

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

17 June 2020

Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggar, Carol Melvin, John Oswell, John Morgan, Allan Kauffman and Jagjit Singh</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Zenab Haji-Ismail (Principal Planning Officer) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
19.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
20.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Melvin declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 6, in that she had been involved with a previous planning application at the site in question. Cllr Melvin would remain in the meeting, but would take no part in the discussion or vote.</p>
21.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Dhot asked that his attendance at the previous meeting be recorded, stating that he was present throughout the meeting but due to technical difficulties could only listen.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2020 be approved as a correct record.</p>
22.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that an updated plan for Item 9 had been circulated prior to the meeting.</p>
23.	<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 1-13 would be considered in public, and that items 14-17</p>

would be considered in private.

24. **5 & 6 FIRS WALK - 30837/APP/2019/3096** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Erection of 3 x 4-bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover (involving demolition of 5 Firs Walk (Outline Planning Application with Some Matters Reserved))

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner's objections to the application were detailed, key points of which included:

- The petition consists of 68 signatures from residents of Dene Road, with an additional 19 individual letters of objection, and is supported by the Dene Road Residents Association and the Northwood residents Association.
- Dene Road is designated an Area of Outstanding Local Character.
- The proposed development is too large for the site, and will result in a loss of local character and garden space.
- The proposal seeks to maintain the building line with adjacent houses, though this appears at odds with the layout plan included in the design and Access Statement.
- The forward-facing garage spurs are an alien feature owing to their depth (nearly as deep as the houses themselves).
- The proposed large crown roofs are not supported by policy DMHD 1 (b-viii) and are not sympathetic to the traditionally designed houses in the area.
- Approval would be contrary to planning policies DHMB 11 and 14, and would also contravene the decisions made by the Committee against the previous application, and that of the Inspector.
- The report identifies a lack of a legal agreement for works required to connect the site to the end of Foxdell, with the legal status of the relevant section of Foxdell currently subject to a legal challenge. If upheld, this challenge could result in no right of way over that section of Foxdell, and therefore no access to the proposed development.
- Access is also restricted from Firs Walk, which is a privately-owned narrow lane, not a public highway. The lane's dimensions will render construction traffic impossible, and any increase in traffic will be unsafe for residents.

Members discussed the application, and were supportive of the refusal reasons set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

25. **15 KEWFERRY ROAD - 26090/APP/2020/300** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Retrospective application for a single storey rear extension and front boundary wall and gates

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner's objections to the application were detailed, key points of which included:

- The house, due to various extensions, has been turned into an eyesore that no longer conforms to policy DMHB 11 and the street scene.
- The owner has a track record of ignoring planning approval and building something that is often then the subject of enforcement action. This is something to be discouraged.
- Since the officer's report, the wall has had lanterns installed, which add to its unsuitability.
- The rear extension is not acceptable due to its size and design, which is visibly intrusive and over dominant.
- Further construction without planning consent includes the windows on the first floor of the side extension, a side wall that is higher than planned, and soil pipes in the wrong position.
- It is requested that the application be refused, and that the rear extensions be specifically included in the refusal. The applicant should be ordered to build in accordance with the approved plans, and be subject to enforcement if this is not fulfilled.

The applicant's submission was detailed, key points of which included:

- The report states that the rear extension is considered acceptable, and that the proposal complies with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 1 of the Local Plan Part 2. The subject of the recommendation for refusal is therefore the front wall.
- The wall is deemed to be out of character with the front boundary treatments. Other nearby properties have similar boundary treatments.
- The report's references to sliding gate openings and gated vehicular access are incorrect. Only one gate to the driveway is a sliding gate, with the other a door style opening installed to provide a balanced aesthetic and to allow for garbage to be taken out. There is no intent to have a second driveway, and since installation of the gate, cars have continued to park in front of it.
- The proposed soft landscaping provision is an increase over the original landscaping and will be in keeping with the visual character of the street scene.
- The design has been put forward following a review of several properties on the street and is in keeping with the street scene. Only 3 of 14 neighbours have raised objections, and many have praised the look of the property.
- The reference to legal actions following damage to a neighbouring property's shed is incorrect. A surveyor report has since confirmed that the damage was due to a neighbour's conservatory resting on the shed. No legal action is pending.
- The development of 15 Kewferry Road has substantially increased the property's value and, by extension, that of neighbouring properties.

