

## Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

19 February 2020

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Duncan Flynn (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Martin Goddard, Becky Haggar, Henry Higgins, Carol Melvin, John Oswell, Raju Sansarpuri and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Glen Egan (Legal Advisor), Matt Kolaszewski (Planning Team Manager), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p> <p><b>In attendance:</b>  Councillor John Morgan (Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills)</p>
117.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Eddie Lavery with Councillor Steve Tuckwell substituting.</p>
118.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
119.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting dated 22 January 2020 be approved as an accurate record, subject to amending minute 113 (17 Elgood Avenue, Northwood Hills) to read:</p> <p><i>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with 5 Members voting in favour and 3 abstentions.</i></p>
120.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Agenda item 12 - Enforcement Report had been withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.</p>

121.	<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 were marked Part I and would therefore be considered in public.</p>
122.	<p><b>60 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM - 70282/APP/2019/2773</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two storey detached building with habitable roof space to provide 8 x 2-bed flats with associated amenity space and parking and installation of vehicular crossover.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to documents that had been circulated to Members and the applicant/agent prior to the meeting. The Committee was thanked for its support since this process had begun in 2017, however disappointment was expressed at the officer's recommendation for approval. Objections were made on three grounds namely that the development would cause a lack of amenity, loss of privacy and overdevelopment. It was submitted that there had been no changes made to the plans for parking, refuse or bike storage since the last application. It was emphasised that there was a high fear of pest issues due to the insufficient refuse arrangements. Overlooking was also a concern as the development would cause a loss of privacy and the additional side windows were questioned. It was submitted that the last minute changes greatly impacted neighbouring properties. The petitioners urged the Committee to support their objections and asked for assurance on what measures would be put into place to manage the issues raised.</p> <p>The architect for the application addressed the Committee and referred to amended plans which had been circulated to Members, officers and the petition organiser prior to the meeting. The application had been recommended for approval by officers and it was highlighted that the proposed changes were fairly minimal. The amenity space and scheme were considered acceptable and met the Council's current standards. It was explained that the neighbouring properties had an opportunity of consultations and notice of the development was provided in sufficient time allowing people to respond. The Committee was informed that an objection that was raised was acknowledged and rectified quickly by the architect and applicant. It was submitted that the scheme was virtually identical to the original scheme and would be a good addition to the housing stock. The Committee was asked to judge the current scheme on its own merits not on any future schemes.</p> <p>Members were advised by the Head of Planning that the level of change was unsubstantial and possible reasons for refusal were limited. The overlooking concerns were explained by officers and it was noted that the impact on different neighbours would be different. The proposed development included an eight flat scheme resulting in two obscured glazed roof lights that would be controlled by conditions.</p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the bins being backed onto a neighbouring fence and the bike sheds. It was highlighted that condition five stated that no development should take place until a landscape scheme including refuse storage was submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. It was noted that the bike shed was in the same location as it had been previously approved.</p>

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with seven Members voting in favour and one abstention.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the changes and clarifications in the addendum.**

123. **SOUTH LAWN, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE - 20698/APP/2019/2739** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 5 x front rooflights, canopy to front, conversion of the attached garage to habitable use and alterations to front and side elevation.**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.

A representative from Northwood Hills Residents Association addressed the Committee on behalf of the petitioners. A history of the application was outlined and a summary of the previous applications was provided. It was noted that the current application sought to create a large six bedroom four bathroom house on three floors. It was submitted that the application was a gross overdevelopment and created a scheme that was out of character in relation to size and appearance with neighbouring properties. The front elevations would be changed by the multiple windows and the building line would be brought forward. There was fear that this would be compromised even further. The change of character was relevant as it overlooked the Eastcote Conservation area which would shortly be submitted as an area of special local character. It was further submitted that the development would also cause a loss of light and loss of privacy.

