

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 August 2010

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Alan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman), David Allam (Labour Lead), Michael Markham, Carol Melvin and David Payne.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Natasha Dogra (Democratic Services) Meg Hirani (Planning Officer) James Rodger (Head of Planning & Enforcement) Syed Shah (Planning Officer) Sarah White (Legal Advisor)</p>	
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Anita MacDonald sent her apologies.</p>	Action by
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Michael Markham declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in item 8 and item 16 of the agenda. Cllr Markham did not leave the room and voted on both items.</p>	Action by
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	Action by
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
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>Items marked Part I were considered in public and Items 19 and 20 were marked Part II and were considered in private.</p>	Action by
6.	<p>UXBRIDGE GOLF CLUB, THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM, 4601/APP/2010/1103 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>	Action by

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petition received in support of the proposal was invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioner:

- The golf club is currently not being used and had been in decline for years
- There was no practice ground or teaching ground for golfers
- The steep slopes at hole 9 and 10 are very difficult to play on and needed to be addressed
- The drainage system needed restoration
- The golf course needed rejuvenation by an applicant as soon as possible.

In accordance with the Council's constitution three representatives of the three petitions received in objection to the proposal were invited to address the meeting.

Points raised by the petitioners:

- The proposed plans for the golf course by the current applicant would be harmful to the wildlife in the area
- The steep slopes on the course cannot be used by disabled people
- There were issues with the drainage system, with many holes not being used throughout the year as there was flooding in some parts of the green
- Landfill issues do not help drainage problems
- Lorries carrying landfill waste will cause noise pollution for local residents
- Additional conditions should be imposed on the applicant in relation to a deadline for landfill completion and a review of progress
- Membership of the golf club had been adversely affected due to the lack of action by the applicant

The Agent was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee:

- The Agent reiterated the fact that the company was not a landfill company, but a golf management company operating in the UK and Ireland.
- The company currently operated eleven public golf courses
- The 2010 season would see the company pay over £400,000 in rent to the London Borough of Hillingdon (£280,000 in fixed rent and £120,000 in turnover related rent).

The Committee asked the Agent that should planning permission be granted how long would it be before the golf course could be played on. The Agent said the **works** would be completed by April **2012**. The Committee also asked Members why the course had not **been** maintained lately. The Agent said he was unable to answer as he was not involved in the course maintenance.

A Ward Councillor was present and addressed the Committee:

- There had been a total lack of maintenance of the golf course
- Disabled access was unsatisfactory

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Restoration Bond offered by the Agent was not a large enough sum and would not cover restoration costs, should the company fail to complete the task. <p>Members commended Officers on a very comprehensive report. Members highlighted their concerns over the low rate of the restoration bond put forward by the Applicant. The Committee said that figure of the bond currently being offered was very low compared to expected offers.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, the Committee agreed refusal unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the following reason:</p> <p><i>“The applicant has failed to demonstrate that an appropriate level of security in the form of a land restoration bond will be provided. Given that the sum of the land restoration bond has not been agreed, in the opinion of the local planning authority, the development presents unacceptable risks to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt and the ecological value of nearby sites of nature conservation interest. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies EC1, OL1, OL2 and R17 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007.”</i></p>	
7.	<p>SOUTH RUISLIP LIBRARY, PLOT A, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP, 67080/APP/2010/1419 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>This Item was withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning prior to the meeting and will be reported at a later date.</p>	Action by
8.	<p>53 PINN WAY, RUISLIP, 1244/APP/2009/2425 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</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 proposals put forward by the applicant did not conform with the Council’s planning policies. <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting. No Ward Councillors were present.</p> <p>Members discussed the application and agreed that the proposals would result in gross overdevelopment.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to vote the application was refused unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by

