

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

19<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2009

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Published on:

Come into effect on: Immediately



<b>1.</b>	<p><b>Members Present:</b></p> <p>Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Payne John Oswell Dave Allam</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b></p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Anita MacDonald with Councillor Dave Allam substituting.</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b></p> <p>Jales Tippell, Meg Hirani, Manmohan Ranger, Sarah White and Gill Brice.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Declarations of Interest:</b></p> <p>Councillor David Payne declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Items 8 and 9 and left the room whilst these items were discussed.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Minutes:</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 6 and 27 October were agreed and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.</p>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Exclusion of the Press and Public:</b></p> <p>It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Consideration of Reports:</b></p> <p>Reports were considered as set out below:</p>

<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>ROYAL QUAY, COPPERMILL LOCK, HAREFIELD</b></p> <p><b>Residential development of 95 residential units in 8 buildings of two to four storeys, with decked and surface car parking for apartments and existing offices, associated landscaping, access alterations and footbridge across canal basin.</b></p> <p><b>43159/APP/2009/711</b></p> <p><b>This application was withdrawn from the agenda by the Corporate Director of Planning and Transportation.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell Meg Hirani</b></p>
<p><b>7</b></p>	<p><b>YEADING BROOK BETWEEN TORCROSS ROAD &amp; WHITBY ROAD, RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Shared use cycle/footbridge over Yeading Brook (River Crane), as part of the proposed cycle track between Whitby Road and Queens Walk, Ruislip.</b></p> <p><b>66331/APP/2009/1968</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of 2 petitions received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents had been misled on this application</li> <li>• The proposal would be out of character with the rural character of the area</li> <li>• CCTV and lighting would be intrusive and impact on residents privacy</li> <li>• There would be an increase in noise, anti social behaviour and vandalism in the area and the bridge would provide an additional means of escape</li> <li>• Proposed barriers would stop access for people with disabilities</li> <li>• access to garage at property in Whitby Road would be further restricted</li> <li>• the proposed cycle track would be over private land</li> <li>• concerns in relation to the safety of cyclist and pedestrians sharing the same path</li> <li>• it would make life safer for residents if the bridge did not go ahead</li> <li>• Safer options had not been considered.</li> <li>• Both Whitby Road and Torcross Road quite residential streets.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell Meg Hirani</b></p>

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:

- Yeading Brook unspoilt Green Chain land
- Open space separated by Torcross Road and Whitby Road
- Youths already gather in this area and the installation of the bridge will increase the anti social behaviour that already occurs in this area.
- Safer Neighbourhood Team is aware of the anti social behaviour that takes place in this area.
- Residents fears in relation to increased anti social behaviour have not been addressed
- This council puts Hillingdon residents first, but residents concerns have not been given due consideration in relation to this application
- Members were asked to carefully consider the application and have regard to the residents concerns

Members felt that after listening to the concerns it was felt that before a decision could be made further information needed to be provided on the design of the bridge, barriers to be used and the effect of the lighting and CCTV on the area. The Safer Neighbourhood Teams views and further views from the Crime Prevention Officer should also be sought. Members also asked for further information on the suggested alternative routes.

Officers advised members that the construction of the footpath did not form part of this application as it was permitted development. Members were only considering the installation of the bridge.

Concerns were raised in relation to the use of the bridge by people with disabilities and how access by motorbikes would be prohibited.

Officers advised members that a condition had been attached for details of the arrangements for disabled access and prohibition of motorbikes needed to be provided before the bridge was built.

Members still had concerns about the application and it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable further information to be sought from the Crime Prevention Office and the Safer Neighbourhood Team to be consulted. Details of the design of the bridge were also to be provided. On being put to the vote deferment was agreed.

**Resolved – That the application be Deferred to enable further information to be provided.**

<p>8</p>	<p><b>LAND REAR OF 114, 116 &amp; 118 ABBOTSBURY GARDENS, EASTCOTE</b></p> <p><b>Single storey detached two-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and new vehicular crossover, involving demolition of an existing garage</b></p> <p><b>66232/APP/2009/1711</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking away 3 gardens was out of character</li> <li>• Concerns in relation to the obscure glazing to Abbotsbury Gardens</li> <li>• Amenity space to 114 Abbotsbury Gardens would be overlooked and any amount of landscaping would not make this private</li> <li>• Parking spaces inadequate width</li> <li>• Size of front room would not allow for wheelchair users to manoeuvre adequately</li> <li>• Driveway shorter than other properties in the area</li> <li>• Roof steep and would be out of keeping with the surrounding area</li> <li>• This is a corner plot and would not be part of any one road therefore would be out of character</li> <li>• Out of keeping with the Dene Estate as other properties have large gardens, which is a feature of the estate.</li> </ul> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is one of the worst applications seen except for the next item on the agenda</li> <li>• The proposal if allowed would destroy the unique nature of the Dene Estate</li> <li>• Application fails on the following 3 counts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Poor quality and appearance – contrary to Policy BE13</li> <li>➤ Fails to complement or enhance the character of the area – BE19</li> <li>➤ This is a backland development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Reminded members of the motion agreed at the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>
----------	--	--