The architect for the application addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application. It was noted that the reference made by the petitioner to a balcony was in fact a flat roof. It was explained that there had been previous applications on this property for permitted development and a big rear extension door and single storey rear extension had been granted. The neighbouring properties had been considered and factored into the applications. Permission was requested to approve the canopy roof and single first floor extension.

Councillor John Morgan, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, addressed the Committee and voiced his support for the petitioners. It was submitted that the officer's report was clear and raised concerns regarding overdevelopment, overlooking an area of special character, size, bulk, character and a loss of privacy. The Committee was urged to go with the officer's recommendation and refuse the application.

It was clarified by the Head of Planning that if the dormer was built in isolation it could be considered as permitted development. The Committee was urged to determine the application on the plans before it.

Concerns were noted regarding the bulk, design and overlooking.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused as per officer's recommendation, subject to the clarification in the addendum.**

124. **32 PARK WAY, RUISLIP - 3149/APP/2019/3993** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Part two storey part first floor rear extension, porch to front, conversion of garage to habitable use, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 x rear dormers and 7 x roof lights.**

Officers introduced the application, highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner in objection of the application addressed the Committee and referred to documents that had been circulated to Members and the applicant/agent prior to the meeting. The officers' report was endorsed and it was submitted that if the development was to go ahead, it would block out 30 – 40% garden length of a neighbouring property. Refusal reasons one, two, three and four were emphasised. The Committee was urged to refuse the application as per officer's recommendation.

The agent for the application addressed the Committee and spoke in support of the application. It was explained that this property was purchased as a long term family residence and the proposed developments were to accommodate all family members. It was noted that the applicant had only been made aware that this application would be going to Committee a few days ago and made a request for it to be deferred to the next meeting. Further, it was noted the applicant had not been made aware of the 48 hour additional documents rule and it was too short notice for the architect to attend. The applicant's architect had contacted the planning department to try and agree suitable plans but there had been no engagement. It was submitted that there were some inaccuracies in the officer's report as there was no impact on the street scene due to the position of the house, the landscaping was set from the main elevation and there would only be an 80 cm extension at the front. The distance to the boundary of the extension was also explained to the Committee and it was submitted that this would have no impact on neighbouring property.

A statement from Councillor Douglas Mills, Ward Councillor for Manor, was read to the Committee by the Chairman. Councillor Mills supported the points raised by petitioners and their concerns regarding size, mass and overbearing nature. The scale and design of the property was not in keeping with the local area. It was submitted that this application failed to comply with local plans and the Committee was urged to endorse the recommendation for refusal.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation, subject to the clarifications in the addendum.**

125. **HAREFIELD UNITED FC, BREAKSPEARS ROAD, NORTH HAREFIELD - 4538/APP/2019/3918 (Agenda Item 9)**

**Proposed upgrade of existing telecoms site by replacing existing 15m lattice mast with 20m monopole with 6 no. antenna apertures, 3 no. 600mm Dishes and 1 no. 300mm Dish, 8 no. equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto enclosed by a 2.1m closed boarded timber fence.**

Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.

It was noted that condition four indicated that no development should take place until details of the colours of external surfaces had been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

	<p>Concerns were raised about the maintenance of cabinets. It was decided that the conditions would be reviewed to reflect this and authority was delegated to the Chairman and Labour Lead to agree this.</p> <p>Subject to reviewing the conditions to include cabinet maintenance, the officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation subject to delegated authority to the Chairman and Labour Lead to review the conditions to include cabinet maintenance.</b></p>
126.	<p><b>47 WOODFORD CRESCENT, PINNER - 35141/APP/2019/3830</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 side roof lights.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application and made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
127.	<p><b>TPO 779, 32 KINGSEND RUISILP</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>TPO REPORT.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the TPO and recommended that TPO 779 be confirmed.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the TPO be confirmed as per officer's recommendation.</b></p>
128.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 8.22 pm, closed at 9.27 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji on 01895 277655. 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.**