

## Minutes



**NORTH** Planning Committee

**19 June 2018**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Scott Farley, Becky Haggar, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Devi Radia, Robin Sansarpuri and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Matt Kolaszewski (Planning Team Leader), Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Richard Michalski (Highways Engineer) and Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
21.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
22.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Eddie Lavery declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 6 – St Thomas More R.C Church Eastcote (482/APP/2017/4564) as he knew the applicant. He left the room when this item was heard.</p>
23.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED – That the minutes from the meeting on 23 May 2018 be agreed as a correct record.</b></p>
24.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
25.	<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 all items would be heard in Part I.</p>
26.	<p><b>ST. THOMAS MORE R.C. CHURCH, EASTCOTE - 482/APP/2017/4564</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for a car parking area for five spaces with associated</p>

landscaping and installation of vehicular crossover. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application. The petitioner referred to a summary document and photographs that had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting. The petition questioned whether the application was necessary and agreed with the highways officers' comments that it was not clear why the applicant required a single access when there was already adequate access from within the church car park. The proposed development was on a residential cul de sac, less than five metres wide with at least two metres taken up with residential parking. The petitioner submitted that there was current access to the church and ample additional parking which was already available on the site. The petitioner submitted that there was no valid reason why an entrance in the Sigers should be considered and the existing car park had sufficient parking with 30 spaces. The church committee informed residents that the future intention was to have a new development on the site and the erection of a siding gate did not eradicate any concerns. Residents believed it to be erroneous to grant access which would lead to horrendous traffic and congestion. There would be disturbance to the long standing residential environment particularly as the applicant was seeking unqualified access thereby underpinning a D1 activity. The petitioner told the Committee that the application was ingenious and totally unnecessary.

The applicant addressed the Committee and told Members that the Diocesan of Westminster was very aware of the importance of preservation of historical buildings and environment, and had great empathy for residents affecting the local area. The applicant submitted that attempts had been made to keep the local characteristics of the area. However, changes to lifestyle and demands for architect planning and design meant that other practical, versatile and meaningful living spaces needed to be introduced to suit contemporary lifestyles. The petitioner reiterated that the Diocesan would not be applying to create a cross over unless they considered it to be absolutely necessary. The applicant submitted that the application was not intended to add additional pressure to existing highways in the area. It was the church's full intention to ensure that any work carried out was done to a high standard and displayed sensitivity to the street and location.

In response to Member questions, the applicant confirmed that there was a planning pre app regarding the future location of the site but this application was submitted to tease out who owned the ranch and strip of land. The site would be used as a residential block for retired priests. It was also confirmed that there was an overspill for parking when mass was held. This application was mainly to ensure that a cross over was available in this location.

The Vice Chairman read the written representation from local Ward Councillor, Nick Denys, into the record:

*Dear Committee Members,*

*I wish to inform you that I strongly support the petition against the planning permission for the creation of a car parking area for five spaces with associated landscaping and installation of vehicular crossover. The strong local objections to this proposal are understandable and valid. As noted in the report, a petition with 59 signatories has been submitted to you, along with a further 14 objections. Please do take them seriously when making your decision.*

*I disagree with the officers conclusion that: "The proposal would not compromise the character and appearance of the surrounding area or unduly harm the amenities of*

*neighbouring residents, whilst retaining safe access to the site and the parking spaces.”*

*The Sigers is a quiet cul-de-sac close to the heart of Eastcote town centre. The residents appreciate the cul-de-sac design as it stops the road being used as a cut through. I will not go further into the reasons why the planning application does compromise the character and appearance of the road, as has been clearly set out by the Eastcote Residents Association. I fully support their arguments, which are shown at the beginning of Section 6 of the paper.*

*I would like to draw your attention to the part of the application that will create a walk way between the Sigers and the Church. This is a fundamental change in the relationship between the Road and Church. It will allow people, for the first time, to access the Church from the Sigers. This is bound to increase traffic flow and parking when events are being held at the Church. I would ask that the Committee respects the current arrangement where you cannot access the Church and grounds from the Sigers.*

*Thank you for considering my objection.*

Members noted that this application related to a quiet residential road and also noted the strong concerns submitted from local residents, particularly regarding the access and its impact.

The Head of Planning stated that the application before the Committee was about a car park of five spaces associated with the church. He advised the Committee to only consider and determine the merits of the current application, not any plans which may take place at a later date.

Members were concerned that the access was through a cul de sac and considered there would have to be some planning restriction for vehicles turning into the road. Members questioned whether officers would be implementing a parking scheme and whether there would be restricted to the car park. Officers clarified action on whether a parking management scheme was required would be on a monitoring and respond basis, and action would not be taken straightaway. A parking management scheme would be considered on a reactionary basis and a petition would need to be submitted to the Cabinet Member for Planning, Transportation and Recycling. Officers also confirmed that the car park would be segregated so there would not be a through route.

