

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

9 January 2019

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

	<p>Committee Members Present:</p> <p>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>LBH Officers Present:</p> <p>Matt Kolaszewski (Planning Team Manager), Richard Michalski (Highways Officer), Kerrie Munro (Legal Officer), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer) and James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration)</p>
128.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
129.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Higgins declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 7 as a resident had discussed the matter with him. He left the room prior to commencement of the discussion on this item.</p>
130.	<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 4 December 2018 be approved as an accurate record.</p>
131.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
132.	<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 of business were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
133.	<p>53 & 53A HAWTHORNE AVENUE, EASTCOTE - 15248/APP/2018/3353 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Officers presented the application which sought planning permission for the erection of two x 2 storey, 3-bed semi detached dwellings with habitable roofspace, 1 x 4-bed detached dwelling with habitable roofspace with parking and amenity space, installation of a vehicular crossover and demolition of the existing bungalows. A similar application had previously been refused due to insufficient parking provision. In the current application six car parking spaces would be provided - two for each of the semi-detached houses and two for the detached property. It was not considered that the development would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application. Key points raised were:-

- 58 residents had signed a petition objecting to the proposal;
- The proposed planning conditions addressed some, but not all, of residents' concerns;
- It was alleged that a case could be made regarding the detrimental impact on neighbours - particularly those at 48a and 50 Lime Grove;
- It was claimed that there would be a sense of dominance due to the increased height of the proposed buildings which would effectively be three-storeys high;
- It was suggested that the application did not meet the requirements of B20, B21 and B24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan;
- Residents felt the site was being overdeveloped - two small bungalows would be replaced by new dwellings which could potentially accommodate a total of 19 people;
- Most houses along that side of Hawthorne Avenue were small therefore the new development would not be in keeping with the road.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the application. Key points mentioned included:-

- It was claimed that the proposed development had been designed to match the existing houses and be similar in style to no.55;
- Adequate parking was now being proposed;
- The internal area would exceed the minimum standards required;
- The proposed vehicular crossovers had been approved by the Highways team;
- It was claimed that there would be no detrimental impact on visual amenity;
- The development would not exacerbate parking stress in the road;
- In response to questions, it was confirmed that the previously proposed scheme did not include rear dormer windows.

Members requested clarification regarding the matter of overlooking resulting from the proposed dormer windows and it was confirmed that the legal distances would be met.

With regards to parking, the Head of Planning responded to Councillors' questions advising that it would not be possible to withdraw rights to parking permits in this situation since sufficient parking was being proposed as part of the scheme.

Councillors expressed some concerns regarding the proposed development citing potential over-development and height issues. It was confirmed that the previous scheme had not been refused on matters relating to size and scale. The dormers were deemed to be acceptable.

Clarification was requested regarding the lamppost to the front of the property. The

Highways Officer confirmed that the developers would have to pay for the adjustment / relocation of said lamp column if necessary.

Councillors raised no further objections. The Committee therefore moved, seconded and, on voting, agreed the officer's recommendation with 7 Members voting in favour and 1 voting against the proposal.

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

134. **SPRINGWELL BARN, SPRINGWELL LANE, HAREFIELD - 50620/APP/2018/1517** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Councillor Higgins had declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item and left the room prior to the discussion and voting.

Officers introduced the application which sought planning permission for the erection of a single storey infill extension, internal and external alterations and conversion from a single 5-bed dwelling to 2 x 3-bed dwellings. Members were advised that the site lay within the Green Belt. Planning permission had originally been granted in 1991 and was renewed in 1996. There had been no changes to green belt policy since that time. It was confirmed that the proposed unit sizes met the required standards.

Councillors commented that the proposed development raised no issues in terms of height and bulk.

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

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

135. **3 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 4075/APP/2018/3495** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the application and tabled an addendum relating to condition 3. The application sought planning permission for a boundary wall to the front of the property (part retrospective). Members were informed that the street scene was residential in character and appearance comprising a mix of properties with small boundary walls and hedges.

Members commented that the boundary fence would make a positive contribution to the street scene as there were already a number of similar boundary walls along the road.

Members raised no objections. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously approved.

RESOLVED That: the application be approved.

136. **514 & 514A VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP - 72489/APP/2018/3204** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers presented the application which sought to remove Condition 7 (Secured by Design) of planning permission for the change of use from a shop (Use Class A1) to a children's nursery (Use Class D1) including alterations to elevations.

Members were informed that a site visit had been carried out by officers alongside the Metropolitan Police. The Secured by Design Officers at the Metropolitan Police had

objected to the removal of Condition 7 and raised concerns relating to the security of the premises. It was confirmed that security at the site included a key code entry system, palisade fencing and CCTV. The Police had stated that the key code system was not secure and requested that it be removed.

Councillors sought further clarification regarding the security currently in place at another premises a few doors away (at 524 / 526 Victoria Road) which had the same owner. It was confirmed that Security by Design had been awarded to said premises on 18 December 2014. In response to Councillors' questions, it was also confirmed that security measures in place at the two sites were broadly the same. In view of this, Members raised concerns that there appeared to be an inconsistency in the approach of the Metropolitan Police regarding the two sites. Should the current applicant appeal against the decision, it was felt that the Council would be in a difficult position.

Members agreed that the inconsistency was a concern and wished to explore the Secure by Design policy further to better understand this. The Head of Planning and Enforcement agreed to discuss the matter further with the Police in order to gain a better understanding of the issue and, potentially, establish a more robust reason for refusal.

The Committee moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to defer the decision to enable the Head of Planning and Enforcement to discuss the matter further with the Metropolitan Police.

RESOLVED That: the decision on this application be deferred to enable the Head of Planning and Enforcement to discuss it further with the Metropolitan Police.

137. **SECTION 106 QUARTERLY REPORT** (*Agenda Item 10*)

RESOLVED That: the report be noted.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.14 pm, closed at 7.58 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.