

Minutes

MINOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

1 September 2021



HILLINGDON
LONDON

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Mohinder Birah Allan Kauffman John Morse (Opposition Lead) Alan Chapman Carol Melvin</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Kerrie Munro, Planning Lawyer Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer James Rodger, Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Team Manager</p>
38.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr John Morgan with Cllr Carol Melvin substituting and from Cllr Nicola Brightman with Cllr Alan Chapman substituting.</p>
39.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
40.	<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 dated 4 August 2021 be agreed as an accurate record.</p>
41.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
42.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I 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 all items of business were marked Part I and would be considered in public.</p>

43.	<p>59 ELM AVENUE, EASTCOTE - 60130/APP/2021/2463 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Proposed demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a residential building comprising 6 no. flats with associated bins and cycle provision, including removal of drop kerb and alterations.</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and highlighted the additional information in the addendum. It was noted that a previous application had been considered by the North Planning Committee in May 2021 at which time, had the application not been under appeal for non-determination, the Committee had resolved to refuse the application for three reasons. Said reasons had regard to the design and scale of the scheme, the proposed unit mix and highway safety concerns relating to the proposed parking and vehicle access arrangements at the site. Members were informed that the current application had adequately addressed two of these issues; however, concerns remained regarding the scale and design of the proposed scheme and its impact on the character and visual amenity of the area.</p> <p>A petitioner was in attendance who thanked officers for their thorough report and welcomed the inclusion of a number of conditions should the application be approved. Thanks were also extended to the ERA Planning Representative. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The residential roads in Eastcote maintained the ethos of a pleasant garden suburb with good-sized family accommodation; • Elm Avenue had seen little in the way of infill building and there were few dormers visible from the street. 2-storey height lines had been respected to date hence the proposal would not be in keeping with the street scene; • The current application had ticked more planning boxes than the previous one but, in doing so, had detracted from the liveability factor; • The proposed 3-bedroom ground floor flat had a side-facing window closely overlooked by the rising Oak Grove pavement – this was a privacy concern; • The 3-bedroom flat increased the size and bulk of the proposed development; • The reduction in parking spaces from 4 to 2 reduced the appeal of the first floor flats; • Wheelchair users would not be able to easily access any of the outdoor amenity spaces and there were no disabled parking spaces in the plans; • The topology of the site had not been considered in the report – approximately one third of the site was taken up by an embankment area leading up to the Oak Grove boundary. The proposal would require levelling the whole site and there was no indication how the narrow Oak Grove pavement and roadway would be maintained during the levelling works or thereafter; • A similar development by the same company in Hatch End which was oversized and overly dominant appeared to be a template for this proposal. <p>The Committee heard that the agent had not wished to attend the meeting so as not to undermine the pending non-determination appeal.</p> <p>Ward Councillor Heena Makwana was in attendance and addressed the Committee in support of the petitioners and residents. Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bulk and design of the proposed development would not be in keeping with the local area and street scene;
-----	---

- Elm Avenue predominantly comprised 2-storey houses with single-storey garages to the side thereby creating a sense of space – the development would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of openness;
- Step-free access to the first-floor flats at the proposed development would not be possible for wheelchair users hence the proposal did not comply with the 2020 London Plan Policy D7;
- The proposal for a flat roof form would be detrimental to the street scene and wider area;
- The depth failed to harmonise with the local context.

Committee Members felt the proposal would result in overdevelopment on a prominent corner site and expressed concern regarding the parking arrangements, the embankment area and the lack of disabled access. It was confirmed that it would be difficult to defend at appeal any additional reason for refusal relating to parking as the standards had been met. Additionally, a new reason for refusal in relation to disability access could not be added at this stage since the previous application had not been refused on that point and it would not be possible to defend this at appeal. However, at the request of Members, it was agreed that the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration would consider the addition of a condition, in the event of an appeal, with regard to the embankment at the application site.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed, subject to the addition of a condition regarding the embankment.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration consider the addition of a condition, in the event of an appeal, regarding the embankment at the application site; and**
- 2. That the application be refused.**

44. 1 MANOR HOUSE DRIVE, NORTHWOOD - 27306/APP/2021/1792 (Agenda Item 7)

Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) and 5 (Landscape) of planning permission 27306/APP/2020/237 dated 25/11/2020 for single storey rear extensions to increase the living accommodation for Flats 1 and 3 (Demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and erection of a two-storey building to provide 4 x 2-bedroom flats and 2 x 1-bedroom flats with associated amenity space and parking)

Officers introduced the application advising Members that the proposed amendments would not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal was policy compliant and was recommended for approval.

A written submission in objection to the application on the grounds of parking concerns was read out on behalf of petitioners. Members heard that, in July 2020, the Council had written to residents proposing a restricted parking scheme. This had been rejected as it was felt that a midday one-hour restriction would not address the issue of overnight overspill parking from residents of Ducks Hill Road. Residents believed that the development of 1 Manor House Drive would further exacerbate the parking difficulties and suggested that, if the application were approved, any future parking scheme should exclude residents of 1 Manor House Drive. Furthermore, petitioners commented that the proposed development would be too big and out of character with

the surrounding houses.

A further written submission was read out on behalf of the agent. Key points highlighted included:

- The principle of demolishing the existing dwelling and replacing it with a block of flats had already been accepted by the Council and the Planning Inspectorate in 2020;
- The application sought to make some minor amendments to the consented scheme to provide a better living area for the two flats – these changes were minimal and would not alter the character of the proposed building nor the impact on neighbouring properties;
- The issues raised by petitioners (principle, parking, amount of development, neighbouring amenity) had already been judged by the Council to be acceptable;
- Council officers had confirmed that there were no technical issues. Parking, amenity levels and space standards tests had been completely satisfied by the proposal;
- In terms of the impact on the character of the area, Manor House Drive generally consisted of large detached properties of varying design. The proposed single storey extensions would not materially alter the visual impact of the building compared to that which had been approved;
- Regarding the impact on neighbours, the proposal fully complied with the 25 and 45 degree lines from neighbouring properties. Single storey extensions could not result in overlooking or a loss of light and were not sufficiently high to be overbearing.

