

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

20 November 2019

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Martin Goddard, Becky Haggard, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, John Oswell and Raju Sansarpuri</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
83.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
84.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
85.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED That: the minutes of the meeting dated 16 October 2019 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
86.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
87.	<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 the items of business marked Part I (items 1 – 11) would be considered in public and the item of business marked Part II (item 12) would be considered in private.</p>
88.	<p>WOODLANDS CARE HOME, 84 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - 74274/APP/2019/1180 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Extension to the existing care home to provide 14 new rooms.</p>

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum and Agenda B. It was noted that two amended plans altering the layout of room number 32 had been received post publication of the agenda; these partly addressed reason for refusal no.2. Members were informed that the proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale, bulk and design would fail to harmonise with the original building and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene. The site was located in the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. The Committee was informed that the proposed development would be visible from no. 84 and would completely fill the visual gap between the Care Home and the Day Centre.

A petitioner (the Manager of the Care Home) addressed the Committee in support of the application. Members were informed that the Care Home had formed part of the local community since the 1980's and had specialised in dementia care since 2014. Adaptations were now required to enable it to meet the needs of its residents. Councillors were advised that a CQC inspection of the Home had found it to be 'outstanding'. It was reported that the proposed extension would facilitate social and communicative interaction amongst the residents.

The Committee was informed that pre-application advice had been sought on 31/10/18 and the proposal had been deemed to be acceptable in principle at that time. In September 2019, the applicant had received notification that the Conservation Officer had recommended that the application be refused. With regard to the infilling of the visual gap, the petitioner stated that there were already other examples of this along the same road. The petitioner indicated that he was happy to work with the Council and would consider cladding to make the extension more aesthetically pleasing. It was reported that a number of residents and families had expressed support for the application.

Members sought further clarification regarding the gap between the pre-application advice and the proposal. The Head of Planning commented that it was important to balance the benefits of the proposal against the potential harm to the Conservation Area. A large extension could be supported by the planning department but, in this case, the proposed extension was considered to be excessively bulky.

Councillors commented that the Care Home had a very good reputation and suggested that the applicant work with the Council's planning department to agree an acceptable scheme. The Head of Planning commented that a first re-submission would not be chargeable.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote agreed with 7 votes in support of the recommendation and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED That: the application be refused.

89. **21 MAXWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 33030/APP/2019/2247** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of Use from A1 Retail to D1 Pre-school Nursery to include replacement of shopfront and installation of windows, rooflights and kitchen ventilation system.

Officers introduced the application. Members were informed that the site was for commercial purposes and had been vacant since September 2018. It was noted that there was a demand for A1 retail usage in the area and concerns were raised that the loss of a retail unit would erode the retail function of the area, harming the vitality of the centre. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy and was recommended for

refusal. Moreover, the Highways department had raised concerns regarding the parking implications of the proposed nursery and the risks to pedestrian safety.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that the site was not the correct location for such a proposal. Three main objections were raised in relation to:

- The lack of parking provision for staff and parents which it was believed could result in people parking inappropriately;
- The fact that the application site lay within the Northwood Conservation area - there was no desire to lose a retail unit in such a location; and
- The lack of play space and window space which rendered the location unsuitable.

Members commented that the premises were clearly unsuitable for the intended purpose and expressed concern that, particularly in view of the lack of parking provision, the proposed nursery would result in increased traffic chaos along an already very busy road. The Committee felt the site was not appropriate and was too small to house a pre-school nursery.

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

RESOLVED That: the application be refused.

90. **17 WOODGATE CRESCENT, NORTHWOOD - 42270/APP/2019/703** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Single storey extension to storage shed (Retrospective)

Officers introduced the report. Members were informed that the extension failed to harmonise with the architectural composition of the existing outbuilding. It was also considered to be detrimental to the character of the Area of Special Local Character and to the amenity of the adjoining occupier at number 15 (by reason of overshadowing, loss of outlook and loss of light).

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application advising the Committee that his mother resided in a neighbouring house. Members were informed that the storage building was easily visible from his mother's living room and had been built without planning permission or building control. Previously, there had been a small low coal shed in situ, but this had been replaced with a much bigger and higher building which ran for 8m along the boundary. The Committee was advised that the two buildings now in place were separated by a small gap of approximately 40 cm giving the impression of one very long building. Moreover, the extension had been constructed of breeze blocks; this was not in keeping with the red brick house. The petitioner stated that bushes and trees had been removed and conifers cut back; as a result, the view from his mother's house was of a long high wall along the boundary. A Member of the Gatehill (Northwood) Residents Association also addressed the Committee advising that the Association also objected to this retrospective application and requesting that it be refused.

