

**Minutes**

**North Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, 23 February 2010**  
**Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,**  
**High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**



**Published on:**  
**Come into effect on: Immediately**

	<p><b>Members Present:</b></p> <p>Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman)  Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman)  Michael Markham  John Oswell  David Payne  Peter Curling  Judith Cooper</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillors Brian Crowe, Philip Corthorne and Scott Seaman-Digby</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b></p> <p>James Rodger, Meg Hirani, Syed Shah, Matthew Gilks and Nadia Williams</p>
1.	<p><b>Apologies for Absence</b></p> <p>Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Anita MacDonald and Carol Melvin. Councillors Peter Curling and Judith Copper attended in their place.</p>
2.	<p><b>Declarations of Interest in matters coming before this meeting</b></p> <p>There were no declarations of interest notified.</p>
3.	<p><b>To sign and receive the minutes of 4 February 2010</b></p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>
4.	<p><b>Matters that have been notified in advance or urgent</b></p> <p>There had been no items notified as urgent.</p>

5.	<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></p> <p>It was agreed that all items of business would be considered in public with the exception of Items 10, 11 and 12 which were considered in PART II</p>	
6.	<p><b>Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip</b></p> <p><b>Erection of 66 dwellings comprising of 2 three storey apartment blocks providing 30 apartments (1 x studio; 5 x one-bedroom; 21 x two-bedroom; and 3 x three-bedroom units) and 36 x three-bedroom houses with associated car parking, landscaping and access (involving the demolition of existing buildings.)</b></p> <p><b>6157/APP/2009/2069</b></p> <p>The Chairman of the Ruislip Conservation Panel spoke in objection to the application and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development would have a detrimental effect on the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and would be out of keeping with the two storey residential developments</li> <li>• The development, so close to listed buildings would be inappropriate</li> <li>• The hang-over roof work could be better improved</li> <li>• The reduction in the number of houses was welcomed, but the space between could be landscaped</li> <li>• Insufficient parking proposed for the development, particularly in an area already suffering from heavy traffic</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting and spoke in objection to the application. The agent also spoke in support of the application.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objected to the greater height and proximity of the development to his home</li> <li>• Concerned about the height of the development with no obscure windows right next to his single storey home</li> <li>• Concerned that the semi eaves, 3 storey high would dwarf his own building</li> <li>• Concerned that the planned parking spaces, with no spare spaces would be inappropriate for the proposed 66 housing development</li> <li>• Commented that a proper vehicular traffic generation was needed to be conducted</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>

- Suggested that yellow lines be introduced on one side of the roads at Pinn Way and Bury Street to increase public safety.

Points raised by the agent:

- Had had long discussions with officers and local residents to make best use of the scheme
- Many changes had been made during the discussion process of the application
- There had been one-to-one meetings with occupiers of properties abutting the site to get residents' concerns, and this had resulted with just one objection from a resident immediately to the development
- Consideration had been given to the impact of the development on the conservation area
- With regard to parking positions, it was difficult to include the actual positions on the plan
- Would accept the Committee including a clause on the S106 agreement to provide for parking studies
- Blocks 11 and 12 had been set back 1.5 metres and 9 metres in depth
- Proposed 26 metres boundary compared to existing boundary
- The result of the application had been due to the successful negotiations with Council officers.

Three Ward Councillors addressed the meeting in support of the petitioner. They raised the following points:

- The Council must continue to look at the issue of overdevelopment in the Conservation area
- Conditions should be put in place to take account of the condition of the fabric of the building, as it deteriorates over time
- Having worked so hard, dismayed that the development would undermine the value of the Conservation area
- Did not accept that the parking standards would reflect the likely level of car ownership of the occupiers
- Noted that the petition was in respect of the resident at No. 25 Bury Street that would be most affected by the development
- Concerned that plots 11 and 12 would have a detrimental effect on the resident at No 25 Bury Street
- Commented that the bricks in front of the single-storey building did not reach the height of the façade
- Asked that block 12 be moved down to the bottom of the garden at No 25 Bury Street
- Otherwise, had no objection to the development of the site

- Noted that the current proposal in respect of parking was an improvement to the earlier proposals
- Suggested that the buildings in the areas dated back to the Fourteenth Century
- Instead of changing the height of the existing buildings, suggested that they be relocated to the bottom of the garden at No 25 Bury Street
- Expressed concerns about the insufficient provisions for parking, and the effects it would have on an area already experiencing parking problems.

Officers explained that 15 metres was the distance set down in the Supplementary Planning Guide in respect of widows near flank walls, and this would not apply in respect of this development. Due consideration was needed to be given to the existing building behind the site, which was at an angle.

In respect of overdevelopment, officers advised that the density land planned scheme was in compliance, and that the scheme meet with all the criteria set by the Council.

Officers explained that in respect of parking provisions, parking spaces would be allocated to specific units and that double bank spaces would not obstruct spaces allocated to a specific unit.

The Committee was informed that the London Plan did not stipulated that flats could not be built in conservation areas.

A Member requested that the laurel bush bordering the rear gardens in Sharps Lane be retained and supplemented. That wooden fencing be extended around the whole site, as there was currently a mix of concrete and wooden fencing.

Officers responded that Condition 2 could be amended to include the requirement for the submission of details of fencing around the site.

In answer to an issue raised in relation to electric vehicular charging points, officers advised that Condition 33 could be amended to increase the number of electric charging points stipulated.

It was noted that the survey of the site showed that there were no other species other than bats.