Committee Members raised no concerns or objections to the proposal. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, approved with 5 Members voting in favour and one Member unable to vote having been absent for part of the deliberations.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

45.	NEYLAND COURT, PEMBROKE ROAD, WEST RUISLIP - 76364/APP/2021/1569 <i>(Agenda Item 8)</i>
-----	---

Demolition of existing garage block and construction of detached building to accommodate new management office accommodation above replacement parking spaces

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for refusal. It was considered that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and their associated external amenity space in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, overshadowing and overbearing impact.

A written submission in objection to the application was read out to the Committee Members on behalf of petitioners. Key points highlighted included:

- Petitioners had concerns regarding the proximity, size, scale, bulk, height, massing, overdevelopment, increased noise, pollution and loss of the bin storage area;
- The development would result in loss of privacy to all 12 flats in Neyland Court and the neighbouring properties in Pembroke Road and Brickwall Lane;

- The proposed office building would block sunlight to all flats and surrounding gardens which would impact on the mental health of residents;
- The proposed development would be incongruous and over dominant and would have a detrimental impact on the character, outlook and appearance of the site and surrounding area which bordered a listed area of special local character. It would be the 3rd such office building in a small area;
- The application suggested the development would be identical in form and materials to Neyland Court i.e. brick built, but the pictures confirmed it would be a steel frame covered in chip board and finished with a brick look cladding;
- The current bin storage area for Neyland Court residents would be demolished with no plan to replace it;
- There would be increased movement of vehicles to and from the site adding to noise pollution and disturbance;
- Overdevelopment of the land could be a surface water flood risk;
- If approved, a condition was requested to ensure the building could not be converted to residential space in the future;
- There was low demand for office space in Pembroke Road and it was likely this trend would continue;
- The application had failed to provide accurate measurements and drawings – a few drawings had been submitted after the consultation period had expired therefore residents had been unable to comment further on these.

A written submission on behalf of the applicant was read out to the Committee and photos relating to an approved 2015 application in the vicinity of the application site were shown to the Committee. The applicant stated that all Anslip (UK) Ltd applications in the last 10 years had been rejected by Mr James Rodger and subsequently granted at appeal. Planning Committee Members were invited to visit the site to see the impact of the proposal on surrounding properties. Members were requested to consider similarities to a previous planning application reference 21000/APP/2015/3095 at Pembroke Lodge which had been approved. It was vital that all applications were considered fairly and without bias.

The differences between the cited application and the current one before Members were pointed out by officers noting that the 2015 application had resulted in no impact on amenity space and there had been no issues regarding overlooking windows. The two were therefore not comparable.

Ward Councillor Philip Corthorne addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents and in objection to the application. Cllr Corthorne expressed concern regarding the size and scale of the proposal and its impact on local residents. He felt it was regrettable that previous Planning Inspectorate decisions had limited the Council's grounds for sustainable objections. Councillor Corthorne raised concerns regarding the possibility of the office space being used as future residential accommodation and noted the lack of proposed bin storage at the application site. It was noted that the proximity to adjoining properties, bulk, size and massing were all matters of concern and were at odds with planning policies.

The Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration informed Members that the applicant's claim that all refusal decisions at the Pembroke House site had been overturned at appeal was inaccurate; an appeal in 2017 had been dismissed. It was however true to say that more appeals had been allowed than dismissed regarding said site.

The Chairman requested that, in future, petitioners refrain from criticising officers or

making accusations about members of staff. It was confirmed that the Council had an official complaints procedure which should be followed in such cases.

Members expressed concern that the offices could be converted into residential accommodation in the future. The lack of allocated parking for the offices was another area of concern as was the lack of spaces for those with disabilities.

At the request of the Committee, it was agreed that delegated authority be granted to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to draft an informative, in the event of a re-submission, regarding the provision of allocated / disabled parking spaces for residents.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed, subject to the addition of an informative in relation to allocated / disabled parking.

RESOLVED:

- 1. That delegated authority be granted to the Deputy Director of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead, to draft an informative, in the event of a re-submission, regarding the provision of allocated parking spaces / disabled parking for residents; and**
- 2. That the application be refused.**

46. 17 OAKLEIGH ROAD, HILLINGDON - 2900/APP/2021/1574 (Agenda Item 9)

Retention of single storey rear extension and rear dormer window

Officers introduced the application informing Members that the change of use from a Class C3 dwelling to a Class C4 HMO (which comprised up to six unrelated individuals) constituted permitted development. The single storey rear extension was acceptable but the rear dormer was considered to be oversized and failed to appear as a subordinate addition to the rear roof slope. The application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Members raised no concerns or requests for further clarification.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

47. TPO 790 - 23 COWLEY CRESCENT, COWLEY (Agenda Item 10)

Tree Preservation Order No. 790 (TPO 790): Horse Chestnut in the Garden of 23 Cowley Crescent

Officers introduced the application advising Members that the making of TPO 790 had been authorised under delegated powers on 11 June 2021 following concerns from local residents that it might be removed.

Councillors welcomed the application noting that it was a beautiful Horse Chestnut tree and it was important to protect it.

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

RESOLVED: That TPO 790 be confirmed.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 7.04 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250636. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.