<p>9.</p>	<p>THE FERNS, WITHY LANE, RUISLIP, 6885/APP/2009/2650 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petition received in support to the proposal was not invited to address the meeting, as the item had been considered previously where the petitioner and applicant had spoken.</p> <p>Members agreed that overdevelopment would result in a decline in the quality of the accommodation due to the lack of space available. The Committee agreed that there was no space for amenity space on the site.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p>
<p>10.</p>	<p>8 SUNNINGDALE AVENUE RUISLIP, 19038/APP/2010/770 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</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 proposed application was out of place with the surrounding buildings • It was highlighted that it was important to keep a sustainable and close community in the area, and this proposal would not encourage this. • Overshadowing issues would cause a detrimental effect on the neighbouring houses. • There was a lack of amenity space in the planned proposals <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting. A Ward Councillor was present and addressed the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ward Councillor supported and endorsed the petitioners’ views ▪ The proposed plans were not in keeping with the surrounding houses ▪ The proposed amenity space was inadequate <p>Members asked for further clarification about the location of bins. Officers informed Members that the bins would be kept in the front garden. The Committee agreed that they did not want to encourage this.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons as set out in the officer’s report with reason 1 being amended as below:</p>	<p>Action by</p>

	<p><i>"The proposal, by reason of its excessive density and site coverage with buildings, including the bin storage building to the front and hard-standing, represents an over-development of the site, that would be out of keeping with the pattern of surrounding residential development and results in an excessive loss of garden space, detrimental to the verdant character and visual amenity of the area. The development therefore fails to harmonise with the character of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007), Policies 3A.3, 4B.1 and 4B.8 of the London Plan, guidance within The London Plan Interim Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, April 2010 and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (as amended) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts."</i></p>	
11.	<p>HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD, 9011/APP/2010/1120 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report.</p>	Action by
12.	<p>HAREFIELD HOSPITAL, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD, 9011/APP/2010/1121 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report.</p>	Action by
13.	<p>KYLEMORE HOUSE, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD, 46539/APP/2010/1396 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</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 proposed vehicle crossover encouraged encroachment of neighbouring properties • The proposed fence would create a suburban style frontage, which was not in keeping with the area • The proposed high fence would decrease the openness of the area, which was in the green belt. <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting. No Ward Councillors were present.</p> <p>Members agreed that the proposed plans did not conform with Council planning policies.</p>	Action by

	<p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused with the additional reason below:</p> <p><i>“The boundary fence, by reason of its overall height, siting and scale would result in a visually obtrusive form of development which would be detrimental to the open and rural character of Hill End Road and the visual amenities of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and OL4 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.”</i></p>	
14.	<p>KYLEMORE HOUSE, HILL END ROAD, HAREFIELD, 46539/APP/2010/1397 (Agenda Item 14)</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 plans proposed by the applicant appeared to be an extension, and not a conservatory as stated in the officers’ report. ▪ Should the plans be approved there would be no garden area on the property. ▪ The plans would be gross overdevelopment in the green belt area. <p>The Applicant / Agent were not present at the meeting. No Ward Councillors were present.</p> <p>Members agreed that the proposed plans would lead to gross overdevelopment in the green belt.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused.</p>	Action by
15.	<p>3 LONG LANE, ICKENHAM, 64180/APP/2010/330 (Agenda Item 15)</p> <p>Members said the design and appearance of the property was poor and not in keeping with the appearance of the area.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be refused. On being put to the vote, refusal was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refusal as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by

16.	<p>84 & 84A LONG LANE, ICKENHAM, 3231/APP/2009/555 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by
17.	<p>111 WEST END ROAD, RUISLIP, 63665/APP/2010/1034 (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by
18.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 327 VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP, 54831/APP/2010/171 (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by
19.	<p>20 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD, 66826/APP/2010/358 (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p>Members said the property had not been in use for the last few years. If the property stayed as A1 use it may deter future applications, resulting in no use for the shop. The Committee agreed that changing the use from A1 to A3 would encourage use of the property during these economically difficult times.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be approved. On being put to the vote, approval was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – It was agreed that the Officers’ recommendation be overturned and the application be approved with conditions as set out in the report and on the addendum.</p>	Action by
20.	<p>ENFORCEMENT (<i>Agenda Item 20</i>)</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the Officers’ recommendations be enforced. On being put to the vote, enforcement was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – It was agreed that the Officers’ recommendations be enforced.</p>	Action by
21.	<p>ENFORCEMENT (<i>Agenda Item 21</i>)</p>	Action by

	<p>It was moved and seconded that the Officers' recommendations be enforced. On being put to the vote, enforcement was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>Resolved – It was agreed that the Officers' recommendations be enforced.</p>	
22.	<p>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 (<i>Agenda Item 22</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
23.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 (<i>Agenda Item 23</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	Action by
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.50 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Natasha Dogra on 01895 277488. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.