Members were sympathetic to both parties, however considered that there were no robust reasons to refuse the application. Officers drew Members’ attention to the conditions which tried to mitigate some of the concerns raised by the petitioners.

The officer’s recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were seven votes in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendations and the additional conditions listed in the addendum.**

27. **38 & 40 DUCKS HILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 71798/APP/2018/803** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of a three storey building to create nine x 3-bed self-contained flats with car parking within basement, with associated parking and landscaping, installation of vehicular crossover to front and detached summerhouse to

rear, involving demolition of existing houses. This was a resubmission. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application and submitted that the development would adversely impact the character of the area due to its out of character, overbearing and intrusive nature. The development would be significantly larger than the neighbouring buildings and would create a visually dominant and intrusive structure affecting neighbouring gardens and patio space. The petitioner urged the Committee to undertake a site visit to understand the impacts of this development. The petitioner read a statement from the residents which indicated that the report and amended plans did not mitigate the concerns raised. The petitioner referred to the appeal decision on 9 February in which it was stated that the main issue was the unacceptable effects on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties, with reference to being over bearing and visually intrusive. The petitioner also identified what provisions of the UDP would be compromised. In light of the large potential impact, the petitioner asked for the decision to be deferred pending a site visit.

The agent addressed the Committee and highlighted the changes made which influenced officers to make a recommendation for approval. The application was in line with all policy and guidance. This was the third application, and the applicant/agent had done their best to address previous issues for refusal. The impact on other property was confirmed by the inspector as being acceptable. This type of development had already been accepted by the inspector who endorsed the visual impact and design. The agent quoted parts of the inspector's reasoning to support his arguments. The agent submitted that the application exceeded all planning requirements and all the technical aspects of the proposal continued to be addressed. The agent asked for the application to be approved given the significant changes made.

The Chairman directed Members attention to the appeal decision which gave one ground to consider. He informed the Committee that the applicant was correct, with the exception to the impact on number 36, the appeal inspector was happy with all other matters.

Members noted the changes made and considered that the applicant had addressed the issues regarding overbearing by reducing the building to two storey. It was considered that significant changes had been made. However, some Members still considered that there was an overbearing issue and it would have been advisable to take it back a metre or so as it was still close. Members questioned the height and the windows on the site. Officers acknowledged Members 'concerns but commented that they could not see any issues with the windows on this proposal.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, there were seven votes for and one abstention.

**RESOLVED – That the application be approved, subject to the changes in the addendum.**

28. **31 FRITHWOOD AVENUE, NORTHWOOD - 8032/APP/2017/3739** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for a part two storey, part single storey rear extension, enlargement of roof space involving alterations to elevations and change of use from a bed and breakfast to extra care facility comprising 13 units and an internal communal facility. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application and referred to photographs circulated prior to the hearing. He submitted that the main concern was the hindrance this application would cause to resident parking. The photographs showed the parking issues in the area as a result of the local school. There were already 14 cars that were regularly parked on the road, and if the application was granted the extra care facility would bring in an additional 16 – 18 cars. The petitioners did not accept the assertion that most of the staff would be cycling or using public transport. There would be a huge impact on local residents.

There was no applicant/agent present for the item.

The Chairman reminded Members that parking was not a refusal reason in this application, it was being refused on design grounds and the absence of legal agreement and management plans to operate the premises as a care facility.

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

**RESOLVED – That the application be refused.**

29. **LAND FORMING PART OF 43 THE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD - 70975/APP/2018/1295**  
(Agenda Item 9)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of two x 3-bed semi-detached dwelling houses with associated parking and amenity space following the demolition of existing outbuilding. This was a resubmission. Officers highlight the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application with 85 signatures from Northwood residents. Residents were upset and angry that another application had been submitted. This application was virtually identical to the application last year and there was no logical reason to approve it. It was submitted that by changing the property's purpose from a swimming pool to a dwelling would contradict the permitted development certificate that the applicant had. The independent approved inspector for the site referred it back to the Council as the owner builder had done nothing right. The petitioner stressed that the building should be torn down. The proposed developments would make the drainage problem worse and not help the low water pressure some residents encountered, impact parking and showed a disregard for the area. The trees and greenery formed an integral part of the character of the area, and needed to be protected and the wildlife. The petitioner hoped that the Committee would agree.

There was no applicant/agent present for the item.

Members commented that they agreed with the concerns raised by the petitioner.

