

## Minutes

### NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 February 2016

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Peter Curling (Labour Lead), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins and John Oswell, Jazz Dhillon and Brian Stead.</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger, Head of Planning and Enforcement, Mandip Malhotra, Major Applications and Business Development Manager, Manmohan Ranger, Transportation Consultant, Tim Brown Legal Advisor, Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p>
134.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Jem Duducu and John Morse with Cllrs Brian Stead and Jazz Dhillon substituting.</p>
135.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
136.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
137.	<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 4</i>)</p> <p>All items were considered in Public.</p>
138.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO 68 KNOLL CRESCENT NORTHWOOD - 70975/APP/2015/3737</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>Two storey detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting the proposals addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner objecting to the proposals made the following points:</p>

- The proposal was identical to the previous refused scheme, other than repositioning it slightly.
- All the reasons for previous refusals still applied.
- It was back garden development.
- If approved, it would set a precedent for more houses to be developed on the site.
- The proposal would have an adverse traffic impact and also harm highway safety.
- The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- The proposal would result in a loss of biodiversity.

The applicant / agent did not attend the meeting.

Highlighting the main material planning considerations, Officers explained that in light of the changes in policy and guidance related to back land development and the harm it was considered to have on the character and appearance of the local area, the proposal was recommended for refusal.

Speaking in general terms about the plot of land, the Committee were informed that it currently formed an important break in the built form and created an area of amenity which contributed to the street scene. It was highlighted that this area also provided a useful turning area for vehicles, which further emphasised its openness.

Discussing the application, the Committee felt the Officer report provided a succinct summary of the key issues and agreed that the application represented a form of back land development / garden grabbing.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed, that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

**Resolved -**

**That the application be refused as set out in the agenda.**

139. **LAND BETWEEN 2 & 6 WOODSIDE ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 70377/APP/2015/3826** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Two storey, 3-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front**

Officers provided an overview of the application and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.

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 proposal would have an adverse impact on the character of the area.
- If approved, it would set a precedent and allow applicants to

develop gardens for separate dwellings on the Estate.

- The proposal would result in a loss of amenity to the neighbouring houses.
- If approved, No 2 Woodside Road would have no rear garden.
- The size, scale and bulk of the proposal would be out of keeping with the area.
- Homes 2 and 6 Woodside Road would suffer from a loss of light
- Number 7 Woodside Road would suffer from a loss of privacy.
- The removal of hedges would impact on the local landscape character
- The development would be contrary to a number of Hillingdon planning policies.
- The proposal did not contain any details of boundary treatments.

A representative of the applicant made the following points:

- The plot related to the yet un-built number 4 Woodside Road.
- The plot of land was lodged at the land registry and was not garden grabbing.
- There would be no overlooking issues.
- There had been no highways objections.
- There was no single style of dwelling on the street scene so the proposal would not be incongruous.
- The proposal would be designed to look like a traditional English home.
- The proposal would follow the building line of the properties at 2 and 6 Woodside Road.
- The hedge would be trimmed only, rather than removed.
- The papers for the meeting had not been issued in the correct timescales.
- The Planning Department had provided inconsistent advice.
- The Planning Department had provided poor customer service and had not responded to correspondence.
- External factors and pressures had been placed on the Committee.

Given the serious nature of the allegations made by the petitioner (in support), the Chairman confirmed the agenda had been published in the proper timescales and interested parties had been notified in the usual way. He also confirmed Planning Officers dictated which items would be considered on the Committee agenda and that the application had not been treated differently from any other planning application. Should the petitioner remain concerned, they were directed to use the Council's Corporate Complaints procedure.

The Head of Planning confirmed that when the Officer report was being prepared, five separate officers were in agreement that the Officer recommendation should recommend the application was refused.

Discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the proposal failed to harmonise with the existing street scene and would result in a bulky and incongruous addition to the street scene to the detriment of the Area of Special Local Character. The Committee noted that had the Officer report recommended an approval it should have included the withdrawal of permitted development rights.

On being put to the vote, it was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be unanimously refused.

**Resolved -**

**That the application be refused.**

140. **PAUL STRICKLAND SCANNER CENTRE, MOUNT VERNON HOSPITAL - 3807/APP/2015/4220** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Installation of temporary two storey portakabin building to be used as office accommodation.**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.

Officers explained that the building would not be easily seen from the street and would be unobtrusive within the rear of the site. As the building was a temporary structure it was considered appropriate to grant a three year temporary permission.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed, that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

**Resolved -**

**That the application be approved as set out in the agenda.**

141. **23 JOEL STREET NORTHWOOD - 8488/APP/2015/3905** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to a mixed use comprising bespoke bridal wear service, bridal make over service and retailing of related beauty and skin care products (Use Class A1/Sui Generis) involving single storey infill extension to front and new shop front.**

Officers provided an overview of the application and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.

As well as a change of use, the application sought the installation of a new shop front, which would incorporate the infilling of the existing recessed front entrance to set it flush with the front building line of the property. Officers confirmed that the overall design of the new shop front was considered to be in keeping with the character of the town centre location and the wider area. In addition, it was noted that the application did not seek consent for the display of any related advertisements or signage, which would have to be considered under any separate future application.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed, that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report.

**Resolved -**

	<p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the agenda.</b></p>
142.	<p><b>THE ORCHARD, ICKENHAM ROAD RUISLIP - 62963/ADV/2015/65</b> <i>(Agenda Item 9)</i></p> <p><b>Installation of 3 x externally illuminated fascia signs, 4 x externally illuminated stand alone signs and 1 x internally illuminated menu light box.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed, that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the agenda.</b></p>
143.	<p><b>WOODBINE COTTAGE TILE KILN LANE HAREFIELD - 26852/APP/2015/3699</b> <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p><b>Proposed replacement entrance gates from Tile Kiln Lane.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>The Committee learnt that Woodbine Cottage was a Grade II Listed Building located on the northern side of Tile Kiln Lane and was located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The application sought to regularise the unauthorised entrance gates which remained an outstanding enforcement issue following the removal of the two unauthorised detached outbuildings.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed, that the application be approved for the reasons set out in the Officer report.</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>That the application be approved as set out in the agenda.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7:30 pm, closed at 8.15 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

