

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

3 February 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery, Allan Kaufmann, Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, David Payne, David Allam and Jazz Dhillon.</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meg Hirani (Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) James Rodger (Planning, Environment & Community Services) Nikki Deol (Legal Advisor) Nav Johal (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Michael White</p>	
94.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence to note.</p>	Action by
95.	<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 for item 6 and left the meeting for the duration of this item.</p> <p>Councillor Allan Kaufmann declared a personal interest for item 8 and remained in the room.</p> <p>Councillor Edward Lavery declared a personal interest for item 9 and remained in the room.</p>	Action by
96.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 21 December 2010 and 11 January 2011 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	Action by
97.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>	Action by
98.	<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>	Action by

	Items marked part 1 were considered in public and items parked part 2 were considered in private.	
99.	<p>76 EXMOUTH ROAD, RUISLIP 66257/APP/2010/1112 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Part single storey, part two storey side/rear extension, involving demolition of existing detached garage to side and single storey extension to rear.</p> <p>66257/APP/2010/1112</p> <p>The application site was located on the south east side of Exmouth Road and comprised of a two storey end of terrace house with a detached garage along the side boundary with 76 Exmouth Road and a part single storey rear extension. The attached house, 74 Exmouth Road, lies to the south west and had a single storey rear extension. To the north east lies 78 Exmouth Road, a two storey end of terrace house with part two storey side and part two storey, part single storey rear extension and front porch. This property was set behind the front wall, but extends beyond the rear wall of the application property.</p> <p>The street scene was residential in character and appearance, comprising two storey terraced houses and the application site lied within the developed area, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).</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>The officers report included new plans were produced in the addendum, which showed the proposed development more clearly.</p> <p>Points raised by the petitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mrs Ebers spoke on behalf of the petitioners who signed the petition objecting to the application. • The petitioner spoke about previous applications on this site. An application had been refused as a 2 storey was too large, another loft extension application had been approved since. • The petitioner queried whether the loft extension application had been taken into consideration with this new application. • The petitioner believed the applicant was careful going around planning law in order to gain approval for applications. • The petitioner disputed the officer's comments on the lighting in the report. She believed that the proposed development would block out some light. • She commented on the already very limited parking on Exmouth Road. That the current driveway on the application site had enough space for one car. • That the application if approved would involve demolishing the garage that was on the site. • The petitioner spoke about the anti-social behaviour and 	Action by

problems caused by tenants at the property.

- Mrs Ebers spoke about the overcrowding the the property, the sub-letting, fights etc that had caused the police to be called out.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

Ward Councillor Michael White addressed the meeting. The following points were raised:

- Councillor White stated that this application was not just an extension but a re-build of the house.
- He believed that the development would be out of sync with the rest of the houses on the street.
- That it would be detrimental to the street scene.
- That parking would cause a problem. That they could not have more cars parked on an already overcrowded street. He went on to say it was debateable whether the garage on the service road would be used to park a car.
- The Ward Councillor stated that there was a long history of planning applications on this site.
- He asked the Committee overturned the officer's recommendation for this application.

Chairman stated that only planning issues could be considered by the Committee. Members commented that several issues that were brought up were issues that they could not take into account when determining this planning application. These other issues could be taken up with other departments in the Council.

Members asked officers about the planning history of this application and the loft extension that was agreed. Officers stated that the loft conversion was permitted development which complied with legislation and the Council's requirements.

Members asked clarification on the size of the development which officers responded too. The 2-storey development was for half the width of the house. The distance to the nearest property would be 2.75metres.

Members queried the issues regarding parking with officers. Officers stated that the existing garage was 2metres wide so was not really a useable garage for car parking. That removing this garage would not impact on the parking situation on the street.

It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.

Resolved –

That the application be approved as set out in the officer's report.

100. **95-97 HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM 63771/APP/2010/2174** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Action by

Change of use from Class B2 (General Industry) to Class A5 (Hot Food Takeaways) for use as a takeaway, including installation of new shopfront.

63771/APP/2010/2174

Planning permission was sought for the retention of the use of the premises as a take away business and the shopfront. It was considered that the level of shop uses in the parade and in the nearby Ickenham Local Centre were adequate to maintain the convenience shopping needs of local residents, and the shopfront was acceptable and did not detract from the appearance of the street scene.

