

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

20 February 2018

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Edward Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Jem Duducu, Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, Manjit Khatra, John Oswell and Jazz Dhillon</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Mandip Malhotra (Pre-Applications Manager), Peter Loveday (Highway Development Engineer) and Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer)</p> <p>Other Councillors Councillors Jonathan Bianco and Scott Seaman-Digby (Ward Councillors)</p>
151.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
152.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
153.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 31 January 2018 were agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting on 31 January 2018 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
154.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
155.	<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 be considered in public.</p>

156. **EASTBURY NURSING HOME - 1901/APP/2017/2235** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the report and tabled an addendum. The application sought permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear extension and two first floor rear extensions. Members were informed that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the original building and was recommended for approval.

Members were advised that a previous application had been refused at appeal due to its size and scale, but the current proposal was considered to be less overbearing on the neighbours' properties and incorporated a 3m high brick wall between Eastbury Nursing Home and Carew Lodge. The proposed development would increase occupancy from 15 to 19 bedrooms. Councillors were also informed that the site was in a conservation area; the Council's conservation team had worked on the proposed design and had no objections.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application. Concerns were voiced regarding the detrimental impact of the proposed development on the residents at 14 Eastbury Road and Carew Lodge flats. Said concerns included the over intensification of the site, issues regarding loss of natural light due to overshadowing, noise pollution and lack of privacy due to overlooking. Members were informed that the report produced by the planning officers failed to mention the distressing noises produced by the occupants of Eastbury Nursing Home which were at times both intimidating and intrusive. Councillors were advised that any increase in the capacity of the Nursing Home would render unbearable the lives of the residents in the neighbouring properties.

The agent spoke in response to the issues raised by the petitioner stating that Eastbury Nursing Home had been extended in a piecemeal fashion over a number of years and the internal facilities were not fully accessible which was a design fault. Members were informed that the agent had worked with the Council's conservation officer to provide a holistic design for the proposed extension. With regards to the aforementioned issues of light and noise, the agent felt that the pertinent points had been covered fully in the planning officers' report and stated that the matter of noise pollution was purely subjective. Members asked the agent what was proposed to mitigate the potential effect of the extension on natural light to the neighbouring properties. Members were informed that the property was set back alongside an alleyway and with dense landscaping.

Councillor Seaman-Digby spoke as Ward Councillor in objection to the proposed development stating that the extension would impact negatively on neighbours as it was a very large overbearing structure. Councillor Seaman-Digby raised concerns regarding the fact that a light study had not yet been carried out and stated that the increase in the number of residents was unacceptable and could swiftly become out of control. Councillor Lewis had also sent in a note objecting to the development which was read out by the Chairman. Members of the Planning Committee had also visited the site prior to the meeting.

Members questioned whether the distance between the window at Carew Lodge and the proposed development was acceptable and also expressed concern regarding the loss of light. The Head of Planning and Enforcement advised that an additional condition could be added to alleviate concerns regarding impact on the neighbours. Members were also advised that additional measures could be explored to minimise noise levels within the proposed development. Councillors were informed that the development would not result in any unacceptable reduction in sunlight to the neighbours' properties.

Councillors had sight of an appeal decision produced by the Planning Inspectorate on 24 November 2011 further to a previously refused application and were informed that said report had raised no concerns regarding loss of light or privacy. The appeal had been rejected as it was felt that the extension would harm the overall character and appearance of the property and would harm the outlook from no. 14 Eastbury Road. However, Members stated that the current application appeared to be more overwhelming than the previous application. Further concerns were expressed by the Committee regarding the impact of noise pollution and it was felt that this issue could not be alleviated by means of an additional condition. Councillors were advised that the applicant would utilise a noise consultant to ensure improvements in this area. With regards to the apparent increase in the bulk of the proposed development compared to the previous proposal which had been refused, Members were informed that, although the current proposal appeared bigger, the pitch had been reduced and it was conceived to be a better design. Members requested clarification regarding the dimensions of the proposed extension compared to the previously refused application and were informed that it had been reduced in depth and in height but the ridge had been increased. In view of the aforementioned concerns, Members deemed the current proposal to be unacceptable.

On being put to a vote, the officer's recommendation was rejected unanimously by the Committee.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused.

157. **MIDHURST COTTAGE, HIGH ROAD - 73006/APP/2017/3705** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the application which sought planning permission for a two storey rear extension. Members were advised that planning permission had already been granted for a single storey rear extension, therefore only the proposed first floor extension could be considered by the Committee. Members were issued with clearer plans for clarification.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that the applications for the single storey and first floor extensions should have been considered as a whole rather than individually as, in conjunction, they would result in overdevelopment of the site. It was felt that the 6m single storey extension should have been refused as planning advice for extensions was 4m and the decision should now be reconsidered in light of the additional application for a first floor extension. Members were advised that no light check had apparently been carried out at the site and the development would be out of keeping with the street scene as the houses were currently staggered front and back which would no longer be the case. Councillors were informed that the proposed first floor extension would result in unacceptable overshadowing at Long Meadow. Attention was also drawn to a proposed additional first floor window which would overlook Long Meadow and compromise privacy. It was proposed that the application be refused. However, if planning permission were granted, the petitioner requested that permitted development rights be removed for the site and assurance be given that all windows to the side of the extension would be frosted or obscure glazed permanently. It was also requested that a party wall agreement be mandated.

Councillor Bianco spoke as Ward Councillor in objection to the application stating that it was a matter of great concern and recommending that permitted development rights be removed from Midhurst Cottage going forward as suggested by the petitioner. Councillor Bianco also expressed concern regarding the bulk of the proposed development and the resultant loss of light to neighbours' properties. Moreover,

Councillor Bianco stated that, if planning permission were to be granted, future developments at the property should be impeded.

Officers commented that the removal of permitted development rights was covered in condition 9 and the matter of obscured windows was covered by condition 5. It was confirmed that the request for a mandated party wall agreement could not be considered as part of the planning process.

Members expressed concern regarding the bulk and impact of the proposed extension but were obliged to consider the first floor application separately as the previous application for a single storey extension had already been approved.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved.

158. **ST MARTINS HOUSE, RUISLIP - 61166/APP/2017/1786** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers presented the report and tabled an addendum. The application sought the change of use of an existing office building to residential. Formation of two additional storeys was proposed to provide 9 residential flats with associated roof garden. Members were informed that the proposed development would not impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area or the amenities of neighbouring residents. The application was recommended for approval subject to a legal agreement securing a restriction to prevent future occupants applying for a parking permit within existing and future Community Parking Zones.

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

RESOLVED - That the application be approved.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.16 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250185. 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.