

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

4th February 2010

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge

Published on:

Come into effect on: Immediately



1.	<p>Members Present:</p> <p>Eddie Lavery (Chairman) Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman) Michael Markham Carol Melvin David Payne John Oswell</p> <p>Apologies:</p> <p>Cllr Anita MacDonald, no substitute</p> <p>Officers Present:</p> <p>James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Sarah White and Charles Francis.</p>
2.	<p>Declarations of Interest:</p> <p>Councillor David Payne declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 16 – 10 Chiltern Road, as he had previous knowledge of the application as a Ward Councillor.</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kauffman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 16 – 10 Chiltern Road, as he knew the applicant personally.</p>
3.	<p>Minutes:</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 22nd December 2009 and 12th January 2010 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
4.	<p>Exclusion of the Press and Public:</p> <p>It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public with the exception of Item 18 which was considered in PART II</p>
5.	<p>Consideration of Reports:</p> <p>Reports were considered as set out below:</p>

<p>6.</p>	<p>HIGHGROVE HOUSE, EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP</p> <p>Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units comprising 1 studio, 6 one- bedroom, 2 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats and 2 two-bedroom maisonettes and erection of 4 two-bedroom mews dwellinghouses, with associated amenity space and landscaping, involving demolition of detached stable building (Time extension of planning permission ref.10622/APP/ 2006/2490 dated 11/01/2007.)</p> <p>10622/APP/2009/2504</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the changes set out in the Addendum below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the second paragraph of Section 7.10, replace second sentence with 'Furthermore, a total of 24 cycle spaces would be required to serve the whole of the wider site, including Yew Tree House in order to satisfy the Council's standards. This would be provided in 4 cycle stores across the site, the details of which have been controlled by condition. In third paragraph, replace 'a S106' with 'a Grampian' condition (condition 17)' 2. In condition 7, after 'secure cycle storage', add 'for 24 cycles'. 3. In condition 8, replace 'screened storage of refuse bins' with 'screened and secure storage of refuse and recycling bins'. 4. Add additional condition 36: RPD2 Obscure glazing and non-opening window. Insert 'ground floor north facing secondary lounge window on western mews house in southern block' Reason RPD2 Standard. 5. In Section 7.11, After fifth sentence, deleting 'Areas' from sixth sentence, add 'The site is within 400m of the children's play area in Warrender Park so no specific provision for a children's play area is required. However, areas...' <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>Approval was delegated to officers subject to any comments being received from English Heritage</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
-----------	--	--

7.	<p>HIGHGROVE HOUSE, EASTCOTE ROAD, RUISLIP</p> <p>Refurbishment and conversion of listed building to 12 residential units comprising one studio, 6 one- bedroom, 2 two-bedroom and 1 three-bedroom flats and 2 two-bedroom maisonettes (Time extension of Listed Building Consent ref.10622/APP/2006/2491 dated 12/01/2007.)</p> <p>10622/APP/2009/2506</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p> <p>Approval was delegated to officers subject to any comments being received from English Heritage</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
----	---	--

