

## Minutes



**NORTH** Planning Committee

**18 November 2020**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Jas Dhot, Becky Haggart, Allan Kauffman, Carol Melvin, John Morgan, John Oswell (Opposition Lead) and Jagjit Singh</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Kerrie Munro, James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) and James Wells (Planning Team Leader)</p>
87.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
88.	<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>
89.	<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 held on 14 October 2020 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
90.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
91.	<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 Items 1 – 13 were marked as Part I and would be considered in public, and Items 14 – 16 were marked as Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
92.	<p><b>49 BEECH AVENUE, RUISLIP - 12926/APP/2020/2732</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two-storey building to provide three two-bed and one one-bed self-contained flats.</b></p>

Officers introduced the report, and the Committee heard that a petition had been received in objection to the application.

The agent had submitted a written representation that stated the siting of the driveway and proposed parking space would have exactly the same impact on 47 Beech Avenue that the parking adjacent to 19, 23, 29 and 31 Beech Avenue have on neighbouring properties, and the amenity space will act as a buffer zone between the parking and the units. The agent noted that the amended amenity space for each flat would have no adverse impact on 51 Beech Avenue, and compliance to parking requirements could be secured by planning conditions. Members were also informed that the proposal sat well on the site in terms of size and character and was not an overdevelopment that would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and character and appearance of the wider area.

The Committee noted that the officer's report was good, and there were enough reasons for refusal as the application was non-compliant. The officer's recommendation was then moved, seconded, and, upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

93. **1 MANOR HOUSE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD - 27306/APP/2020/237** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and erection of a two-storey building to consist of four two-bedroom flats and two one-bedroom flats with associated amenity space and parking.**

Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum, which included an amended condition.

A petition was received in objection to the application, and the petitioners stated that there were five issues with the application. The Committee heard that the proposed development did not have sufficient parking which would exacerbate parking concerns in the area and that the any permission required strict conditions on waste management to prevent waste being left on the kerbside. The petitioners requested a condition to require screening be maintained at all times, with appropriate re-planting, to maintain privacy for the development and properties on Manor House Drive, and that the any damage to the area caused by the development be restored by the developer at its conclusion. Finally, the petitioners stated that the development was too big for the site and out of keeping with surrounding houses, and would have an intrusive and adverse effect on neighbouring properties and their privacy and amenity.

The agent submitted a written representation that stated there were no technical issues in the application that could not be addressed through planning conditions, and the building is in keeping with the character of the area and of a scale consistent with the surrounding properties. The Committee heard that the bulk of the roof was reduced from what was considered unacceptable previously, and that the proposal would not create additional overlooking above that of the existing dwelling on site.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration noted that the cycle and bin storage should be separately conditioned to screening, and sought delegated authority to confirm final noise conditions for appropriate internal insulation. The Committee noted that a noise condition was no longer required, as the application was required to meet the most

relevant British standards.

Members thanked officers for the comprehensive report, but sought clarification over whether the proposed balconies would overlook the gardens of ground floor flats below. The Committee suggested that screening be used to prevent overlooking concerns and delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to discuss this with the applicant. Responding to Councillors' questioning, officers commented that the roof elevation was 0.6m lower than in previous plans.

The Committee moved the officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to amend the noise condition, separate the conditions regarding cycle and bin storage and landscaping, and agree appropriate screening for the balconies to prevent overlooking. This proposal was then seconded, and upon being put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject the delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to:**

- 1. Amend Condition 7 to ensure it meets relevant British standards and has relevant internal insulation;**
- 2. Amend Condition 5 to remove cycle and bin storage from the landscaping condition; and,**
- 3. Add conditions regarding cycle and bin storage and screening.**

94. **WYLDEWOOD, 25 THE AVENUE, NORTHWOOD - 13305/APP/2020/2690** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Four two-storey, three-bed terraced dwellings with habitable roofspace, parking and amenity space, installation of vehicular crossover to front and demolition of existing dwelling.**

A petition was received in objection to the application, and the petitioner submitted a written representation which noted agreement with the reasons for refusal. The Committee heard that the application was an overdevelopment of the site and would impact on the street scene and lead to overlooking at No 3 and 5 Chelwood Close. The petitioner also stated that there is a parking management scheme in The Avenue and the nine proposed spaces at the site could not all be used due to manoeuvring, and this would lead to parking concerns.

Members agreed that the proposal was too big, an overdevelopment of the site and a bad design, and noted the officer's report was good. As such, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

95. **18A ELGOOD AVENUE, NORTHWOOD - 47802/APP/2020/492** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Installation of paved patio with timber railings and gates to the south eastern side elevation and part two-storey, part single-storey side/rear extension, single-storey front extension, installation of two rooflights to rear and front elevation. (Part Retrospective Application).**

Officers introduced the application.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application, and a written representation received from petitioners. The Committee heard that the refusal reasons regarding the veranda from a previously appeal had not been overcome, and the application would cause harm to the area through its proposed height and materials. The petitioners wrote that no attempt to address the effect on 19 Gatehill Road had been made, and screening had been removed to expose the neighbours' garden and home. Furthermore, the windows and patio of 19 Gatehill Road would be more overlooked than before as there was no reduction in the height of the raised terrace. The petitioners requested a condition be added to ensure the garage was used to accommodate cars only, and the bathroom window obscurely glazed.

