

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

25 October 2017

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Jazz Dhillon and Janet Duncan (Reserve) (In place of Manjit Khatra)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Edward Oteng (Major Applications Manager), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
94.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Khatra. Councillor Duncan was present as her substitute.</p>
95.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
96.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 10 May, 11 May, 30 May, 13 July and 3 October 2017 be approved as a correct record.</p>
97.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that item 6 - 53 Wieland Road, had been withdrawn from the agenda.</p> <p>Item 9 - 82 Royal Crescent, had been added to the agenda as an urgent item as it was now the subject of an appeal against non-determination, and the Council was required to confirm its position within the statement to be sent to the Planning Inspectorate.</p>
98.	<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>It was confirmed that all items were in Part I, and would therefore be considered in public.</p>

99.	<p>53 WIELAND ROAD - 28044/APP/2017/2249 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.</p>
100.	<p>PINCIO GATE END - 8954/APP/2017/2400 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 4-bed, detached dwelling with habitable roofspace, involving demolition of existing bungalow.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and detailed the site's planning history, with previously rejected plans displayed for illustrative purposes. Officers asserted that the new plans did not show sufficient changes from the rejected plans to allay officer and Committee concerns over size and bulk, a lack of harmonization with the existing site and surroundings, and a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity, and the application was therefore recommended for refusal.</p> <p>A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. The petitioner confirmed that she represented the views of the Gateshill Residents Association (GRA) and Estate, who shared the view of officers that the new application was not sufficiently different to the previously rejected application, and therefore requested that it be refused.</p> <p>The applicant/agent for the application addressed the Committee, and referenced two documents previously submitted in response to the GRA letter of objection and the petition letter, which were felt to include inaccurate statements. The applicant confirmed that the development was proposed in order to provide additional space for his family, and that he was in regular contact with the Council's planning officers, who had offered advice before the submission of the application. Previously approved applications within the Gateshill Estate were referenced, which the applicant felt were of similar size to the application being proposed. The applicant concluded by requesting that the application be approved.</p> <p>Councillor Jonathan Bianco, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. Councillor Bianco confirmed that he supported the petition in objection to the application, and praised the petitioners for what he felt was a reasoned and sensible argument. Councillor Bianco asserted that the application submitted had failed to address previous Committee and officer concerns, and was an overdevelopment of the area. Councillor Bianco concluded by requesting that the application be refused.</p> <p>Members discussed the application, and shared the previously stated concerns regarding overdevelopment of the site, which was not felt to be in keeping with the character of the local area. With this in mind, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the item be refused.</p>
101.	<p>LAND BETWEEN 2 AND 6 WOODSIDE ROAD - 70377/APP/2017/2956 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Details pursuant to conditions 3 (Materials), 5 (Obscure Glazing), 8 (Levels), 11 (Method Statement) and 13 (Landscaping) of the Secretary of State's Appeal Decision Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3171932 dated 28-07-2017 (LBH Ref: 70377/APP/2016/4221 dated 06-03-2017) (Two storey, 3-bed dwelling with habitable roofspace, parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular</p>

crossover to front).

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was seeking to discharge condition 3 (materials), 5 (Obscure Glazing), 8 (Levels) 11 (Method Statement) and 13 (Landscaping). Officers addressed the conditions in turn:

Condition 3 (Materials) - the Conservation Officer had confirmed that the proposed materials were acceptable;

Condition 5 (Obscure Glazing) - Level 4 privacy was deemed to be acceptable;

Condition 8 (Levels) - there were no objections to levels, as these were the same as existing properties;

Condition 11 (Method Statement) - the Council's Landscaping Officer had deemed this to be acceptable;

Condition 13 (Landscaping) - the Council's Landscaping Officer had deemed this to be acceptable.

The application was therefore recommended for approval.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application, and stated that the landscaping plan was the same as originally submitted and had not considered the comments made by the Planning Inspectorate, such as the recommendation that 25m of soft landscaping should be retained.

With regard to the officers' report, the petitioner requested clarity on where the agreed planting of fences would be located or how this would be enforced, as this detail was not included within the plans or report. Concerns were raised that enforcement officers would not be able to take enforcement action, if this detail was not explicitly set out within the approved plans or conditions.

A tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) had been removed, and clarity was sought on how this would be replaced. With regard to privacy, it was asserted that not all side windows were labelled on the plans as obscured, and there were concerns that this would lead to overlooking and a loss of privacy for neighbours. Windows were also to be side-hinged, and thus could be opened, further leading to a potential loss of privacy.

The petitioner concluded by requesting that the application be refused.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee, and asserted that all concerns previously raised had been addressed. New boundary screenings would be installed, and existing trees would be retained. The removal of the tree protected by a TPO had taken place prior to the applicant purchasing the site, and would be replaced by two trees that the Council's landscape officer had deemed acceptable. Boundary trimming would be carried out by a certified arborist.

With regard to hard surfacing, other nearby sites had considerably less soft landscaping. This application sought to include approximately 61% hard surfacing. In relation to concerns over privacy, the Council had confirmed that level 4 obscured glazing was deemed to be acceptable, which could be enforced by conditions. In line with the recommendation from the Council, including confirmation from the conservation and landscaping officers that the application was acceptable, it was

requested that the application be approved.

Members sought clarity that the windows facing 2 & 6 Woodside Road were obscured. It was confirmed that this was the case. The windows were fixed panes, under fan lights, with no side hinges. It was confirmed that this was not the case originally, but that the obscuring was added following advice from the Council. As such, the windows on the plans were not labelled as obscured.

Members sought confirmation of the location of the proposed two new trees. It was confirmed that these would be installed at the front of the property, where there were currently no trees.

Councillor Bianco addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, and requested clarity over the stated 61% of hard surfacing, before highlighting the importance of ensuring that all conditions were correct and enforceable.

Officers confirmed that the layout and frontage of the site, as part of the application to be determined, was in accordance with the Planning Inspectorate. There was therefore no confusion over the proposed 61% of hard surfacing. In addition, officers asserted that the conditions, as set out, were clear and enforceable.

With regard to the replacement of the TPO tree, it was confirmed that the Council's landscaping officer had deemed the suggested location and type of replacement trees to be acceptable. It was confirmed that replacement trees did not have to be a like-for-like replacement. It was likely that the trees to be planted would be semi-mature.

The Chairman sought confirmation that the proposed hedging was clearly shown on the plans. Officers confirmed that this was the case.

Members were supportive of the application, and the officer's recommendation was moved, subject to the addition of an informative regarding the removal of fencing and its replacement by hedging. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the item be approved, subject to the addition of an informative regarding the removal of fencing and its replacement by hedging.

102. **82 ROYAL CRESCENT - 72669/APP/2017/927** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Two storey 3-bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, two storey rear extension to existing dwelling and installation of vehicular crossover.

Officers introduced the item, added to the agenda as an urgent item following the submission of an appeal against non-determination.

Officers confirmed that there were six reasons for refusal, as set out in the report, and were:

- The absence of a Flood Risk Assessment;
- The siting of the development beyond the front building line;
- Roof Alterations failing to harmonize with the original dwelling;
- The level of subordination;

- Inadequate residential accommodation in terms of layout, size and amenity; and
- Insufficient private amenity space.

For these reasons it was recommended that the application be refused.

It was confirmed that a petition in objection to the application had been received, though neither the petitioner, nor the applicant or agent, were present at the meeting.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the item be refused.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.20 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.