#### **NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009 at 7.00pm

Councillor Eddie Lavery (Chairman)
Councillor Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman)

**Councillors:** Michael Markham David Allam

Carol Melvin Anita MacDonald

Advisory Members \* Michael Hirst Canal Locks Conservation Panel

\* Chris Groom/Lesley Eastcote Conservation Panel

Crowcroft

\* Clive Pigram Ruislip Conservation Panel

John Ross Harefield Village Conservation Panel

Pamela Jeffreys Ickenham Conservation Panel

# 1. BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC

The Committee agreed that all of its business would be conducted in public with the exception of item 7, which was considered in Part 2 as it contained exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985).

# 2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2009 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

#### 3. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Carol Melvin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 3 – 23 Halland Way, Northwood, pertaining to supporting the applicant in her role as Ward Councillor. Councillor Melvin withdrew from the meeting during discussion and did not take part in the decision of the application.

#### 4. DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Decisions on applications are shown below and are based on Agenda and reports for the meeting, and Addendum sheets circulated at the meeting.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
1.	Harefield Academy Northwood Way Harefield	Harefield	Variation of condition 3 (opening hours) of planning permission ref.17709/APP/200 6/825 dated	7709/APP/2009/429

<sup>\*</sup> Denotes apologies received

16/06/2006:	
Redevelopment of	
school, involving	
erection of new	
buildings and	
demolition of	
existing buildings	

The officer's recommendation for the variation of Condition 3 was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

RESOLVED – That Condition 3 of Planning Permission 17709/APP/2006/825 dated 16/06/2006 be varied subject to additional restrictions as set out in the officer's report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
2.	Kylemore House Hill End Road Harefield	Harefield	Gate to front boundary to include new vehicular crossover	17709/APP/2009/429

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
3.	23 Halland Way Northwood	Northwood	Erection of a first floor rear extension and part two-storey, part single – storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof-space for habitable use involving the raising of the roof height and installation of 3 side, 2 rear and 2 side roof-lights (Resubmission)	13589/APP/2008/2958

In introducing the report, officers advised that the description of the application varied slightly from that in the report and the wording is as shown in the proposal above. The officer recommended that condition 6 should be revised to include obscure glazing in order to protect the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Representatives of a petition in objection to the development addressed the Committee. The applicant spoke in support of the application.

It was noted that the applicant would be prepared to consider reducing the garage by at least a metre. However, in the absence of his architect, this proposal could not be confirmed.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee that, if the applicant was proposing to make a change to the application, and Members were minded to take this into account, the Committee would need to either consider the application that was in front of them, or defer the application in order for the changes to be reflected.

In response to a query about overlooking, officers advised that there were no issues of overlooking, and explained that the proposal was for the two side windows to be obscure glazed.

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

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and revised condition as follows:

# **Revised Condition 6**

The new first floor en-suite bathroom and three roof-light windows facing 21 Halland Way and first floor bathroom and roof-light windows facing 25 Halland Way shall be glazed with obscured glass and non-opening below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level for so long as the development remains in existence.

#### Reason

To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
4.	43 Oak Avenue Ickenham	West Ruislip	The erection of a two-storey side/rear extension, front porch, part two-storey rear extension and rear conservatory, decking, and conversion of the roof-space to provide habitable accommodation involving raising the roof and the installation of two rear dormer windows and three roof-lights (Involving demolition	64104/APP/2009/100

	of the side garage	
	and rear	
	conservatory)	

A petition representative addressed the Committee and spoke in objection to the application. The agent spoke in support of the development.

In response to a request to clarify the issue of dominance and the 45 degree line of sight, officers advised that the 45 degree line of sight was taken from the middle of a habitable room window and normally, any neighbouring two-storey building within this line of sight would breach guidance, if it was sited within 15m of the window. In this case, the application property was already sited within 15m of the side habitable window at the neighbouring property, No. 41 and therefore, the outlook from the window was already restricted. However, the proposal would make the existing situation worse by bringing a two-storey development closer to the window.

The Conservation Advisory Member for Ickenham commented that, compared to the previously approved scheme, the Conservation Panel fully supported the officer's recommendation for refusal of this scheme.

The officer's recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

# RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
5.	Joel Street Farm Joel Street	Northwood Hills	Erection of a single- storey rear extension	8856/APP/2008/2721
	Northwood		with 2 roof-lights	

In introducing the report, officers advised that the building was a locally listed building, where the Council recognised its own buildings, which were not high status enough to be statutorily listed. It was noted that locally listed buildings were included in Policy in order to protect architectural buildings.

The officer's recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

# RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
6.	Verge adjacent to Recreation Ground Field End Road Ruislip	South Ruislip	Installation of a 12.5m high imitation telegraph pole mobile phone mast and ancillary equipment cabinet (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning	65815/APP/2009/345

		(General Permitted	
		Development) Order 1995	
		as amended)	

Members commented that positioning a third mast in this area would be unsuitable, and expressed concerns about the proposed mast further decreasing the sight lines, and the detrimental effect it would have on traffic, particularly around school time.

The officer's recommendations were moved, seconded and on being put to the vote were agreed.

#### **RESOLVED**

- A) That prior approval of siting and design was required
- B) That details of siting and design be refused

# PART 2

This report was considered in Part 2 because it contained exempt information as defined in paragraph 6 of the schedule to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. The report contains information, which if disclosed to the public, would reveal that the authority proposes –

- a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
- b) to make an order or direction under any enactment (Paragraph 13 of the Schedule to the Act).

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
7.	30 Northolt Avenue Ruislip	South Ruislip	To consider the expediency of Enforcement Action	ENF/961/06

RESOLVED – That Enforcement Notice as recommended in the officer's report be approved and recommendation 1.2 be revised to six calendar months.

The meeting closed at 8.40pm.