

Minutes



NORTH Planning Committee

14 July 2020

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Vice-Chairman), Alan Chapman, Jas Dhot, Becky Haggart, John Oswell, John Morgan, Allan Kauffman, Jagjit Singh and Steve Tuckwell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Zenab Haji-Ismael (Principal Planning Officer), James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer) and Alan Tilly (Transport, Planning and Development Manager)</p>
36.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lavery and Councillor Melvin, with Councillor Tuckwell and Councillor Chapman substituting.</p>
37.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 14, and left the meeting for the discussion of that item.</p>
38.	<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 17 June be agreed as a correct record.</p>
39.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
40.	<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 Part I and would be considered in public, and that Items 12 – 15 were marked Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
41.	<p>32 MIDCROFT, RUISLIP - 2574/APP/2019/3940 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.</p>

42. **18 ST EDMUNDS AVENUE, RUISLIP - 3255/APP/2020/1398** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension with Juliette balcony involving demolition of existing extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use, to include two rear dormers, two front dormers, seven roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with alterations to fenestration, hard standing to front, associated refuse and recycling store, including rebuilding of existing garage.

This item was considered alongside Item 8.

Officers introduced the application and noted the addendum, which included an additional reason for refusal as the proposed extension, by reason of its proximity to the boundary, would result in an unacceptable reduction in the light received by the adjacent bedroom window at the neighbouring property, 16 St Edmunds Avenue, in addition to which the extension would appear as an overbearing and visually intrusive feature which would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

A petition was received in objection to the application, and the petitioners submitted a written representation which stated that the proposed development was too large and should be scaled down to reflect the size and design of other more modestly extended bungalows on the street. The Committee also heard that the position and size of the windows on the flank wall facing No. 16 were inaccurate on the plans and would have any impact on the daylight reaching this room. The petitioner wrote that the layout and density of the proposed extension will be overly dominant, and will significantly overlook No 20, while the driveway was built with an excessively large area of hardstanding.

The agent for the application submitted a written representation which noted that the application would not impact the existing baseline of the street scene, nor the wider landscape, and the proposal should be considered in keeping with the character of the local area. Members heard that the application took into consideration the design of the range of architectural styles along St Edmunds Avenue and would deliver a redeveloped property that was similar in scale when compared to the immediate residential properties. The Committee was informed that there would be no harm on the neighbouring amenities of No 16 and No 20 St Edmunds Avenue, and soft landscaping would be introduced to the front of the property.

Councillor Ian Edwards, Ward Councillor for Eastcote and East Ruislip, submitted a written representation to the Council which noted that St Edmunds Avenue was a quiet, residential road that consisted of detached chalet bungalow properties, commonly with modest roof extensions. Councillor Edwards stated that neither proposal under consideration at the site comply with the Council's planning policies that require extensions and roof extensions to be subordinate to the original property and in keeping with the neighbourhood. The Committee were informed that the ground floor plans submitted were inaccurate in relation to the size and position of windows of No 16, and this would have a detrimental impact on the daylight reaching that room. Furthermore, the conversion to hardstanding in the front garden is harmful to the visual amenity of the street and detrimental to the environment.

The Legal Officer noted that short videos had been received from both the petitioners and the applicant, and these were shared with the Committee prior to the meeting.

The Head of Planning, Regeneration and Transportation noted that the additional reason for refusal outlined in the addendum addressed the concerns of the petitioners

and Ward Councillor, and informed the Committee that the plans do include soft landscaping and drainage to the front of the property.

The Committee agreed that the applications were out of character with the street scene and neither complied with the Council's planning policies. Members agreed that the additional reason for refusal that took into account the loss of light to No 16 was very welcome, and noted that while there were modest extensions elsewhere in the neighbourhood, these proposals could not be construed as modest, and would impact on neighbouring properties.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

43. **18 ST EDMUNDS AVENUE, RUISLIP - 3255/APP/2020/1404** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Single-storey rear extension involving demolition of existing extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include one rear dormer, two front dormers, three roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable end with alterations to fenestration, rebuilding of existing garage, new hard-standing to provide off-street parking, refuse and recycling store and alterations to access steps.

