

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

12 March 2019

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Scott Farley, Martin Goddard, Becky Haggard, Henry Higgins, John Oswell, Robin Sansarpuri and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Matt Kolaszewski (Planning Team Manager), Kerrie Munro (Planning Lawyer), Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
161.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
162.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
163.	<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 held on 19 February 2019 be approved as a correct record.</p>
164.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
165.	<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 items 1-11 were marked as Part I and would be considered in public. Item 12 was marked as Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
166.	<p>LAND ADJACENT TO 10 TURNSTONE CLOSE - 74303/APP/2018/3920 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 3-bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, confirming that for the reasons of incongruity with the</p>

existing character and appearance of the area, the application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Points highlighted included:

- Local residents supported refusal for the reasons outlined within the officer's report.
- There were inaccuracies within the application proposal relating to the rear garden of No 11 Turnstone Close.
- There was no access from Turnstone Close listed within the plans.
- Turnstone Close was a small cul-de-sac which already had issues with access by the emergency services and to resident driveways.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee. Points highlighted included:

- The technical standards relating to height as listed within refusal reason 2 had been misapplied. The application did meet the requirements when correctly applied.
- There was no unacceptable impact on neighbouring residents, with no undue loss of privacy or increased noise.
- The application was in line with a pre-existing pattern of development in the area, and provided its own parking and secure garden space.
- The Local and London Plans stated that Authorities should give weight to applications that boosted housing provision.
- Trees and shrubs were to be retained.
- The Ickenham Residents Association had not made any comments objecting to the proposal.
- Officer statements offering advice, without objection, had not been included within the report.
- There were no objections from the Council's Conservation officer.
- The report by the Heritage Specialist had deemed the proposal to be acceptable.

Members sought clarity on a number of points raised by the agent, including the assertion that the bedroom height was compliant with standards, and whether the proposed development would include its own garden.

The agent confirmed that, in line with prevailing standards, the height of the entire dwelling must be taken into consideration, rather than just one room. While one bedroom's height was marginally lower than standards, over 75% of the total dwelling was of sufficient height, and was therefore compliant. With regard to the garden, the existing garden at No 11 was very long. The proposed division would allow both properties to retain a garden that was in excess of the guidance's required size.

Officers advised that, following the agent's comments regarding refusal reason 2, it was agreed that this refusal reason should be removed. However, reason 1 remained and was considered sufficient to retain the officer's recommendation to refuse the application.

Members supported refusal reason 1, and the officers' recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

167. **DUCKS HILL FARM - 5907/APP/2018/4177** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Change of use of land to B8 (Storage) and the siting of 36 shipping containers

Officers introduced the report, and asserted that due to a principle of inappropriate development and resulting harm to the Green belt, the application was recommended for refusal.

A petition in objection had been received, though the petitioner was unable to attend the meeting. In their absence, the Chairman read a statement forwarded by the petitioner. Points highlighted included:

- The land in question was in the Green Belt, and the proposed storage would be clearly seen when travelling by road. The location of 36 shipping containers on the land would therefore be visually intrusive.
- The National Planning Policy Framework set out the planning position regarding development of land within the Green Belt, and the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2, the October 2015 edition, closely follows the NPPF.
- Clause 6.18 stated that a change of use or development on land in the Green Belt is 'inappropriate' development except in 'Very Special Circumstances'.
- The application did not contain relevant 'Very Special Circumstances,' that alter the proposal from being 'inappropriate.'
- Development of farming land for storage was not an acceptable alternative as provided under Clause 2.33 for Farm Diversification, and, in particular, the adverse impact on the landscape quality.
- Concerns remained regarding the impact of more traffic along Ducks Hill Road, particularly in relation to larger vehicles turning into the site on what was a high traffic road.

The applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application. Points highlighted included:

- The positive impact of the site in future years would outweigh any potential visual impact.
- The proposal was in line with NPPF policies on sustainable agricultural areas.
- Of the three farms on Ducks Hill Road, only the applicant's provided products for human consumption. This was not very profitable.
- Investment in machinery and buildings had been made to provide for increased agricultural development, to further increase profit in future years.
- There were no other objections raised within the report, other than the visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt. There were no issues with traffic or environment.

Members were sympathetic to the applicant, but felt that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the appearance and character of the Green Belt.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

168. **R/O 17-21 THE CLOSE - 11448/APP/2018/2541** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Two storey building for use as Class B1 (Business) (Outline Application with all matters reserved)

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. The Committee was reminded that the application had been deferred from the meeting held on 30 January 2019 to allow officers to provide detail on the heights of the previous applications that had been taken to appeal. This information was set out within the officer's report, which confirmed that the proposed height of 5.5m was correlative to the height of the application approved in 2008 by way of appeal. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

169. **THE KINGS ARMS PUB, 6 PARK LANE - 74218/APP/2018/3542** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Erection of boundary fence

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the proposal was considered acceptable in principle and with regard to its impact on highway and pedestrian safety, the setting of Listed Buildings, the visual amenity of the street scene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

170. **WETHERBY HOUSE - 68153/APP/2018/2612** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Erection of a two storey building with habitable roofspace and a basement to include 9 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated parking and installation of vehicular crossover, involving demolition of existing two storey building

Officers introduced the report and addendum, confirming that the site was last in use as a nursery but was now vacant. The proposal was considered to be in keeping with the keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene, and would not result in loss of amenity for adjoining occupiers, formed an appropriate relationship with the setting to the nearby Aldis Hall, and with Glen Conservation Area. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The addendum was referred to, which set out the stronger wording on Condition 7 and clarified that the electric charging point numbers should correctly list 5 active and 5 passive spaces. In addition, comments on page 85 of the report were to be deleted, as they had been included in error.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

171.	<p>FORMER ARLA DAIRY SITE - 66819/ADV/2018/75 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Installation of various signage</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, confirming that the proposal was for 3 additional signs to be installed on the site, which already contained signage on plinths. 25 objections had been received, which had focussed on potential antisocial behaviour as a result of the installation, including graffiti. These concerns over antisocial behaviour had been separately referred to the Council's ASBET team.</p> <p>As it was considered that there were no concerns over safety, and that the proposal would comply with the relevant policies, the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
172.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was 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 purposes of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <p><i>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 1085 as amended).</i></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.30 pm, closed at 8.27 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.