

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

2 June 2015

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, John Morse and John Oswell, Brian Stead and David Yarrow</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger, Head of Planning and Enforcement, Meg Hirani, Planning Service Manager, Syed Shah, Highway Engineer, Tim Brown, Legal advisor, Danielle Watson, Democratic Services Officer.</p>
3.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Carol Melvin and Cllr Raymond Graham with Cllr David Yarrow and Cllr Brian Stead substituting.</p>
4.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
5.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 13 MAY AND 14 MAY 2015</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 13 and 14 May 2015 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
6.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman informed Members that Item 7, 54 Pembroke Road, Ruislip had been withdrawn from the agenda as requested by the applicant.</p>
7.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be considered in Part 1 public.</p>
8.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 26A WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP - 67242/APP/2015/188</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey, 2-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached garage.</b></p>

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

The proposal was for the erection of a detached two bed dwelling within the rear garden of No.26a Windmill Hill that ran adjacent to the highway. The new dwelling would be sited next to the neighbouring property at No.26 Windmill Hill and would be in the form of a chalet style bungalow.

It was considered that the principle of one new house on this site was acceptable, and that the proposed building and use would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, nor the amenities of nearby residents. Parking and highway safety matters and the protection of trees were also satisfactory. The application complied with the Council's planning policies and was therefore recommended for approval, subject to appropriate conditions.

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

The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:

- The proposals were next door to the petitioner's garden.
- A tree with a Tree Protection Order was on the boundary of the application.
- This was the 3<sup>rd</sup> application that had been submitted and the previous 2 applications had been refused.
- The present application runs parallel with Windmill Hill.
- The previous applications were notably smaller in size whilst the 3<sup>rd</sup> application was 62sq/m.
- Developer at 28a sets a precedent, as it was built in the 1980's.
- There would be pressure from future occupiers.
- The proposals were contrary to policy BE38 policy.
- There could potentially be disputes with future neighbours.
- The tree on the boundary could grow up to 100ft.
- The proposal was situated near a elongated roundabout.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- Follows two previously refused applications.
- The application had been designed in accordance with the London Plan and Council standards.
- The inspectors concern was that the proposal should have a wider frontage.
- The proposal was an acceptable form of development.
- The case officer agreed with the amended design.
- Supported the officer's recommendation.

Members discussed the application and believed the proposals conflicted with the Council's policy in relation to back land garden grabbing. The Legal advisor present stated that it was right to support the Council's policy, however, following the Planning Inspectors decision the Council had limited reasons for refusal.

Members were concerned about the tree and noted that the Tree Officer had reservations regarding its close position to the proposed property. Officers informed Members that the current proposal was not any closer than the previous two applications.

	<p>Members discussed the petitioners concerns and decided that it would be more appropriate to defer the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for further details to be provided.</p> <p><b>Resolved- That the application be deferred for further details to be provided.</b></p>
9.	<p><b>54 PEMBROKE ROAD, RUISLIP - 10793/APP/2015/476</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn from the agenda at the request of the applicant.</p>
10.	<p><b>12 COLCHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 70151/APP/2015/980</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>2 x two storey, 2-bed semi detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front involving demolition of existing detached bungalow.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>Members noted that there had been 9 letters of objection and a petition received against the application.</p> <p>Members noted that the proposed dwellings were not acceptable in design terms and would result in an incongruous addition to the street scene. The proposal would also have a dominant and overbearing impact on the adjacent bungalow. Additionally the positioning of the proposed crossover was unacceptable and would be detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposals addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was speaking on behalf of petitioners.</li> <li>• Northwood Residents Association objected to the proposals.</li> <li>• This application conflicted with the Council's garden grabbing policy.</li> <li>• The current bungalow was habitable.</li> <li>• The property was situated on a proposed incline.</li> <li>• The property would be overbearing on properties situated on both York Road and Colchester Road.</li> <li>• The property would be intrusive.</li> <li>• There was already a limited amount of off-street parking available which would be exasperated further if 2, 2 storey dwellings were approved.</li> </ul> <p>A representative of the applicant raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The process had started in July 2014.</li> <li>• There had been a pre-application submission which indicated that it was possible and practical for the proposals to be carried out.</li> <li>• Based on positive feedback from the pre-application an application was made.</li> </ul>

- They had a number of case officers throughout the process.
- There had been a number of delays.
- Withdrawn the previous application and submitted a revised application.
- There were previously 3 car parking spaces proposed and now there were only 2.
- The shape of the roof was changed so that it was not too daunting.
- The source of light for the property opposite would not be affected.

The applicant informed Members that it was their understanding that the tree could be preserved, although perhaps more investigation could be carried out to be certain.

The Chairman reminded the Committee that a decision would need to be based on information contained in the officers' report. Members agreed that the proposals were overbearing and that the site photos did not show how intrusive the proposal would be on neighbouring properties. The Chairman highlighted size, bulk, the position of the crossover and its impact on highway and pedestrian safety and insufficient information regarding the impact of the proposed crossover as reasons for refusal. Members agreed that the wording for the reasons for refusal to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.

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.**

11. **18 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 33211/APP/2015/1061** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, two storey front extension, first floor side extensions, raising of roof to allow conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 2 front dormers, 4 side roof lights, conversion of garage to habitable use involving raising of roof of garage alterations to front and rear elevations including new boundary wall to front.**

Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.

The scheme proposed a part-two storey, part single storey rear extension. The part single storey and two storey side extension had been omitted from the previously refused scheme.

The two storey rear extension would reflect the design of the existing two storey rear element with two pitched roofs. There are no new windows proposed in the side elevations. The eaves would follow the lines of the existing dwelling. The proposal comprised two additional bedrooms resulting in a total of five bedrooms for this property and a living room and dining room on the ground floor. A 2.5m deep patio was proposed to the rear of the property. The materials would match the existing house with a sand cement render finish.

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

12.	<p><b>UXBRIDGE SKIP - 49984/APP/2014/3806 (Agenda Item 10)</b></p> <p><b>Changes to open storage areas associated with existing non-hazardous waste treatment and transfer facility including 2 x replacement trommels and waste picking stations, new baler, boundary treatment and landscaping involving replacement of workshop building following demolition of existing workshop building.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>This application sought consent for both proposed and retrospective changes to the open storage areas associated with existing non-hazardous waste treatment and transfer facility. Retrospective consent was sought for the replacement of two trommels, waste picking stations and a new baler. Planning permission was also sought for new boundary treatment and landscaping involving the replacement of a workshop building following demolition of existing workshop building.</p> <p>It was considered that in this case, very special circumstances existed to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The site had an established use and the proposal would involve incorporating a narrow strip of embankment into the active use, to facilitate the introduction of modern and efficient equipment and reorganisation of the site. This would reduce the sites visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt, without leading to an increase in vehicle movements.</p> <p>The proposal involved significant environmental benefits including a reduction in noise and dust levels associated with the existing waste recycling facility and proposed improved landscaping and boundary treatment adjoining Uxbridge golf club.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that 'living walls' be removed from condition 4 and be added to condition 5. Additionally Members agreed for the wording to be delegated authority to be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>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. Also delegated to the Head of Planning authority to change wording of conditions if required, on the advice of the Council's Solicitor.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.57pm.</p>

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.