Councillor Richard Lewis, Ward Councillor for Northwood, submitted a statement supporting the officer's recommendation for refusal and highlighting his concerns that the high lantern roof was overdominant, suggesting that the roof should be reduced in height.

Members discussed the applicoant and supported the reasons for refusal as set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

26. **48 MURRAY ROAD - 9357/APP/2019/4133** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of 4 x 2-storey detached dwellings with habitable roof space with parking, amenity, cycle provision, refuse and external landscaping and associated works

Officers introduced the report and addendum, and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval.

A petitioner's objections to the application were detailed, key points of which included:

- The Officer's report states that the site would technically be "development on garden land". Accordingly, the development does not comply with DMH6 as it is not more intimate in scale and mass or lower than frontage properties.
- Most trees are to be removed. Only about 36% of site is retained as garden area, with most of the site to be built up or hard-landscaped. This would be uncharacteristic for most parts of Northwood outside of town centre locations. Significant loss of existing mature garden would be at odds with the prevailing character of the surrounding area and will create a cramped form of development. Wildlife habitat has not been assessed.
- The proposed new homes would be on a raised site, resulting in overbearing and overlooking, including overlooking of the bedroom windows of 27-33 Leaf Close and other habitable rooms of 34-40 Leaf Close, from the windows on its side (SW) elevation.
- The development proposes to remove the 21m separation distance, as the intervening foliage is to be removed. This would be of detriment to quality of life for residents of these maisonettes and the new House D.
- The development does not include an assessment of trees directly adjacent to location of House D, and these protected trees are very likely to be adversely affected by any excavations for the construction of House D or the new access road.
- Residents of Leaf Close and Lingfield Close, both with private internal roads, will be adversely affected and the impact on these internal roads has not been assessed.
- Many long-term council tenants in the neighbouring properties are elderly, and may not have the means to relocate if their lives were negatively impacted by this development.
- If approved, it is requested that the Committee consider the following conditions: a) possible exclusion of House D from the scheme, and b) for the House D to be redesigned as a two-storey house and to eliminate the windows on its south elevation entirely so as not to disadvantage current occupants.

The agent for the applicant submitted details in support of the application, key points of which included:

- The proposed development seeks to meet the clear and substantial borough-wide requirement and need for larger family-sized homes.
- As set out in the Council's report, the redevelopment of the site is logical and considered acceptable in principle. The proposed design is considered appropriate within the site's context, and the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties or the local highways network. The Council's Tree and Landscape Officer and Highways Engineer

have both reviewed the proposals and confirmed that they have no objections or concerns, subject to conditions which are agreed and supported by the Applicant.

- Proposals were also revised in agreement with representatives from both Craigmore Court and Mansion House, following discussions and a site visit meeting with them.
- The design, scale, layout and separation distances within the site and with neighbouring properties have all been developed to comply with the Council's pre-application advice and adopted policies and guidance.
- The development protects and does not harm any Category 'A' or 'B' trees, based on expert arboricultural consultancy input. Whilst the proposals remove 5 lower quality trees, the proposed illustrative landscaping scheme seeks to replace these with new specimen trees and supplemental planting, which is to be controlled by planning condition. The development will result in an increase in trees on the site. The Council's assessment confirms that the proposals retain and safeguard the sylvan character and appearance of the area.
- The highways and refuse design and operations have been developed with expert transport and highways consultants and reviewed by the Council's Highway Engineer. Subject to planning conditions, these aspects are all considered to be acceptable and the development will not result in any highway safety concerns.

Councillor Richard Lewis, Ward Councillor for Northwood, submitted a statement supporting the officer's recommendation for refusal, highlighting his concerns that the development was overbearing and out of character with the street scene, and whether Lingfield Close could accommodate an increased number of vehicles.

