

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

31 May 2016

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Manjit Khatra (Labour Lead), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Morse and John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning and Enforcement, Richard Conroy, Manmohan Ranger, Transportation Consultant, Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Joyti Mehta, Legal Advisor (observing) and Charles Francis, Democratic Services</p>
4.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
5.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
6.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 12 MAY 2016 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as an accurate record.</p>
7.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
8.	<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.</p>
9.	<p>53 PINN WAY, RUISLIP - 1244/APP/2016/342 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Two storey rear extension, part single storey rear extension and 2 single storey side extensions involving demolition of existing side structures.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p>

Neither the petitioner nor the applicant / agent attended the meeting.

Officers explained the main planning issues related to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding area, the impact on residential amenity of the neighbouring dwellings, and provision of adequate off-street parking.

The Committee heard Officers considered the side extensions would not be excessive in scale, width and height and that they constituted subordinate additions to the existing dwelling. In relation to its location, Officers confirmed the application would be set away from the boundaries with the adjacent dwellings at Nos. 51 and 55 and as a result, the two storey rear extension would not constitute a dominating and obtrusive addition in relation to the context of the site and the closest adjacent dwellings.

With regards to the impact on the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling to the south at No.55, Officers noted that due to the positioning of this property and given the separation distance between properties, the proposal would not harm the amenities of occupiers therein. Similarly, the relationship between the application property and No. 51 would ensure that there was no harm caused to the residential amenity of this neighbour.

Discussing the application, the Committee raised concerns about the change of design from a crown to a double pitched roof, the bulk, size and scale of the development as well as the extent of projected overshadowing and the impact on adjoining properties.

As a result of these concerns, it was moved seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit.

Resolved -

That the application be deferred for a site visit.

10. **57 COPSE WOOD WAY, NORTHWOOD - 24862/APP/2015/3571** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Two storey, 5-bedroom, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace to include 2 front dormers, 1 rear dormer, integral garage, parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing detached dwelling.

Officers provided an overview of the application.

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 significant impact on neighbouring amenities by reason of loss of sunlight, outlook, overlooking, overshadowing of rear gardens and over-bearing and over-dominating impact.
- The application would result in the loss of views to woodlands to the rear from street scene.
- The mass, size and scale of the development would result in an excessive footprint and represent an over-development of the site.
- The proposal projected beyond the front building line and would be detrimental to the street scene.

- Overall design and in particular the roof, was not in keeping with character and appearance of neighbouring properties and surrounding Area of Special Local Character.
- The application would result in the loss of protected trees and hedges which provided screening along the side boundaries with neighbouring properties

A representative of the applicant did not attend the meeting.

A Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioner and the following points were made:

- A 5,000 square foot home was massive.
- The proposal was over dominant.
- The application should be deferred for a site visit to assess the impact of the proposal on the local area.

Discussing the application, the Committee raised a number of concerns namely, size, scale and bulk, overshadowing and its impact on character of the area. In response, Officers explained that while they appreciated these concerns, the application was situated on a large plot of land which could accommodate the proposal before the Committee.

Having considered the matter, it was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be deferred for a site visit and for an over shadowing diagram to be prepared to inform the Committee's future deliberations.

Resolved -

That the application be deferred for a site visit and an over shadowing diagram.

11. **10 JACKETS LANE, NORTHWOOD - 70543/APP/2016/154** (*Agenda Item 8*)

3 x two storey, 5-bed detached dwellings with habitable roof space and 1x two storey, 4-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking, amenity space and landscaping with installation of vehicular crossovers and demolition of existing dwelling house

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

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 scheme had been previously refused for Bulk, Scale & Siting and overlooking .The new proposal was no better.
- The height of the proposal had "increased" by 1.41metres since the refusal.
- The application still failed the minimum distances for overlooking (private amenity/patio & lounge patio Windows/doors).
- The limited new change did not resolve the "very significant loss of amenity" to key habitable rooms, patio and garden through total loss of direct late afternoon -sunset sunlight (key social time) for 9 months of the year
- All new proposed houses were taller than existing / remaining
- Even with the applicants' changes there would be a circa 100% plus ratio in new

internal floor space to that of the remaining houses of Hurst Place and Jackets Lane.