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

**RESOLVED – That the application be refused, subject to the clarification listed in the addendum.**

30. **51 WIELAND ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 17990/APP/2018/1101** (Agenda Item 10)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning

permission was sought for the variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission ref: 17990/APP/2015/645 dated 24/04/2015 to permit changes to the basement and fenestration (Part two storey, part first floor rear extension, construction of basement, conversion of garage to habitable use, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 rear roof lights, alterations to front elevation and demolition of existing rear element). Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval

The Head of Planning drew the Committee's attention to a briefing sheet on the local plan part II. He advised the Committee that the plans before the Committee did not cite policies from the emerging part II local plans. Members were referred to paragraph 216 of the national planning policy framework. The Head of Planning highlighted that reference was made to the word "may", and talked the Committee through the three key criterias, highlighting that although draft policies had been published and been subject to public consultation, they had not gone through an inspector evaluation process.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application on behalf of the Gateshill Residents Association and submitted that the submissions due to be made would be made primarily on the comments in the officer's report, not the comments on the local plan part II. The petitioner referred to documents that were circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting. The petitioner stated that the Council had been putting together the development management policies since 2014. The policies that officers made were sent out for public consultation twice and on neither occasion where any amendments made. The petitioner submitted that the policies did have weight and covered requirements for developments to harmonise with existing street scenes, complement amenity and character of residential area and to be unobtrusive. These are the existing current policies. The petitioner accepted that permission was granted but submitted that the application differed from the application approved. There were significant changes. In summary, the petitioner requested officers to clarify the full length, full width and additional full width of the basement proposals as it would damage the amenity of neighbours and that the front and side light wells and the removal of conifers as they were all contrary to BE 5/6, 13, 15 and 19. The petitioner asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent addressed the Committee and submitted that permission for this development had been lawfully commenced and the proposal for an enlargement for an approved basement together with alterations were highlighted by the officers were relatively minor. It was critical to consider the permission granted on appeal for the replacement dwelling, which included a large basement of a comparable size. The inspector raised no issues with the size of that basement. The agent highlighted that a scheme was put forward last year for another replacement dwelling, with a basement and although Members refused that application it was not on the grounds of basement, they refused it on the basis of above ground works which was the subject of the appeal at the moment. There was no objection from the conservation officer, flood water officer or urban design team.

In response to a Member question, the agent said that the lightwells were in the scheme submitted last year.

Members considered that the application depended on the clarification on the difference in size between what the applicant was looking to do now compared to what the inspector provided planning permission. Members questioned officers in relation to the measures and sought clarification on how different it was. Officers confirmed that they did not have the precise dimensions. It was noted that there was an appeal

decision that allowed a basement, then an application was refused but not on the basement grounds. This basement mirrored the basement that the Committee did not previously have an issue with. Officers reiterated that previously, the Committee decided that the basement was considered acceptable. Officers confirmed that it was marginally bigger.

Members required further information as to what marginally bigger meant and they needed more information on the dimensions. Members also questioned the new policies and the Head of Planning confirmed that there were no strict basement policies.

The meeting was adjourned at 08:55 to allow officers to obtain further information in relation to the dimensions of the basement.

The meeting resumed at 21:15 and additional documents were circulated to Members. Officers double-checked the plan and it was confirmed that the depth of the basement before the Committee was 3.8 metres deeper and there was a depth of approximately 23 metres as opposed to 20 metres. There was an extra 3 or so metres difference. Both conservation and flood water officers had no objections to the proposals in any way. The width was the same.

Members discussed the difference in measurements and concluded that the difference in basement sizes was not a marginal change. Officers worked out a percentage of the total depth and it was concluded to be around the 15 percent mark.

The Head of Planning commented that there was no reason to refuse the application as there was no strict policy. Members also questioned how many extra light wells the application had.

The Head of Planning explained Members had two options; firstly to approve the officer report or secondly to request a more comprehensive report. The Head of Planning noted the concerns of Members which were not covered in the original report.

For clarity, the Chairman said that the officers indicated that there were no refusal reasons to hold up at appeal. It was clear there were some concerns regarding the size of the basement, the number of lightwells and the impact on neighbours. Members asked officers to research previous schemes to find out what size the basements were. Officers were also asked to seek clarification on whether there were any flooding issues. The Committee agreed that a more robust report was required to make a proper and informed determination.

A motion was called for the item to be deferred pending further information. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously.

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

31. **AUDIT HOUSE, 260 FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP - 19365/APP/2017/3088** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of rooftop extensions to existing building to provide nine residential flats, façade alterations and associated works at Audit House. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

	<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 as per officer's recommendations and subject to the changes in the addendum.</b></p>
32.	<p><b>CANADA HOUSE, 272 FIELD END ROAD, RUISLIP - 3894/APP/2018/498</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the erection of rooftop extensions to existing building to provide nine units, facade alterations and associated works. Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</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, subject to changes in the addendum.</b></p>
33.	<p><b>4 ASHBURTON ROAD, RUISLIP - 15579/APP/2018/642</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for a part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension, 4 x detached garages to rear and conversion of dwelling from 1 x 4-bed to 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed dwellings with parking and amenity space. This was a resubmission. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously refused.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED – That the application be refused as per officer's recommendations.</b></p>
34.	<p><b>178-182 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 28388/APP/2018/1303</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Officers had regard to the officer's report. Planning permission was sought for the change of use of part of ground floor from shops to letting office including new entrance and alterations to rear and side elevations. Officers made a recommendation for approval.</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 as per officer's recommendations.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.15 pm, closed at 9.38 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 27 7655. 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.**