Members discussed the application and raised various concerns, including that the application constituted an overdevelopment that would result in a lack of quality amenity space, and a lack of satisfactory refuse storage, management and collection arrangements, for future residents. For these reasons, it was moved that the application be refused. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the application be refused; and**
- 2. That the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, set out the Committee's reasons for refusal.**

27. **17 WOODSIDE ROAD - 29754/APP/2019/3994** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Two storey side extension and first floor rear extension

Officers introduced the report and addendum, and confirmed that the application was recommended for approval, inclusive of the changes to condition 2 as set out in the addendum.

A petitioner's objections to the application were detailed, key points of which included:

- The proposed roof raising and enlargement will result in a loss of privacy for the occupiers of No 19. The officer has proposed a condition that no further windows can be inserted into the walls facing No 15 and No 19. It is requested that, if approved, the application be conditioned to prohibit windows in the roof

facing No 19 to preserve their privacy.

- The width and depth of the proposal is a manifest over-development of the site and the enormous, bulky proposed roof shape bears no correlation to the original property, being totally out of keeping by its over-dominance.
- There is no condition to prevent the proposed property being subdivided to form additional units or used in multiple occupation. The previous approved and built extension reference 29754/APP/2008/3569 contains a planning condition that, *'The development hereby approved shall not be subdivided to form additional dwelling units or used in multiple occupation without a further express permission from the Local Planning Authority'* to ensure that the property remained a single dwelling unit. It is requested that, if the application is approved, you carry the previous condition over to ensure that this vast property is not subdivided to form additional dwelling units or used as an HMO.
- It is requested that, if approved, a condition be added to ensure that the boundary treatment remains typical of this Area of Special Local Character complying with policy DMHB 6 iii). (The boundaries are currently high hedges, no walls or closed board fences are allowed.)

The agent for the applicant submitted detail supporting the application, key points of which included:

- Based on the planner's feedback to the pre-application, the current submission has omitted the following:
 - Second floor loft space accommodation
 - A raised ridge height to the apex of the main roof
 - Two half-octagon bay windows
 - A crown roof over the extended part of the property
 - A projecting canopy over the proposed new front entrance
 - A reduction in the width of the extension from 7.5m to 6.7m
 - More recently the design of the front façade has been modified to allow for a single storey window over the entrance, and not a two storey feature as before.
- With regard to the petitioner's assertion that DMHD1 c) i states that 'side extensions should not exceed half the width of the original property'. The Gateshill Residents Association (GRA) has wrongly construed 'property' to mean 'house'. Dimensionally, the original width of the property is 13.4 metres, and the proposed extension is 6.7m. The ratio of the proposed extension is 50%.
- The GRA states that, 'the current proposal is to extend [at the rear]... 6 metres beyond the original house'. However, this is incorrect. The proposed extension is level with the rear of the original house, and does not project beyond it.
- The GRA asserts that the proposed extension is out of character with the streetscape, both in terms of the proposed choice of building materials and in its size and form. The building materials are stated as 'to match existing,' so this first point is incorrect, and the original scheme has been amended as above in order to allay such concerns. It will be noted that many of the properties on Woodside road have already been heavily extended.
- In terms of proportions, the host property/proposed extension is compatible and commensurate with its neighbour, with the gap between the two properties being more than 8 metres apart.
- One of the main reasons that the applicant is undertaking this project is to enable his disabled septuagenarian father to live with the rest of his family in the same house. He needs 24 hour care and for all of his accommodation to be on the ground floor. This need is provided for in the Local Plan Part 2, under section A1.17, which calls for 'Annexes designed specifically for the use of disabled or

dependent elderly family members... located on the ground floor and be fully accessible'.

- The applicants offered to meet a representative of the GRA to discuss this proposal; unfortunately, this offer was declined.

Officers confirmed that any concerns relating to potential subdivision or HMOs could be allayed, as any such subdivision would require further planning permission.

Members discussed the application, and were supportive of the application, subject to the addition of a condition prohibiting further extensions, and the strengthening of condition 7, which related to additional windows and doors.

The officer's recommendation, with the additional conditions as set out above, was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the addition of a condition prohibiting further extensions, and the strengthening of condition 7.

