

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

18 November 2015

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Carol Melvin, John Morse, John Oswell and David Yarrow.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Syed Shah (Transport Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
97.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Jem Duducu with Councillor David Yarrow substituting.</p>
98.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
99.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman advised that the application in relation to 51 Hilliard Road, Northwood (70450/APP/2015/3266) had been withdrawn by the applicant and, therefore, would not be considered by the Committee.</p>
100.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all agenda items, with the exception of agenda item 10, were Part I and would be heard in public. Agenda item 10 was Part II and would be heard in private.</p>
101.	<p>51 HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 70450/APP/2015/3266 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>The application had been withdrawn and was not considered by the Committee.</p>
102.	<p>92 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD - 47953/APP/2015/3459 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Two storey side/rear extension involving raising and enlargement of roof to provide habitable roof space to include a rear dormer and 7 rooflights, including demolition of existing rear conservatory.</p>

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. The application was for a side and rear extension with rear dormer and roof lights. It was noted that there had been two previous applications for an extension at the property, one of which had been refused, while the other had been withdrawn.

Officers advised that the application currently under consideration was markedly different to the previous proposal. The main issues for consideration related to the effect of the application proposal on the character and appearance of the original house and the impact on the neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

It was noted that the proposals included a slight raising of the roof, but similar work had been approved at a neighbouring property. A raised roof was not considered to be a significant issue as the 45 degree line would not be breached. The proposal would use similar architecture to the existing structure and would provide sufficient garden space and parking provision. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.

A petition had been received in support of the application. In accordance with the Council's constitution, the lead petitioner, who was also the applicant and the applicant's agent, addressed the meeting.

The applicant's agent made the following points in support of the proposals:

- Significant attempts had been made over the last two years to achieve planning permission for the applicant's dream home following the previous refusal in 2014 and an application that had been withdrawn.
- The comments received in objection to the application were similar to those raised in response to previous applications. These issues had been addressed, therefore, a number of the comments were not relevant to the current application. This was particularly true of point 9 of the objection, which stated that the rear extension was too big and point 10, which stated that the porch was not subordinate in scale and form. The agent advised that the application currently under consideration did not include a porch.
- Planning officers had not agreed with the objections raised in relation to the character and bulk of the proposals.
- The submitted proposals were in accordance with relevant planning policies.

The lead petitioner made the following points in support of the proposals:

- He had been a resident of Northwood since the 1980's. It was a great area in which to bring up a family.
- The house was a family home and the applicant wanted to use the application as an opportunity to allow the premises to 'grow and flourish.'
- The house was currently in relatively poor condition and had not had much work undertaken on it in the last 20 years. Approval of the application would provide an opportunity for the house to be updated and to provide extra accommodation for when the applicant's parents visited.
- The previous planning refusals had been problematic but the issues that had caused previous refusals had been resolved and the majority of neighbours were supportive of the application.
- The officer recommendation was that the application be approved.

There was a brief discussion, during which Members confirmed that they would be

prepared to approve the application, given the changes compared to the previously refused and withdrawn proposals.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

103. **LAND TO THE REAR OF 2 HILLIARD ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 34684/APP/2015/2907** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Single storey, 1-bed, detached dwelling with associated amenity space (Part Retrospective).

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. It was noted that the application was part retrospective.

It was considered that the development would have an adverse impact on the local pattern of residential development and on the character of the area. The proposed access arrangements for the property were considered to be insufficient. The proposals also failed to provide satisfactory living space or parking provision. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be refused.

It was noted that there was an overprint on a number of the planning policies contained within the officer's report. A clear version of the policies could be found within the local plan.

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' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.

104. **BREAKSPEAR ARMS, BREAKSPEAR ROAD SOUTH, HAREFIELD - 10615/APP/2015/3318** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and referred Members to the addendum sheet circulated. The application was for the resurfacing of a car park in order to replace the existing surface with permeable asphalt. It was noted that the area had longstanding use as a car park and that approval of the proposals would improve parking provision for a nearby restaurant.

Subject to landscape conditions to ensure that the proposals preserved and enhanced the character of the local area, there were no objections. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be approved.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved as per the officers'

	<p>recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated.</p>
105.	<p>MIDDLESEX STADIUM, BREAKSPEAR ROAD, RUISLIP - 18443/APP/2015/3181 <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which was for the installation of a temporary parking area to the rear of the site. The area, which was currently in use for storage, consisted of hard storage and contained overgrown weeds and trees.</p> <p>It was considered that the proposals represented inappropriate development within the green belt. Accordingly, officers recommended that the application be refused.</p> <p>It was noted that there was an overprint on a number of the planning policies contained within the officer's report. A clear version of the policies could be found on page 54 of the officer report, with the exception of policy B1, which was contained within the local plan.</p> <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' recommendation, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
106.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>RESOLVED: That:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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>The meeting, which commenced at 8:15 pm, closed at 8:40 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.