

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

8 December 2015

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman) John Morgan (Vice-Chairman) Peter Curling (Labour Lead) Raymond Graham Carol Melvin John Oswell Brian Stead Ian Edwards Jazz Dhillon</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Adrien Waite (Major Applications Manager), Manmohan Ranger (Transportation Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer) and Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
107.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn and John Morse with Councillors Brian Stead, Ian Edwards and Jazz Dhillon acting as substitutes.</p>	
108.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
109.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
110.	<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>All items were considered in Public.</p>	

111. **82 DUCK HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 39262/APP/2014/4357**
(Agenda Item 5)

Three storey building with associated basement to provide 3 x 4-bed self contained supported living flats with associated parking

Officers introduced the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the application.

Officers highlighted the changes set out in the addendum and in particular drew the Committees' attention to the withdrawal of the word 'ambulance' throughout the report and the comments of the access officer. Officers also confirmed the proposal was not contrary to H10.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The size of the proposed extension was too large and out of character with the area and that it would have an adverse impact on residents.
- The design and form of the development would result in incongruous roof forms, which were out of keeping in the area
- The proposal would give rise to overlooking issues.
- The removal of trees was unnecessary.
- The business use of the proposal meant that 30 staff were required as it was a high dependency facility. This would create parking problems locally.
- Service vehicles would also create pressures on local roads.
- The proposal was situated in a cul-de-sac which had not been designed to accommodate the anticipated form of use.

The applicant raised the following points:

- The proposal sought to meet the needs of vulnerable adults with specific needs.
- The proposal met all the necessary standards, including the highways one in relation to car parking.
- A transport impact assessment had been submitted and proposal site was located 100 metres from a bus route.
- Vehicular access was good and the site was not located in a high incident area.
- The general character of the area had changed over the last 15 years and so the design was not out of keeping with the area.
- The proposal met waste management, flood and drainage standards.
- The proposal was a high level design which would meet a specific need.

Officers explained the proposal would provide assisted living flats, incorporating new vehicular access and associated car parking. An area of soft landscaping would be retained within the rear of the site, which could be utilised as communal amenity space.

While not objecting to the principle of the development, the Officer

	<p>report stated the refusal reasons included siting, size, scale, bulk and massing. The proposal was also deemed to be an incongruous and intrusive form of overdevelopment which was incompatible with the street scene and wider area. Additional reasons for refusal included insufficient parking and cycle storage facilities.</p> <p>Discussing the application, the Committee sought further clarification on the amount of car parking available and the size and scale of the development. In response, Officers confirmed the proposed provision of 6 car parking spaces for the number of residents and staff was considered to be unacceptable and due to the size and scale of the development, it was considered to be out of character with the surrounding area.</p> <p>On this basis the recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	
112.	<p>HOLLAND & HOLLAND SHOOTING SCHOOL, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 16568/APP/2015/3140 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Extension to existing reception building and new underground shooting range, including the demolition of the existing pavilion and garage</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>The Committee heard that as the application site was in use as a shooting ground, its use was deemed to be an acceptable use in the Green Belt. Furthermore, as an established business, its need to expand to continue to operate successfully was seen to demonstrate very special circumstances for the proposed increase in the size of the building.</p> <p>Officers explained that the current application was smaller than previous approvals and the height and bulk of the building, when taken in context with the size of the site and previous consents, was considered not to cause unacceptable levels of harm to the surrounding Green Belt.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was one of the premier shooting establishments in the country • The application was smaller than previous ones which had been approved. • A recreational purpose was an acceptable use within the Green Belt. 	

	<p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved as set out in the officer report.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be Approved.</p>	
113.	<p>48 HARLYN DRIVE, PINNER - 4956/APP/2015/3462 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 5-bed, detached dwelling with habitable basement space with associated landscaping involving demolition of existing dwelling house</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the application.</p> <p>Officers highlighted the changes in the addendum which included a petition in support of the application which had been received since the publication of the agenda.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a representative of the petitioners in support of the proposal addressed the meeting and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant had tried to work with the Council but had experienced difficulties. • The applicant disagreed with the officer report that insufficient information had been provided about flood risk. • The basement was not living accommodation. • The size and scale of the application was very similar to a design which had been granted on appeal. • The proposal had been designed to an exceptional standard. • Harlyn Drive contained a mixture of architectural styles and so the proposal would not be out of place with the street scene. <p>Officers explained that while they did not object to the principle of the design, the report stated the refusal reasons included size, scale, bulk and being out of keeping with the street scene. Officers reiterated that insufficient information had been provided by the applicant regarding the flood risk posed by the development.</p> <p>Discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposed design, including the large crown roof was a bulky and incongruous addition to the street scene. As a result, the design was considered to be out of character with the area.</p> <p>On this basis the recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED</p> <p>That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	

	The meeting, which commenced at 6pm, closed at 6:50pm.	

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.