

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

23 June 2015

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Edward Lavery Councillor John Morgan Councillor Peter Curling Councillor Jem Duducu Cllr Brian Stead Councillor Raymond Graham Councillor Carol Melvin Councillor John Morse Councillor John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning and Enforcement Meg Hirani, Planning Contract and Planning Information Manager Syed Shah, Principal Highways Engineer Sarah White, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p>	
14.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Duncan Flynn with Cllr Brian Stead substituting.</p>	
15.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
16.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 2 JUNE 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 2 June 2015 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
17.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Item 18 was considered in Part 2 as an urgent Enforcement item.</p>	

18.	<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 Public with the exception of Items 14 to 18 which were considered in Private.</p>	
19.	<p>29 BROADWOOD AVENUE, RUISLIP - 33999/APP/2015/465 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Part two storey, part single storey front extension, single storey rear extension and raising of and enlargement of roof to allow for additional habitable roofspace involving demolition of existing conservatory to rear.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>Officers explained that the proposed first floor and single storey front extensions, by virtue of their siting, size, scale and design, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the architectural composition, character and appearance of the existing building and the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition in support of the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The petitioner advised that the rear extension had already been approved. • Contrary to the officer report, the front elevation was not incongruous with the local area. • The local area contained a diverse range of architectural styles and many properties had been extended and redeveloped over the years. • The proposal would not affect the residential amenity of neighbours. • A number of local residents had signed the petition in support of the application. • The proposed extension would not protrude over the building line. • The proposal would enhance the character of the dwelling. • The proposal was subordinate to the original design. <p>A number of photographs were circulated by the petitioner to underline the character of the area and the designs of the buildings therein.</p>	Action by

	<p>Noting these photographs, the Committee agreed that number 31 Broadwood Avenue was very similar in design to the proposal at 29 Broadwood Avenue. On the basis of these photographs, the Committee agreed that there were not grounds to refuse the application.</p> <p>After due consideration of the petitioners' points as well as the photographs, the Committee agreed that the Officer recommendation for refusal should be overturned and the application be approved.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, agreed with 5 votes in favour, with three against, that the officer recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application approved.</p> <p>Resolved - That the officer recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application be approved. Conditions to be agreed by Chairman and Labour Lead.</p>	
20.	<p>198 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE - 12955/APP/2015/1143 <i>(Agenda Item 7)</i></p> <p>Change of use from A1 to sui generis to be used as hairdresser & beauty salon.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor attended and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application was supported by the Eastcote Chamber of Commerce. • The secondary shopping area was non-existent. • The application would ensure that the premises were used in the day time. • If the approval were not granted it would force the applicant to close their shop. <p>Discussing the Officer recommendation for refusal, the Committee noted that this had been suggested on a technicality. The Committee agreed that where possible, it should encourage local business and support the idea of thriving town centres. Examining the intention of the application, the Committee noted that a successful application would attract local people to the area, encourage the daytime use of the site as well as provided valuable local employment.</p> <p>Concluding its consideration of the application, the Committee agreed that empty shop syndrome should be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote unanimously agreed that the Officer recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Officer recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application be approved. Conditions to be</p>	Action by

	delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.	
21.	<p>168 WHITBY ROAD, RUISLIP - 38420/APP/2015/1148 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>First floor side extension.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote unanimously agreed that the Officer recommendation for approval be agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the Officer recommendation for approval be agreed.</p>	Action by
22.	<p>33 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 4811/APP/2015/438 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission 4811/APP/2014/1254 (Variation of conditions 2 and 4 of application 4811/APP/2012/1906 -'Demolition of Existing Dwelling and the Erection of a Two Storey Five-bedroom dwelling with habitable roof space and basement to allow for the insertion of additional obscure glazed windows in the flank elevations of the approved dwelling') to allow for the insertion of a door in the flank wall, dormer windows in the front and rear elevations and retrospective consent for the enlargement of the south elevation (adj No. 31) by 0.4m. [amendment is for the inclusion of the alterations to the south elevation].</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>Officers explained the application sought consent for alterations to the approved scheme, to allow for the addition of 3 dormer windows, insertion of a door at ground floor level in the southern elevation and retrospective consent for the enlargement of the southern elevation by 0.4 metres.</p> <p>The proposed dormers and door by reason of their acceptable design, size, scale and siting, were not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building or to have an adverse impact on the amenities of the adjacent occupiers. However, Officers explained that they did have concerns with the enlargement of the southern elevation of the building, which by reason of its size, scale, height and siting, was considered to appear unduly overbearing and visually intrusive to No. 31, and excessive in scale when viewed in the context of the building and surrounding area.</p> <p>Summarising the reasons for refusal, Officers confirmed that the scheme failed to comply with the Councils policies and guidance. Having considered the officer presentation and had regard to site plans and photographs and the Committee agreed with grounds for refusal set out in the Officer report.</p>	Action by

	<p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</p>	
23.	<p>33 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 4811/APP/2015/715 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a detached outbuilding to be used as a pool house and a summerhouse and the provision of a swimming pool.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated.</p> <p>The main issues for consideration in determining the application relate to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area including the adjoining Green Belt, the impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, provision of acceptable residential amenity for the application property and the availability of parking.</p> <p>The scale and bulk of the proposed pool building and summerhouse would appear subordinate in scale to the main house. As a result it is considered that it would not have a negative impact upon the visual amenity of the site</p> <p>The building should leave a significant amount of garden space for the residents to enjoy. In relation to the swimming pool it is considered that as it has no enclosure around and over it, it could be constructed under permitted development rights and therefore no objection is raised in this regard.</p> <p>The proposed outbuilding would not be seen from any public vantage points and given the tall vegetation along the common boundaries with Nos. 31 and 33A it is considered that there would be no loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p>	Action by
24.	<p>33 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 4811/APP/2015/1113 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Detached garage to front.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and referred members to the addendum sheet that had been circulated. Having considered the Officer presentation, the Committee agreed that the proposed development, by reason of its siting, size, scale, bulk and height would represent a visually dominant form of development which would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the existing building, the visual amenity of the street scene and the character and appearance of the locality</p>	Action by

	<p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</p>	
25.	<p>LAND NORTH OF CARLTON PLACE, RICKMANSWORTH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 67584/APP/2015/1028 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Installation of shipping container, lean to barn, 2 x loose boxes and 2 x garden shed for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p>	Action by
26.	<p>THE WHITE BEAR PH, ICKENHAM ROAD, RUISLIP - 7263/APP/2015/528 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition 7 (Dining Terrace) of planning permission ref: 7263/APP/2014/3825, dated 28-01-2015 (Proposed increase in height of single storey addition on side/rear elevations of the building, installation of glazed entrance lobby, replacement of kitchen extract system, alterations to openings on the rear facade and entrance to the premises, alterations to the external seating areas to the front and rear and associated landscaping and internal alterations) to amend hours of use of the dining terrace.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined details of the application.</p> <p>The Committee heard that the applicant sought to vary condition 7 in order to amend the hours of use of the dining terrace at the rear of the Public House to allow for staff to clear up between 22:00 and 22:30. It was noted that customer use of the rear dining terrace would finish at 22:00, as per the original wording of the condition.</p> <p>Officers considered that amending the hours of use of the rear dining terrace to allow an extra half hour for staff to clear up would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the site and the surrounding area or on the residential amenity of adjoining occupants.</p> <p>The application is therefore recommended for approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</p>	Action by

27.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action 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>	Action by
28.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action 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>	Action by
29.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action 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</i></p>	Action by

	<i>the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i>	
30.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 17)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action 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>	Action by
31.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 18)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action 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>	Action by
The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.17 pm.		

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 is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.