pole. The site was very near to a conservation area and green belt land. The visual impact of the new pole and the additional cabinet supporting its operation was considered to be unacceptable.</p> <p>Councillors felt that the impact on the conservation area would be significant, and that the cumulative impact of cabinets was unacceptable.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be refused, for the reasons outlined in the officers report.</p>
179.	<p>18 PRIORY COTTAGES, HARVIL ROAD, HAREFIELD 2091/APP/2012/2706 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the retention of part of the existing decking. The decking was subject to enforcement action, and the proposal was for the removal of a small part of the decking in an attempt to make the structure acceptable. Officers considered however that the proposal did not go far enough and that the decking would still cause harm to neighbouring properties and be a dominant feature.</p> <p>Councillors were concerned that the proposal would still lead to overlooking and noted the large number of policies the proposal would breach.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be refused, for the reasons outlined in the officers report.</p>
180.	<p>27 HALFORD ROAD, ICKENHAM 16527/APP/2015/339 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the alteration and reconstruction of the front wall of the garage. The impact on the street scene was considered to be very limited. Officers drew the committee's attention to the addendum which sought to replace a condition.</p> <p>Councillors felt that the proposed frontage would be more aesthetic than the existing front wall.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p>

	<p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report and subsequently amended by the addendum report.</p>
181.	<p>FOOTPATH ADJACENT TO AUTOCENTRE, NORTHWOOD 67084/APP/2015/1227 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that the application was for the replacement of a 17.1 metre high telecommunications mast with one 0.4 metres taller, and the addition of a small ancillary cabinet. The pole was located in close proximity to a railway bridge which was the dominant feature of the street scene. Officers were therefore recommending that the application be approved.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report.</p>
182.	<p>THE WOODMAN PH, JOEL STREET, EASTCOTE, PINNER 19391/APP/2015/94 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced both the planning and listed building consent applications relating to The Woodman Public House, Eastcote. They explained that the unauthorised wooden lean-to would be demolished and replaced with a brick built extension. There had been a number of objections, many of which related to the operation of the public house. The conservation officer was content with the proposals, which they described as 'very small and discrete'. Officers explained that the addendum report for items 12 and 13 ought not to have included 'if necessary' at the end of the first paragraph of the officer comments.</p> <p>Councillors noted that the public house was now more commonly referred to as Arens Bar, but agreed that the proposals would represent an improvement to the site.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report, and subsequently amended by the addendum report.</p>
183.	<p>THE WOODMAN PH, JOEL STREET, EASTCOTE, PINNER 19391/APP/2015/95 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>This application was discussed along with agenda item 12.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p>

	<p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report, and subsequently amended by the addendum report.</p>
184.	<p>44 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP 137/APP/2015/613 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, explaining that application was for a change of use from class A1 to class D1, which would be restricted to use as a dental practice. There would not be any significant physical change, and so the issue was one of principle. Officers considered that there were an acceptable number of A1 units remaining in the town centre, and that a dental practice was suitable for a town centre location. Officers therefore recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>Councillors agreed that a dental practice would be a valuable community asset. They questioned whether dental products would also be sold from the unit, but this was not clear from the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report.</p>
185.	<p>HIGHWAYS VERGE 25M NORTH EAST OF AYLSHAM DRIVE, HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM 70746/APP/2015/1032 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report explaining that the application proposed a new 25 metre high telecommunications pole, four cabinets, and one slimline pillar. These would be located in front of a new development, and officers felt that that because of the height of the pole, which was the same height as some eight storey buildings, and because of the extra street clutter, the proposal would be visually obtrusive. They therefore recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be refused, for the reasons outlined in the officers report.</p>
186.	<p>148 SHARPS LANE, RUISLIP 17251/APP/2015/100 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the reports, explaining that the application was for a single storey side extension and a part single and part two storey rear extension. The side extension would replace the existing garage, whilst the rear extension was narrower at the first floor than on the ground floor. There would be little impact on the street scene, and the extension complied with all relevant policies. The proposal would not infringe unduly on neighbouring properties, which had themselves been extended. Officers drew the committee's attention to the addendum report. Officers</p>

	<p>recommended that the application be approved.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report, and subsequently amended by the addendum report. The formatting of the conditions and informatives was to be improved by officers before a decision notice was sent.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.40 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Ainsley Gilbert, Democratic Services Officer on agilbert@hillingdon.gov.uk 01895 556454250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.