The applicant / agent spoke in response to the petitioner. Councillors were informed that the brick façade over the storage shed had collapsed as a large branch of the pine tree had fallen on it. This had caused the roof of the shed to collapse. Furthermore, there had been two large unsightly diesel tanks behind the storage space which were rusty and potentially dangerous. Members were informed that it had been essential to

do the works to improve the visual amenity and to make the environment safe.

The applicant stated that the new extension was relatively small and had been built to the rear of the pre-existing storage shed; the height was the same as previously and there was approximately 8m of open space between the edge of the extension wall and the neighbour's property. The Committee was advised that the materials used for the front façade were bricks to match the existing. The side wall of the extension was breeze blocks which had been rendered; this was in keeping with materials used in the area and consistent with the various policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan. Members were informed that there was no loss of visual amenity or adverse impact on the Special Local Character as the extension could not be seen from any public vantage point. There was a thick screen of trees and shrubs blocking any public views of the extension. Moreover, the applicant commented that the extension had no windows and was screened by a row of pine trees and shrubs along the boundary with the neighbour at number 15. It was claimed that the tall pine trees had a greater impact on light than the extension and that the restored front elevation enhanced visual amenity. The applicant made reference to sections 117, 118 and paragraph 54 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 in support of the works carried out.

In conclusion, it was claimed that the reasons for refusal were not justified.

Ward Councillor Morgan addressed the Committee in objection to the application commenting that officers' photos did not fully demonstrate the actual impact of the extension on number 15. Members were informed that the extension was excessively large and had been built right up to the boundary wall necessitating the removal of shrubs and low branches.

The Committee commented that the extension was clearly problematic and unacceptable. It was agreed that non-standard refusal reason 2 be amended by the Head of Planning to remove reference to 'overshadowing' and 'loss of light'. Planning enforcement would be requested to review the site in its entirety.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed, subject to the amendment of non-standard reason for refusal 2.

RESOLVED That:

- 1. the application be refused;**
- 2. that authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend reason for refusal 2 to remove reference to 'overshadowing' and 'loss of light'; and**
- 3. planning enforcement be requested to review the site in its entirety.**

91. **5 CHILTERN ROAD, EASTCOTE - 54673/APP/2019/2201** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Installation of raised patio to rear (Retrospective)

Officers introduced the report. The development was recommended for refusal due to its size, scale, bulk and design as it represented an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development, detrimental to the character, appearance and architectural composition of the existing property and to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at no. 3 Chiltern Road.

Members noted the reasons for refusal and agreed with the officer's recommendation. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be refused.

92. **53-55 THE BROADWAY, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 5564/APP/2019/2892**
(Agenda Item 10)

Proposed new shopfront, ramp and 4 x cycle stands.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the information in the addendum. Members were informed that the application was considered to be acceptable in principle and with regard to its impact on the street scene, neighbours, the local highway network, landscaping and access. A Section 106 agreement would need to be entered into to secure a Highway Stopping-Up Order. It was noted that point A in the Recommendation section of the report (which referred to the Mayor of London) had been included in error and would need to be removed.

Members raised no concerns in respect of the application. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

93. **121 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP - 543/APP/2019/1989** *(Agenda Item 11)*

Change of use from Hairdressers (Use Class A1) to Nail Bar (Sui Generis)

Officers introduced the report. Members were informed that there was no objection in principle to the scheme as the majority of the parade would remain in A1 use. The proposal would not result in a loss of residential amenity and the demand for parking and traffic generation from the proposed use would not differ significantly from the previous use.

Councillors raised no concerns regarding this application. The officer's recommendation was therefore moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

94. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** *(Agenda Item 12)*

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, be agreed; and,**
- 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 purpose of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

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).

95. **53-55 THE BROADWAY, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 5564/APP/2019/3483**
(Agenda Item 11a)

Replacement of existing entrance doors and sidelight with new shopfront.

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the proposed amendment to the recommendation as outlined in the addendum. It was noted that the application was associated with the reinstatement of a Public House use to the site, which was a designated Asset of Community Value. It was therefore considered to be in the public interest to expedite determination. It was recommended that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to make the final decision (in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead) once the public consultation period had expired.

Members noted that this was the only Asset of Community Value in the Borough. No concerns were raised by the Committee. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED That:

- 1) the application be approved;**
- 2) delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead to determine the application after the expiry of the consultation period (including the removal of conditions 3 and 4 if satisfactory details are received).**

The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.40 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.