8.	<p>GARAGE REAR OF 8 KINGSEND, RUISLIP</p> <p>Two storey two-bedroom detached dwelling with associated parking.</p> <p>27853/APP/2009/1773</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution representatives of petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning proposal is trying to put too much into a small space. • In section 6, the number of residents who wrote to oppose or approve the plans are not stated in the report • There is an error in section 3.1 of the report. There are in fact four flats at the existing 8 Kingsend with the following addresses - 8 8a 8b and 8c. (Section 3.1 only states <i>8b and 8c Kingsend</i>). • The plans at 8 Kingsend are incorrect, as they do not show the four addresses. There are actually 2 flats on the west side of the building with their front doors opening onto the side driveway with no separate pedestrian footpath. These 4 flats have existed for about 30 years or more. • The loss of garages will cause problems as residents already have insufficient parking facilities. • The proposal includes the demolition of 2 garages. What would happen to the two remaining garages and would these be structurally safe? 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
----	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents will be affected by noise and pollution if the application is approved. • No consideration has been given to waste management issues if the application is approved. <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reasons for refusal are expressed in detail in the report. • The objections raised by the petitioners were supported. • This is inappropriate development in a Conservation Area. <p>Members agreed that the proposed development was inappropriate in a Conservation Area and building works would have a significant impact on the surrounding area especially with regards to vehicular access.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
9.	<p>76 EXMOUTH ROAD, RUISLIP</p> <p>Erection of a single storey side and rear extension (involving demolition of existing attached garage to side and part single storey rear extension).</p> <p>66257/APP/2009/1785</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed double garage will be an eyesore. • Concern that the garage might be used as a dwelling. • The application will not be in keeping with the street scene. • The plans show a proposed upstairs store cupboard. Due to its size, this might be used as a further bedroom. • Concern that the landlord might change the use of the living room into a further bedroom. • Fears that if planning permission is granted then the dwelling might change into a House of Multiple Occupation. • The property is (allegedly) not well maintained and increasing the size of the property might mean that some aspects of the property might fall into further disrepair. <p>In answer to a query about the proposed double garage, officers confirmed that no proposals relating to garages were</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>before the Committee. Members noted that the garage was withdrawn from the application.</p> <p>Members asked whether Permitted Development Rights could be withdrawn in relation to the property as a whole. The Legal Officer advised that this would not be appropriate under the circumstances.</p> <p>Members asked whether conditions could be introduced to limit the use of the study and store room. In response, officers explained that this would be difficult to enforce and that condition 3 limited the use of the dwelling to single family occupancy. To provide assurance to the petitioner, officers explained that if it was proved that the dwelling was being used by more than one family, the petitioner was advised to contact the Planning Department to discuss planning enforcement options.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
<p>10.</p>	<p>3 NEWYEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD</p> <p>Erection of a two storey side and part single storey rear extensions.</p> <p>64656/APP/2008/1921</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent spoke as the representative of the petitioners.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the occupants of surrounding properties support the application. • The proposed design (incorporating 1 bedroom and 1 reception room) is attractive and not overly dominant. • The application was submitted in 2008, about 1 and a half years ago and has taken a significant amount of time to reach Committee. Under these circumstances could Members look at the application in a sympathetic manner? • There is a generous gap of 4 metres to the side of the proposed extension and sufficient space between properties. • A proposed development of 60% increase of the entire property falls within Permitted Development rights. This proposal is less than 70% increase stated in the report. • To request that the application be permitted given the special circumstances and time taken to bring the 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>application to Committee.</p> <p>Members agreed that the Green Belt should be guarded at all costs.</p> <p>In answer to a query in relation to the size of the proposed development officers accepted that the proposal fell somewhere between the range of 60% and 70% of the size of the original dwelling.</p> <p>After considering all the concerns raised the recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
11.	<p>OAKHURST, 1 NORTHGATE, NORTHWOOD</p> <p>Erection of 2 x two-storey, six-bedroom detached dwellings with habitable roof space and associated parking, including a detached double garage and new access road located between 'Oakhurst' and 'Walderton' and erection of a part single storey, part two storey side/front extension to Oakhurst (involving the demolition of the existing detached garage)</p> <p>30779/APP/2009/2036</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was also present at the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of 72 trees to implement the proposal is excessive and will be detrimental to the area. • The application site should not be considered a back garden but rather as woodland • The proposal for the homes to include 2 storeys and habitable roof space makes this a 3 storey application. • The proposal will impact on the privacy of residents • The service access road is located too close to Oakhurst and there is a risk to the fabric of Oakhurst from construction and other vehicles. • The time taken to process the application has meant that Oakhurst has suffered unduly from vandalism and water ingress. • The hope that the Developer might purchase the home next door and develop an adjacent plot of land instead of the application site. • The proposed extension to Oakhurst is dreadful and out of character with the existing building. 	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

Points raised by the agent

- The application is a reworking of the existing permission.
- The access and form of access road to the site is identical to the previous planning application.
- The high quality house design will be sympathetic to surrounding properties and will preserve the character of the area.
- The proposed homes will be located to the rear of the application site.
- Numerous site visits have taken place and there have been no arboricultural objections from the Council.
- The height of the proposed developments will be no higher than surrounding buildings, including Oakhurst.
- The ecological concerns raised have been noted.