	<p>Council meeting held on 5 November in relation to the London Plan, which was agreed unanimously</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to meet the minimum floor space required for wheelchair accessible dwellings</li> </ul> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the parking provided officers advised that the Lifetime Homes Standard stated that as long as it could be demonstrated that wheelchair access could be provided a proposal was acceptable. In this case the parking as provided is adequate.</p> <p>A member raised concerns in relation to the land grab of 3 gardens and the proposal backs onto two different roads. The extent of the back garden is inappropriate, out of character with the area, there are concerns over the shape of the roof, and would cause additional parking problems in the area. I am unable to support this application.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to policies in relation to backland development officers advised that the policies are outlined in the report and are a matter of interpretation. In relation to this application the policies are met and the recommendation for approval has been made accordingly.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote there were 4 in favour of approval and 2 against the application was therefore approved.</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.</b></p>	
9	<p><b>LAND AT REAR AND FORMING PART OF 63, 65 AND 67 LOWLANDS ROAD, EASTCOTE</b></p> <p><b>Two storey, detached four-bedroom dwelling with habitable roofspace with associated parking and new vehicular crossover</b></p> <p><b>56032/APP/2009/967</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Last meeting raised a number of issues that had now been dealt with</li> <li>• Unhappy with the response provided on levels as the</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>

- information had not been provided by a professional
- Proposed dwelling would be higher than existing properties
  - The proposed house was still the size of a pair of semi detached houses, it had not been reduced by a great deal, consideration had not been taken of the Design Guide – Residential Layouts.
  - No tree survey carried out in Abbotsbury Gardens, which would be affected by this development
  - The proposed house is too large, out of keeping with the surrounding area
  - The proposal does not meet the concerns of the Inspector who dismissed a previous appeal
  - The proposal takes away rear gardens and the amenity from existing residential properties
  - Any new development must compliment or improve the area; this application does not do that.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raised the following points:

- Previous applications had all been refused and dismissed on appeal
- The last 4 applications had all been similar and the planning department should not have been accepted
- The residents and petitioners objecting to the numerous applications on this site had been caused undue stress
- The application fails on three policies BE13, 19 and H12
- Referred members to the motion agreed at the Council meeting held on 5 November 2009 as highlighted on the previous application.
- This is an unsuitable site with the loss of 3 gardens
- Appearance of the proposed dwelling does not harmonise with the existing street scene
- The proposal fails to compliment the amenity and character of the area detrimental to the street scene
- If allowed this would be the only building wholly in the rear gardens of other properties, hence a backland development.

In response to an issue raised in relation to the site levels members were informed that the applicant had provided a professional independent survey on the levels.

Members still had concerns in relation to the proposed dwelling being too large for the site, but if the application was refused and the applicant appealed, some of the conditions in the officer report may be lost.

	<p>Officers in answer to an issue raised in relation to clarification of policies BE13, BE19 and H12, members were advised that this information was contained on pages 101 and 102 of the officer's report.</p> <p>A member reported that if the committee were minded to refuse the application, as stated previously it would be a gamble as to whether all the conditions listed in the officer's report would be attached by an Inspector.</p> <p>Officer's advised that If members are minded to refuse the application there needed to be clear robust planning reasons, as the principal of the development on this land had been established.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor added that if the application was refused without robust reasons and was allowed on appeal there may be a danger of costs being awarded against the Council.</p> <p>After considering all the concerns it was moved and seconded that the application be refused on grounds of size, bulk and overdevelopment. The Chairman and Labour Lead to agree the wording for the reasons for refusal. On being put to the vote refusal was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reasons:-</b></p> <p><b>The proposed development by reason of its size and bulk would be out of keeping with the surrounding area, creating an out of scale and visually overdominant form of development detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the locality and street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.</b></p>	
10	<p><b>33 PARKFIELD ROAD ICKENHAM</b></p> <p><b>Single storey brick outbuilding to rear for use as shed.</b></p> <p><b>40891/APP/2009/1338</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners received objecting to the proposal and the applicant addressed the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Had lived in the area for 27 years</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not against the principle of a shed but the proposal is unacceptable</li> <li>• Object to height and location of proposed shed only 20 centimetres lower than a double Decker bus</li> <li>• If allowed would set a precedent</li> <li>• Proposal would not complement or improve the character of the area</li> <li>• Concerns about the future use of the shed as it has a toilet and sink.</li> </ul> <p>Points raised by the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shed formed part of original application for erection of a house at the site but was removed to uncomplimented the planning process.</li> <li>• Applicants are keen gardeners and liked to keep garden tools neat and tidy in one place.</li> <li>• Having a toilet and sink in the shed would mean not having to go into the house when in the garden and would have no impact on the neighbours.</li> <li>• There would be only 2 people using the dwelling and the shed.</li> <li>• There was no hidden agenda for the shed.</li> </ul> <p>Officers advised that a condition had been added to restrict the use of the proposal to a shed as granted.</p> <p>Members had concerns over the height of the shed and suggested that the application be deferred to enable negotiations to take place with the applicant to reduce the height or change the style of the roof.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable negotiations to take place with the applicant to reduce the height of the proposed shed. On being put to the vote deferral was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable negotiations with the applicant to reduce the height of the shed.</b></p>	
	<p><b>At 9 p.m. the committee agreed a 10 minute adjournment</b></p> <p><b>The meeting re-convened at 9.10 p.m.</b></p>	
11	<p><b>126-128 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Part change of use of Nos.126-128 from Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) to Class D2 (Assembly and Leisure) for use as a bingo hall (licensed under the 2005 Gaming Act) and alterations to front of No.128.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>



