

## Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

31 January 2018

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, John Oswell and Jazz Dhillon</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Matt Kolaszewski (Principal Planning Officer), Mandip Malhotra (Strategic and Major Applications Manager), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
141.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Khatra.</p>
142.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
143.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2018 be approved as a correct record.</p>
144.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that Item 9: 31 Frithwood Avenue, had been withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning and Enforcement.</p>
145.	<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 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that Agenda Items 1 - 9 were marked as Part I and would be considered in public. Agenda Item 10 was marked as Part II and so would be considered in private.</p>
146.	<p><b>70835/APP/2017/4023 - 4 WILLOW END</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of timber staircase for access (Retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was seeking</p>

retrospective permission for a timber staircase erected at the side of the applicant's property.

The staircase had been erected to allow the applicant to access their garden via a public alleyway, situated at the rear of the property. The alleyway was public right of way, not an adopted public highway. A gate installed on the public right of way had been installed under permitted development, and had not required planning permission. However, the remainder of the staircase did require permission. It was confirmed that the applicant could install steps directly into the embankment under permitted development, should they wish.

The staircase was located immediately adjacent to the recently constructed rear extension, and was relatively minor in relation to the scale of the original dwelling. As such, it was not felt to fundamentally reduce the openness of the Green Belt in this location.

Concerns had been raised regarding the visual impact of the staircase, however Northwood was set on a hillside with properties situated on various levels. It was deemed that appropriate staining of the staircase, allied to landscaping to shield the visual impact of the staircase via the erection of bushes and plants, would address those concerns. With this in mind, the addendum was highlighted which sought to amend condition 2 to mandate that the applicant must complete the staining and landscaping within 3 months of the proposed revisions being approved by the Council. The officer concluded by recommending that the application be approved.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in opposition to the application. Points raised by the petitioner included:

- The staircase did not fit into the ambience, or the character of the area.
- The staircase detracted from the visual amenity of the area.
- The staircase would exacerbate residents' existing concerns over security within the area, as it joined onto a public alleyway, which could allow thieves easier access to residences within the estate.
- There were concerns that the staircase would not be properly maintained in the future.

Members sought clarity from the petitioner regarding how many properties the alleyway provided access to. It was confirmed that the alleyway provided access to house number 4 on the estate.

Members discussed the application, and were concerned that the staircase was not visually congruent with the existing character of the estate. In addition, Members raised the possibility that the materials used in the construction of the staircase were not appropriate to ensure that the staircase would not fall into disrepair in the future.

Members requested further information from officers regarding the purpose of the staircase. Officers confirmed that the applicant had erected the staircase to provide access to their garden, which had been blocked following the extension to their property. It was confirmed that the applicant was not required to include garden access when constructing the extension.

It was moved that the application be deferred to allow officers to negotiate with the applicant regarding the potential removal of the balustrades, changes to soft landscaping, the colour of the staircase, and the materials used in its construction. This

was seconded, and when put to a vote, passed by a vote of 6 to 1.

**RESOLVED: That the application be deferred.**

147. **67201/APP/2017/3513 - 39 HIGHFIELD DRIVE** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Removal and remodelling of existing unauthorised extensions to create part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer window.**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was for retrospective approval to rationalise existing extensions to the building, a number of which were unlawful. Alterations requested included a step down in the roof eaves and ridge height of the hipped roof side extension, removal of the first floor windows on the flank elevation, bringing the front elevation of the extension further in from the site frontage, removal of the single-storey extension to the front of the dwelling on the southern side of the two -storey hipped roof projection, repositioning of the dormer within the rear roof slope and removal of the rear facing dormer on the side extension, and removal of the 'wrap around' element of the single-storey rear extension.

The current proposal was confirmed to be significantly different to what had been constructed on site. The Inspector for the previous appeal had accepted that the appearance of the front dormer extension was acceptable, and that no previous reason for refusal had related to that aspect of the development.

Overall, the amended scheme was considered to overcome the previous reasons for refusal, and would be sympathetic to design, scale, form and proportion of the original dwelling. As a result, the site would no longer appear overdominant or incongruous within the street scene. Regarding impact on neighbours, it was confirmed that the proposed development complied with standards set out within the Council's SPD for residential extensions. For the reasons summarised, it was recommended that the application be approved.

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

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved.**

148. **5985/APP/2017/4380 - 10 NEW POND PARADE** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to hot food takeaway (Use Class A5) and installation of an extractor fan to the rear of the property.**

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the principle of change of use was considered acceptable and was in accordance with Council policies S6 and S7. Based on surveys carried out by the planning officer, it was considered that the replacement of one A1 use unit would not result in the area being deficient of essential shop uses.

Regarding the flue, the proposed extraction duct measured 0.5m in height, would project 5m out from the rear of the building line of the unit, and was located 3.4m above ground level. The rear of the application site comprised of a service yard serving the commercial premises, and the rear boundary wall of Ruislip High School playing fields. Given the duct's lack of visibility from any vantage points, and its distance from any neighbour windows, it was considered acceptable. To further limit impact on neighbours, the extractor would utilise a baffle filter which controlled grease produced,

	<p>a carbon filter for grease and odour control, and a silencer to minimise noise.</p> <p>The addendum was highlighted, which set out the addition of a food hygiene informative.</p> <p>The officer concluded by recommending that the application be approved.</p> <p>Members sought assurances that the applicant would install the noise limiting measures as set out in the report. Officers confirmed that this would be controlled by a relevant condition.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</b></p>
149.	<p><b>8032/APP/2017/4601 - 31 FRITHWOOD AVENUE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>The item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
150.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></li> <li><b>2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></li> </ol> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.33 pm.</p>

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.**