Members agreed that the application was a balancing act and the conservation of Oakhurst came at the price of limited development.

In answer to an issue raised in relation to access to the site and potential damage to the fabric of Oakhurst, officers suggested an additional condition might be added to reduce the risk posed by construction and other vehicles.

After considering all the concerns the recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to changes set out in the Addendum and addition to condition 5 to read as follows:

1. Delete reference to Drawing. No. BP.01.
2. At end of condition 25, add '*unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority*'.
3. Replace condition 28 with:

'No development shall take place on site until an energy efficiency report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The energy efficiency report shall include a full assessment of the sites energy demand and carbon dioxide emissions, measures to reduce this, and the provision of 20% of the sites energy needs through on site renewable energy generation. The methods identified within the report as approved shall be provided prior to the first residential occupation and thereafter permanently retained and maintained'.

REASON

To ensure that the development incorporates appropriate energy efficiency measures in accordance with policies 4A.3

	<p>and 4A.7 of the London Plan (February 2008).'</p> <p>Addition to condition 5 to read:</p> <p><i>'(viii) Measures to prevent damage to the fabric of Oakhurst from construction and other vehicles'</i></p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and addition to condition 5 set out above.</p>	
12.	<p>10 MEADOW CLOSE, RUISLIP</p> <p>Single storey rear extension and conversion of loft space to habitable use with 2 side and 1 rear dormers and 1 side rooflight</p> <p>19443/APP/2009/2377</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
13.	<p>JOEL STREET FARM, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD</p> <p>Infill extension to create additional Class B1 office space with mezzanine level and 3 rooflights (renewal of Planning permission ref: 8856/APP/2006/3097).</p> <p>8856/APP/2009/2349</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the amendment of condition 5 to read as follows:</p> <p><i>'Development shall not commence until details of parking provision of two spaces for wheelchair disabled people and blue badge holders, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until all the approved details have been implemented and thereafter these facilities shall be permanently retained'.</i></p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

<p>14.</p>	<p>MOSSLEIGH, HIGHFIELD CLOSE, NORTHWOOD</p> <p>Two storey five-bedroom dwelling with associated parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling.</p> <p>61633/APP/2009/2387</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. the amendment of condition 5 II. the addition of an extra condition III. and the deletion of condition 14 to read as follows: <p>Condition 5 should be amended to read:</p> <p><i>'No development shall take place until details of facilities to be provided for the secure and screened storage of refuse bins within the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied until the facilities have been provided in accordance with the approved details and thereafter the facilities shall be permanently retained'.</i></p> <p>An additional condition is recommended as follows:</p> <p><i>'The proposed residential unit hereby approved shall be built in accordance with 'Lifetime Homes' Standards as set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Accessible Hillingdon'.</i></p> <p>REASON</p> <p>To ensure that sufficient housing stock is provided to meet the needs of disabled and elderly people in accordance with London Plan (February 2008) Policies 3A.5, 3A.13, 3A.17 and 4B.5.</p> <p>That Condition 14 should be deleted as additional crossovers are not proposed.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>22 WINCHESTER ROAD, NORTHWOOD</p> <p>Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extensions (involving the demolition of existing side garage) (amended plans received)</p> <p>65938/APP/2009/1751</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
16.	<p>10 CHILTERN ROAD, EASTCOTE</p> <p>Single storey detached garage / plant room with habitable roof space with 1 front and 1 rear dormer involving demolition of existing detached garage and car port and installation of swimming pool to rear</p> <p>13772/APP/2009/1897</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
17.	<p>QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - 1 OCTOBER - 31 DECEMBER 2009 - PART I</p> <p>Resolved – That the report be noted</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
18.	<p>QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - 1 OCTOBER - 31 DECEMBER 2009 - PART II</p> <p>Resolved – That the report be noted</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
	<p>SITE VISIT</p> <p>Members asked Officers to arrange a site visit to Bury Street, Ruislip</p>	
	<p>Meeting closed at: 21:05 p.m.</p> <p>Next meetings: - Next ordinary meeting 23 February 2010</p>	

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 are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.