	<p><b>3874/APP/2009/1837</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many residents not aware of the application</li> <li>• Petition against the proposal was collected in 20 minutes</li> <li>• Letter form Ruislip Residents Association objecting to the proposal was not included in the report or addendum.</li> </ul> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting in support of the petitioners objecting and raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence that there is a demand for this type of establishment in this area</li> <li>• Criteria for the Service area not complied with by this application</li> <li>• There are already 3 locations for amusement arcades in the High Street</li> <li>• Reference made to comments made by Conservation Officer that proposal could proceed as long as goods are displayed in the window. Indications from existing establishment show that goods displayed in windows are not suitable</li> <li>• The comments made are supported by the other West Ruislip Ward Councillors</li> </ul> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	
12	<p><b>290 WEST END ROAD RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Change of use from Class A1 (Shops) to Class A3 (restaurants and cafes.)</b></p> <p><b>45677/APP/2009/1971</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was 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.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>
13	<p><b>20 CHESTNUT AVENUE NORTHWOOD</b></p> <p><b>Installation of 1 internally illuminated fascia sign (Retrospective Application)</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>

	<p><b>3401/ADV/2009/61</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	
14	<p><b>21 HILLSIDE ROAD NORTHWOOD</b></p> <p><b>Single storey front infill extension and loft conversion, involving conversion of garage to habitable use.</b></p> <p><b>19722/APP/2009/1861</b></p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell Meg Hirani</b></p>
15	<p><b>315 WEST END ROAD RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Provision of 1.9m high close boarded timber fencing along the Masson Avenue and West End Road boundaries, with new access gates and visibility splays Masson Avenue (Part Retrospective application).</b></p> <p><b>61905/APP/2008/3233</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell Meg Hirani</b></p>
16	<p><b>80 HIGH STREET RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Change of use from Class A1 Retail to Gaming Arcade (Sui Generis) (Dual planning application with ref.3862/APP/2009/653.)</b></p> <p><b>34237/APP/2009/652</b></p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported the officer’s recommendation for refusal</li> <li>• If approved would lead to an unacceptable length of continuous frontage of non-retail uses</li> <li>• Trips to the Gaming Arcade would not lead to an increase in shopping trips to the area</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell Meg Hirani</b></p>

	<p>The Chairman suggested an amendment to the reason to refusal as this was a prominent corner site within a Conservation Area.</p> <p>It was suggested and agreed that after 'frontage' at the end of the first line 'within this prominent location within a Conservation Area' be added.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal with the amendment was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the following reason:-</b></p> <p><b>The proposal by reason of the increase in the width of the interruption of the retail frontage within this prominent location within a Conservation Area would erode the retail function and attractiveness of the Ruislip Town centre, harming its character, function vitality and viability. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S11 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and `policy 3D.3 of the London Plan 2008.</b></p>	
17	<p><b>70 HIGH STREET RUISLIP</b></p> <p><b>Change of use from Gaming Arcade (Sui Generis) to Class A1 Retail (Dual planning application with ref.34237/APP/2009/652.)</b></p> <p><b>3862/APP/2009/653</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>Jales Tippell</b> <b>Meg Hirani</b></p>
	<p><b>Meeting closed at: 21.40 p.m.</b></p> <p><b>Next meetings: - Special Meeting 3 December 2009</b> <b>Next ordinary meeting 8 December 2009</b></p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Gillian Brice on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.