This item was considered alongside Item 7.

Officers noted the addendum which included an additional reason for refusal as the proposed extension, by reason of its proximity to the boundary, would result in an unacceptable reduction in the light received by the adjacent bedroom window at the neighbouring property, 16 St Edmunds Avenue, in addition to which the extension would appear as an overbearing and visually intrusive feature which would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook.

A petition objecting to the application was received, and the petitioner's written representation is outlined in the minute of Item 7.

The agent submitted a written representation which stated that the scale, mass and form of the property would not be perceived by the passer-by due to the hip to gable end conversion and two dormers at the front of the property. The Committee heard that the applicants required the development to comfortably house their family, and the proposal would not exceed the building line nor have the largest footprint. The agent noted that the application had good design within a residential development, and was respectful of its surrounding area.

The Committee moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, which upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

44. **ST JOHNS SCHOOL, POTTER STREET HILL, NORTHWOOD - 10795/ADV/2020/32** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Installation of one internally illuminated wall-mounted LED sign.

Officers introduced the application which requested a wall-mounted LED sign that

depicted the school's logo.

The Committee expressed its support for the application and agreed that it complemented the building, but noted that it may be useful to limit the time at which the sign could be illuminated.

Members stated that there was currently low level lighting for security at the site, but this was a necessity. The Committee agreed that a time limit on the illumination of the logo should be agreed as the application was within the Green Belt, but also to combat climate change as a light on for 24 hours a day could not be considered environmentally friendly.

Councillors agreed to add a further condition to the application to ensure that the sign was not illuminated after 10pm, and then moved the officer's recommendation, subject to the additional condition.

This proposal was seconded and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to a condition that ensured the LED sign was not illuminated after 10pm.

45. **53 - 55 THE BROADWAY, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 5564/APP/2020/847**
(Agenda Item 10)

Erection of a three-storey building to provide three one-bedroom and four two-bedroom residential units with associated parking and bin and cycle storage, involving alterations to existing crossover.

Officers introduced the report, and the Head of Planning, Transportation and Recycling outlined the detailed planning history at the site. The Committee was informed that recent appeal hearing decisions meant that reasons of refusal related to parking or visual amenity were not considered appropriate, however, 17 conditions would be imposed on the application should it be approved that sought to counter these concerns.

Councillor Duncan Flynn, Ward Councillor for Northwood Hills, submitted a written representation that stated the application did not comply with Hillingdon's parking standards and would lead to more congestion on the surrounding rounds. Members heard that the site was very compact and the density of the proposed application would dwarf the surrounding residential streets, and overlook neighbouring properties, and Councillor Flynn also stated that the building did not enhance the local street scene and was unattractive and of poor quality. As such, Councillor Flynn encouraged the Committee to refuse the application.

The Committee expressed concerns over the height and number of units in the building, and noted that parking could cause of a problem, particularly with the delivery of goods to the pub on the premises.

The Highways Officer confirmed that deliveries to the premises took place from a bay roughly 70 metres away on Joel Street, and officers were happy with the arrangements

Members noted that due to previous decisions by the Planning Inspectorate it may be difficult to refuse the application, but noted the conditions that would be imposed should it be approved. The Committee requested that electric charging points were provided at the parking bays, and were satisfied that there would also be no

overlooking of residential properties from the development.

Officers confirmed that electric charging points could be added to Condition 8 of the application, and that dual vehicle charging points could be used to ensure that one point can charge two vehicles. The Committee suggested that the two internal parking spaces have active charging points, and the other three spaces have passive charging points.

The Committee moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, subject to an addition to Condition 8 to include the addition of electric charging points, and when put to a vote, the proposal was agreed with seven votes in favour and one against.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to an alteration to Condition 8 to include the provision for electric vehicle charging points next to parking bays.

46. **S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT** (*Agenda Item 11*)

RESOLVED: That the S106 Quarterly Monitoring Report be noted.

47. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 12*)

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.

48. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13*)

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**

	<p>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.</p>
49.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Morgan declared a non-pecuniary interest and left the meeting during the discussion of the item.</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 beach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <p>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.</p>
50.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</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 beach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <p>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.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.38 pm.</p>

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.