

DRAFT Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

15 July 2010

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Alan Kauffman, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, David Payne</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement) Meg Hirani (North Area Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Sarah White (Legal Advisor) Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Anita MacDonald substitute Cllr Janet Duncan</p>	
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Item 10 '18 Church Road, Northwood' as she had discussed the application with residents. She left the room and did not vote on this item.</p>	
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of 22nd June 2010 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
5.	<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 all items would be considered in public with the exception of Item 16 - Enforcement, which was considered in private.</p>	

<p>6.</p>	<p>81 ABBOTSBURY GARDENS, EASTCOTE - 38458/APP/2009/1527 (Agenda Item 6)</p> <p>Part single storey, part two storey side/rear/front extensions, involving demolition of existing side/rear extensions.</p> <p>38458/APP/2009/1527</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal was invited to address the meeting.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will increase the ground floor from 62m² to 127m² which will not conform to HDAS guidance and will be an overdevelopment of the site. • The proposed 3.6m extension is too large • The block plans are incorrect and show the side boundary, and a wooden fence delineates the boundary and not the side boundary • The proposal will exceed the current building line. • The proposed development will result in unneighbourly development and adversely effect nearby properties through over dominance, visual intrusion, overlooking and over shadowing. • The proposed roof extension is not at the same ridge height as the main building, when it should be lower in height than the main ridge. • Concerns about the drainage and surrounding trees touching the roof. <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting. No Ward Councillors were present.</p> <p>Members sought further clarification about the location of the garage and the extent of the surrounding trees and hedgerows. Officers explained the position of the garage would be identical and mature shrubs would not constrain the development.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed by five votes in favour and one abstention.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report and addendum</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>THE BUNGALOW, NEW YEARS GREEN LANE, HAREFIELD - 29665/APP/2010/617 (Agenda Item 7)</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<p>Construction of a temporary Civic Amenity Facility for use during redevelopment of the Harefield Civic Amenity Site, including temporary change of use of bungalow to office and staff welfare facility.</p> <p>29665/APP/2010/617</p> <p>Members discussed the application and agreed it was important the Green Belt was protected and in particular those species indigenous to the site. In answer to a query about the access road, Officers explained that earth mounds would be used to delineate the edge of the road surface instead of fencing.</p> <p>Members discussed the implications of Condition 4 at length and sought assurances about the longevity of the access road and the steps that might be required if pollutants were discovered. Officers explained that Conditions 19 and 20 in the officer's report addressed these concerns.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was unanimously agreed as set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet with the precise details of Condition 4 to be agreed by the Chairman in consultation with the Labour Lead.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as per the agenda and addendum.</p> <p>Details of Condition 4 will need to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p>	<p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>WHITE HEATH FARM, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD - 21558/APP/2009/1949 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a detached cattle shed.</p> <p>21558/APP/2009/1949</p> <p>Members discussed the application and asked officers about the likely visual impact of the proposal and the location of the silage tower. In response to these queries, Officers explained that a degree of new planting was proposed to screen the application from residential properties. Officers confirmed that the silage tower would remain in its current location.</p> <p>Member's raised the topic of animal welfare and enquired whether the cattle would be confined to the shed for the duration of their lives or if the intention was to use this for a combination of feed storage and housing in bad weather. In response, Officers explained the proposal was an addition to the current farm complex and they understood that the herd would not be increased and the cattle would be kept outside for the majority of the time. Member's requested that an additional</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>

	<p>informative be added to safeguard animal welfare.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum with an additional informative relating to cattle welfare to follow.</p>	
9.	<p>36 HIGHFIELD DRIVE, ICKENHAM - 12536/APP/2009/1896 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey four-bedroom detached dwelling with habitable roofspace and associated parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling.</p> <p>12536/APP/2009/1896</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
10.	<p>18 CHURCH ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 6532/APP/2010/235 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Single storey side and rear extension involving the demolition of existing garage to rear.</p> <p>6532/APP/2010/235</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
11.	<p>20 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 66826/APP/2010/358 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from retail (Class A1) to cafe (Class A3).</p> <p>66826/APP/2010/358</p> <p>Members discussed the application and asked officers how long the premises had been empty. Officers explained that the property had been vacant for two years.</p> <p>Members referred to the current economic climate and agreed it was important for the vitality of the local area that it was not left with another</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>

	<p>empty shop. The Committee decided to defer the item and asked officers to bring back a set of conditions for the Committee to discuss at the next meeting.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that the application be deferred until the next meeting.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Deferred, to be reported back to next committee with a list of possible conditions if approved.</p>	
12.	<p>BUILDERS YARD, JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD - 16194/APP/2009/2214 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Single storey building for use as office sales desk, showroom and storage facility, external storage racking and associated parking (involving demolition of existing buildings and telecommunications mast and compound).</p> <p>16194/APP/2009/2214</p> <p>Members discussed the application which the officer report acknowledged represented inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Officers introduced the report and explained that very special circumstances had been demonstrated in this case.</p> <p>Members were concerned about the size, scale and bulk of the proposed replacement building and suggested that if this were approved, it would represent a dangerous precedent for future development.</p> <p>While Members accepted that the proposal would tidy the site and that it had been a builder's yard for more than 30 years, the Committee considered a 72% increase in the footprint of the site to represent an inappropriate development within the Green Belt which would impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote agreed by two in favour and four against that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the officer recommendation be overturned and application refused on the grounds of inappropriate development in the Green Belt and size, scale and bulk of the proposed building and its impact visually. Wording for reasons to be agreed with the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
13.	<p>24 CROFT GARDENS, RUISLIP - 45820/APP/2010/1061 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<p>Single storey side extension, first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.</p> <p>45820/APP/2010/1061</p> <p>The Chairman referred to a letter which had been tabled by a local resident and addressed to him and the Labour Lead. He explained that the Committee could not modify the application (as requested) but only determine the proposal as set out in the officer's report.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>1 THE GREENWAY, ICKENHAM - 66229/APP/2010/460 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Part single storey, part two storey rear extension and first floor side extension with ground floor drive through.</p> <p>66229/APP/2010/460</p> <p>Members discussed the proposal and asked officers for further clarification about the required distance where a two or more storey development abutted a property or its boundary. Officers confirmed that the guidance stated that this distance should be 15 metres to avoid possible over-domination and that in this case, the distance was 14 metres.</p> <p>Members also had concerns about the first floor side window, facing 77High Road and access to the rear garage. Officers explained that this was a secondary window which had been conditioned to be fitted with obscure glass to prevent overlooking and the exit and egress passageway to the garage was 2.2metres wide, which was wider than the current garage door.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed with five Members in favour, with one against.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be Approved as set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT - UP TO 31 MARCH 2010 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Members received a report updating them on the current position in relation to S106 agreements.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed that</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<p>the report be noted.</p> <p>Resolved – That the report be noted.</p>	
16.	<p>ENFORCEMENT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be taken. On being put to the vote, enforcement was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>Meg Hirani & James Rodger</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7:00 pm, closed at 9:20 pm.</p>	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.