- 3 metre high hedging proposed already breached the Council's high hedging policy (2 metres). However, 5 metres hedging would be required to prevent overlooking.
- The proposal would further reduce sunlight to the garden of 4 Glynswood.
- The scale and siting of the proposed building meant the landscaping buffer would not reduce the significant impact to the visual amenity.
- A site visit was requested.

A representative of the applicant made the following points:

- The proposal had been designed in accordance with HDAS.
- The landscape buffer would provide additional privacy.
- An overshadowing report had been provided by the applicant which illustrated there would be limited overshadowing.

A Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioner and the following points were made:

- The proposal was over dominant.
- The gardens of adjoining properties would suffer considerable loss of light in the afternoons.
- The application was out of character with the area.
- The application should be refused.

Discussing the application, the Committee raised a number of concerns namely, the distance between the application site and neighbouring properties, overshadowing, size and scale and its impact on character of the area. The Committee raised concerns that this application was back-land development.

In response, Officers explained the application was compliant with the Council's 21m rule. The Legal Officer advised that the development could not be classified as back-land development.

Having considered the matter, it was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed with 5 votes in favour with 3 against that the officer recommendation for approval be overturned and the application be refused as the development proposal, by virtue of the siting, bulk, and proximity of the new building on plot 4 would result in significant loss of residential amenity to occupiers of No. 4 Glynswood Place, contrary to 'saved' policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan (2012). Exact wording to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.

Resolved -

That the application be overturned and refused

The scale, massing and proximity of plot 4 to its immediate neighbour is such that it would be likely to lead to an oppressive form of enclosure, which given the local context of large detached houses set in spacious plots would be overbearing and visually intrusive for occupiers of No. 4 Glynswood Place. This is contrary to 'saved' policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan (2012) which seeks to resist development proposals that would result in a significant loss of residential amenity.

12.	<p>186 FIELD END ROAD, EASTCOTE, PINNER - 2294/APP/2016/410 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Demolition of existing building and erection of new four storey building containing ground floor offices and 3 no. two bedroom, three person flats above.</p> <p>Officers provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The Committee noted the application was considered to be unacceptable by virtue of the design, scale and bulk and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene and the neighbouring Conservation Area. In addition, it was noted that the application would result in a loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the agenda.</p>
13.	<p>THE BEAR ON THE BARGE PH, MOORHALL ROAD, HAREFIELD - 13931/APP/2016/721 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Retention of 2 x single storey structures to rear and side of the existing building.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>Highlighting the main planning considerations, Officers explained the extensions constituted a disproportionate and incongruous overdevelopment of the site by reason of their unacceptable design, size, scale and siting.</p> <p>The size of the extension was also considered to erode the openness and character of the Green Belt and detract from the character and setting of the building within the Waterside Conservation Area.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the agenda.</p>
14.	<p>9 HARVIL ROAD, ICKENHAM - 52950/APP/2016/540 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>The Committee heard the proposed development by virtue of the design, scale and bulk is considered unacceptable and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the streetscene and the neighbouring area. Given the close proximity of the extended building along the boundary line with the adjacent property it is also considered that the proposal would result in a loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers.</p>

The proposal has also failed to demonstrate that it can provide privacy to the future occupants of the ground floor and first floor flats contrary to the Hillingdon Local Plan (2012) and the London Plan 2015 and is recommended for refusal.

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. Following revisions to condition 4 'flooding' to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement.

15. **THE WATER TOWER FIELD, DUCKS HILL FARM, DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 60901/APP/2016/691** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Replacement of existing 20m telecoms mast with 27.5 metre high mast to allow for site sharing, and associated cabinet and apparatus.

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the 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 -

That the application be approved.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.25 pm.

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

The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.