In response to issues raised, officers advised that Condition 2 could be amended to include details of finishing to timber cladding, which would enable officers to check the finishing prior to use.

For point of clarification, officers advised that Condition 21 could

be amended to include the requirement for details for specific cycle storage in the rear gardens to be provided.

A Member added that specific dimensions should be outlined for storage in respect of houses with back gardens, to ensure that storage was sufficient for garden tools and adequate facility for cycle storage. It should be stipulated that no petrol driven tools should be stored in the house or the garden.

Following discussion, the recommendation for delegated power to be given to the Director of Planning and Community Services and/or the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed, subject to the conditions and in formatives in the report, addendum sheet and the amended conditions 2, 21 and 33 to be endorsed in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

### **RESOLVED**

**That delegated power be given to the Director of Planning and Community Services and/or the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission subject to the following:**

- 1. That the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicants under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:**
  - i. Education: a financial contribution of £486,065 (Nursery £51,620; Primary £220,141; Secondary £214,304)**
  - ii. Health: a financial contribution of £29,807.29**
  - iii. Open Space: a financial contribution of £57,000**
  - iv. Community facilities: a financial contribution of £30,000**
  - v. Libraries: a financial contribution of £3,161.11**
  - vi. Construction Training: a financial contribution in the sum of £20,000**
  - vii. Project Management and Monitoring: a contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contributions secured from the scheme**
  - viii. Transport: a s278 is required to be entered into to address the new site access and potentially waiting restrictions**
  - ix. A bond of £25,000 to cover the cost of any parking and safety remedial measures in case of these arising as a result of the development, or an undertaking that**

if deemed necessary by the Council, the developer will submit a parking and safety improvement study and implement the works agreed by the Council

x. The internal estate roads to be constructed in accordance with the Council's standards (including street lighting), with the developer to cover the costs of detailed design review and site inspection.

2. That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the S106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.

3. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.

4. That if the S106 Agreement has not been finalised by the 1 March 2010, the application be refused for the following reason:

The applicant has failed to provide contributions towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of education, health, open space, community facilities and libraries, construction and employment training facilities). The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.

5. That the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, addendum sheet and the following amended conditions and additional informative be attached:

**Additional Conditions:**

2. No development shall take place until details and/or samples of all materials, colours and finishes to be used on all external surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include:

- (i) fenestration and doors
- (ii) timber cladding (including details of finishes)
- (iii) balconies
- (iv) boundary walls and railings
- (v) porches/canopies
- (vi) timber pergolas/car barns
- (vii) external lighting

**(viii) comprehensive colour scheme for all built details**

**Reason**

**To ensure that the development presents a satisfactory appearance in accordance with Policy BE13 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).**

**21. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be commenced until details of covered and secure cycle storage for 66 cycles in total, including provision for the houses within their own curtilage, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter permanently retained.**

**Reason**

**To ensure the provision and retention of facilities for cyclists to the development and hence the availability of sustainable forms of transport to the site in accordance with Policy AM9 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Chapter 3C of the London Plan (February 2008).**

**33. Before development commences, plans and details of two electric vehicle charging points, serving the development and capable of charging multiple vehicles simultaneously, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason**

**To encourage sustainable travel and to comply with London Plan Policy 4A.3.**

**Additional Informative:**

**The applicants should note that in submitting details in connection with Condition 10 of this permission it is expected that the Laurel hedge bordering the gardens of the properties on Sharps Lane will be retained and supplemented with additional planting to provide a substantial screen between the development site and the properties on Sharps Lane.**

<p>7.</p>	<p><b>Former Mill Works, Bury Street, Ruislip</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of existing buildings (Application for Conservation Area Consent.)</b></p> <p><b>6157/APP/2009/2070</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>
<p>8.</p>	<p><b>Former Highgrove Day Nursery, Campbell Close, Ruislip –</b></p> <p>1 four-bedroom detached house.</p> <p><b>48552/APP/2009/2334</b></p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>
<p>9.</p>	<p><b>151 High Street, Ruislip</b></p> <p>Change of use from Class A1 (Shops) to Mixed Use Class A3 / A5 (Restaurant with takeaway facility), with associated flue at rear.</p> <p><b>11899/app/2009/2540</b></p> <p>Officers reported that a previous application on this site was refused in 2009. However, it later became apparent that permission granted in 2006 was still valid.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns about the detrimental effect the vibration of the duct system would have on occupiers of the residential flat above the property.</p> <p>Officers advised that the Committee could attach an additional condition to control the level of noise.</p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>



	<p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed, subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report, the additional condition in the addendum sheet and the following additional condition. That the wording for the additional condition to be endorsed in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved, subject to conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the following additional condition:</b></p> <p><b>The development hereby approved shall not commence until a scheme for the control of vibration emanating from any proposed plant and equipment (air conditioning, refrigeration units, extract equipment etc) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall then be fully implemented and thereafter shall be retained and maintained in good working order for so long as the building remains in use.</b></p> <p><b>REASON</b> To safeguard the amenity of the occupants of surrounding properties in accordance with policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</p>	
10.	<p><b>Enforcement Report</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</li> <li>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>
11.	<p><b>Enforcement Report</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</li> <li>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>

12.	<p><b>Enforcement Report</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed, subject to amendments to recommendation 1.3(i).</p> <p>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Meg Hirani</b></p>
	<p>The meeting closed at 9.00pm.</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams 01895 277655. Circulations of these minutes are to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.