The applicant submitted a written representation that stated the proposed and completed works were fully compliant with all applicable and local planning policies. Councillors were informed that the proposed patio's size, height and design was acceptable and not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjacent properties and open space.

The Committee noted that the application was retrospective, but the patio was acceptable and there were no grounds to refuse the application. Responding to Councillors' questioning, officers confirmed that the extension was built away from 19 Gatehill Road, and the new windows caused no further overlooking of No. 19 that the existing windows in the house.

Members were informed that the application removed the roof and timber patio, and this was the main concern of the Planning Inspectorate. The Committee expressed concern that landscaping had been removed by the applicant, and a hedge or similar would be more suitable screening than a wall between the two properties. The Head of Planning and Regeneration noted that the application was in an Area of Special Character and a condition to ensure suitable screening was justified.

The Committee moved the officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to add an additional condition to ensure the screening between the site and 19 Gatehill Avenue was suitable for the local area. This proposal was seconded and unanimously agreed at a vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application be agreed, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Regeneration to agree an additional condition to ensure appropriate screening on the boundary between 18a Elgood Avenue and 19 Gatehill Road.**

96. **2 GATEHILL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 10808/APP/2020/2629** (*Agenda Item 10*)

This application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

97. **SOUTH LAWN, HIGH ROAD, EASTCOTE - 20698/APP/2020/2964** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Single-storey rear extension.**

Officers introduced the application.

A petition had been received in objection to the application, and the petitioners submitted a written representation which stated a number of applications had been received at this site in recent years, and the building was now out of character with

surrounding houses and the local area. Members heard that the application would have a detrimental impact on the house at Long Meadow, and is in excess of the permitted depth for a single storey extension. The Committee was informed that the proposal would adversely affect both the adjoining houses and was disrespectful to the idyllic part of the Borough.

Members noted that the proposal was astounding, and completely agreed with the officer's report. The recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

98. **THE SIX BELLS PUBLIC HOUSE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, RUISLIP - 14387/APP/2020/2775** (*Agenda Item 12*)

**Proposed barn extension to provide a restaurant at ground floor and ten guest rooms at first floor, changing the use from a public house / restaurant to mixed use (Sui Generis), with associated works and landscaping.**

Officers introduced the item and noted the addendum.

A petition was received in support of the application, and a written representation was submitted by the petitioners. The petitioners confirmed that the applicant had restored the derelict listed building, and his latest proposal was welcomed by local residents, including the Ruislip Residents' Association. Members heard that the Covid-19 outbreak had prevented the dining hall at the site from opening, and the applicant needed to diversify for his business to survive, hence this application. The petitioners noted that the proposed changes should not create a visual intrusion, and local neighbours were happy with the plans, having been engaged by the applicant throughout the process. The Committee was informed that residents were happy for the application to be granted, and it was in the best interest of the local community, and would not cause harm to the green belt, the listed building or the local street scene by virtue of design.

Councillor Philip Corthorne, Ward Councillor for West Ruislip, submitted a written representation to the Committee. The Committee heard that local employment and the associated benefits of the application should be considered, particularly considering the challenging issues faced by businesses currently. Councillor Corthorne stated that the applicant was to be commended for his level of engagement with the local community, and noted that there was support from the Ruislip Residents' Association and local residents. The Committee heard that the question of weighing up the relevant considerations was subjective, but Councillors were urged to approve the application.

Members recognised the unusual nature of the situation, which had support from local residents and the Ruislip Residents' Association. The Committee expressed sympathy for the applicant in the current economic climate, and noted that if the application was refused, it could present difficulties for the business. Councillors agreed that local pubs were important parts of the community and that the restoration of the listed building had improved the site. The level of support from local residents was also noted.

The Committee commented that there was already permission for a restaurant at the site that had never opened due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and that this business could still be a success without the approval of the latest application. Members also noted that, although they could sympathise with local businesses and the applicant, planning considerations must be considered to approve the application. Concerns were

expressed regarding the design, and Councillors noted officers' comments that the application was considered too large, as the scale and mass of the application would overpower the Grade II Listed Building. Members also stated that they were not against the idea, but the development was too large and would need to be on a smaller scale to be approved.

The officer's recommendation was moved and seconded by the Committee. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation received five votes in favour, and four votes against.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

99. **THE SIX BELLS PUBLIC HOUSE, DUCKS HILL ROAD, RUISLIP - 14387/APP/2020/2776** (*Agenda Item 13*)

**Proposed barn extension to provide a restaurant at ground floor and ten guest rooms at first floor (Application for Listed Building Consent).**

This item was heard alongside Item 12.

Officers introduced the item and noted the addendum.

Members moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, and upon being put to a vote, there was five votes in favour, and four votes against.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

100. **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 beach 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 and 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.

101. **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 beach 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 and 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.

102. **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 beach 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 and 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 8.05 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](mailto: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.**