28. **LAND AT GARAGE BLOCK, SOUTHBOURNE GARDENS - 72211/APP/2020/480**
(Agenda Item 10)

Four storey building comprising 8 x 2 Bedroom flats with associated car and cycle parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing garages

Officers introduced the report, and confirmed that the application was recommended for refusal.

A petitioner's objections to the application were detailed, key points of which included:

- The properties surrounding the site are traditional two-storey houses and maisonettes. The proposal would create a building that would overshadow all of its neighbours, and the residents of the upper floor of the new development would have a clear view into surrounding properties result in a loss of privacy for many of the neighbouring properties.
- Residents in Dollis Crescent would lose much of their early morning sunlight due to the height of the building. Those in Green Lawns would be similarly effected in the evening. It is noted that the applicant has not submitted an updated Daylight and Sunlight Assessment with this application.
- Residents in Dollis Crescent face the prospect of having a large brick wall at the end of their gardens that would tower over the existing trees.
- The style of the building is out of keeping with its surroundings. The provision of an extra storey would draw attention to the building spoiling the appearance of the area.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact on the panorama looking north from Cavendish playing fields.
- The addition of another two double bedroom units to the development will add to what will already be a crowded development, with no additional parking provided on site. These two extra units could result in an extra three or four vehicles looking for places to park, in an area where parking is at a premium.
- The provision of two extra units will generate additional visitors and deliveries to the development. Southbourne Gardens is already a busy road, especially during morning and evening peaks. It is used as an alternative route between Ruislip Manor and Eastcote, avoiding both town centre traffic lights.
- The access to the site will always be a safety issue. During construction there

have been two minor collisions in front of the site entrance. Lorries delivering supplies to the site have damaged pavements. In one case, the pavement had recently been repaired by the council. The paving slabs have now been cracked by lorries using the pavement to gain access to the site.

- Refuse collection would be a bigger issue with the provision of two extra units. If rubbish is deposited at the end of the access road awaiting collection this will either be left in the narrow access road, restricting this even further, or more likely obstructing the pavement which is used by many children travelling to Newnham School.
- The development does not propose any extra amenity space on the site, and as a result falls short of the requirement of planning policies.
- Following a large number of flatted developments in Eastcote, there is no need for another development to be squeezed onto this land.

Members discussed the application, and were supportive of the officer's recommendation for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

29. **HUME WAY, RUISLIP - 54873/APP/2020/721** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Installation of a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, equipment cabinets, the removal of the existing 13.7m monopole, 3 x antennas, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the application was recommended for refusal.

Members supported the reasons for refusal as set out in the report, and the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. (Councillor Singh was not present for the vote)

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

30. **WEYBEARDS FARM, PRIMROSE COTTAGE, HILL END ROAD - 72546/APP/2019/3837** (*Agenda Item 12*)

Conversion of existing barns into 4 (2 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedroom) residential units, including alterations to fenestration with associated works

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum, confirming that the application was recommended for approval inclusive of a car parking management condition as set out in the addendum. Officers clarified that there were eight parking spaces proposed within the development.

Members were supportive of the officer's recommendations, but suggested that a condition be added to prohibit future conversion of the garages.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to an additional condition prohibiting future conversion of garages.

31. **LONG LANE FARM, LONG LANE - 14951/APP/2020/1449** (*Agenda Item 13*)

Proposal to remove 6 x existing antenna from an existing telecommunications site and replace with 12 x new antenna and add all ancillary works and to upgrade existing cabins internally

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the application was recommended for approval.

Members were supportive of the recommendation, but suggested that a condition be added regarding the maintenance of the cabinets, similar to conditions recently discussed at the Central and South Planning Committee.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the addition of a condition relating to the maintenance of the cabinets.

32. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 14*)

RESOLVED:

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.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it

33. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 15*)

RESOLVED:

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.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it

34. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 16*)

RESOLVED:

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.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it

35. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 17*)

RESOLVED:

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.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 8.27 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on Telephone 01895 250636 or email (recommended): democratic@hillington.gov.uk. 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.