A fascia sign had also been erected however this is the subject to a separate application for Advertisement Consent. The new shopfront comprised a glazed shopfront set within a powder coated aluminium frame with a 1m wide centrally positioned doorway with internal ramped access.

Originally the applicants also applied for the retention of the extractor flue located on the flank wall of 97 High Street. The duct was located some 9m behind the front elevation of 97 High Street, immediately before the existing external metal staircase. It comprised galvanised steel attached to the wall by brackets and measures 1m by 1m tapering to 0.8m by 0.8m, and extending approximately 1m above the parapet. However, the applicants had agreed to submit details of a new flue and remove the existing one.

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

Points raised by the petitioner:

- The Petitioner present lived next door to the site.
- She stated that although the existing flue would be removed a subsequent flue would have to be approved.
- The petitioner stated that parking on the lay by would cause congestion to other residents.
- That rats would congregate in areas where rubbish was piled up.
- That the proposed application was not in-keep with the area.

Mr Christopher Dance spoke on behalf of the applicant:

- The applicant had worked very closely with the case officer to address any issues.
- He stated that there were no development plans that objected to this application.
- That there were no objections to the shop front.
- Mr Dance stated that the existing flue would be removed and a new one would be erected, where permission had been granted.
- He stated that there were no highways objections to the proposed application.
- That the application was subject to a time bound condition.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Dance stated that officers had fully scrutinised all the issues and he urged that the Committee followed the advice of the officers. <p>Members asked officers clarification on the opening hours of the premises. Officers confirmed that staff were only permitted on the premises from 08:00 until 23:30 hours, and this was as per the officer report.</p> <p>Members and officers discussed the flue which officers had made clear to the applicant a new one should be smaller in size. The current flue was unauthorised and did not have permission. It was confirmed that this was not in consideration with this application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report with amendments as set out in the addendum.</p>	
101.	<p>95A HIGH ROAD, ICKENHAM 63007/ADV/2010/59 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>1x internally illuminated fascia sign to front and 1x internally illuminated projecting sign.</p> <p>63007/ADV/2010/59</p> <p>The application site was located on the north west side of High Road Ickenham and comprised of a ground floor commercial unit in use as a hot food take-away, forming part of a terrace of 9 units, with residential above. To the north east lies 97 High Street and to the south west lies 93 High Street. The street scene comprises a mix of commercial and residential properties and the application site lies within the developed area, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).</p> <p>Advertisement consent was sought for the retention of an internally illuminated box fascia and projecting signs. The fascia sign was located on the fascia panel, measures 4.7m x 0.7m x 0.2m deep and was internally illuminated by fluorescent tubes. The projecting sign was located along the right side of the fascia panel, measures 0.7m x 0.6m x 0.12m and was also illuminated by fluorescent tubes.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	Action by

102.	<p>FORMER REINDEER PH, MAXWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD 18958/APP/2010/2210 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a part two storey, part three storey, part four storey building comprising 1, one-bedroom flat, 4, two-bedroom flats and 6, three bedroom flats, with associated car parking, secured cycle parking, bin store and alterations to vehicular access</p> <p>18958/APP/2010/2210</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the erection of a part two, part 3, part 4 storey 'U' shaped block of 11 flats comprising 1 x 1 bedroom, 4 x 2 bedroom and 6 x 3 bedroom apartments. The proposal includes parking for 19 cars at basement and surface level, 11 secure cycle spaces and bin stores at basement (lower ground) level.</p> <p>Two letters of objection had been received, objecting to the proposal on the grounds of lack of parking and increased traffic congestion. In addition, two petitions bearing 21 and 23 signatures have been received objecting on the grounds that the bulk, height and lack of child safe garden area made the scheme an unsuitable development. These two petitions had been withdrawn prior to the meeting. One letter of support has also been received.</p> <p>In response to concerns from the Urban Design and Conservation Officer, amended plans had been submitted modifying the design detailing of the gable feature on the front elevation, while the pitch of the roofs has been reduced to 46 degrees. Further consultations were carried out on the revised plans and one additional letter has been received, objecting on the grounds of increased traffic congestion and inadequate parking.</p> <p>The principle of a residential development and the mix of units were considered acceptable in this edge of town centre location. The layout, siting and scale of the development was compatible with surrounding built form and would respect the established character of the area. The proposal would not detract from the amenities of adjoining residents and provides satisfactory accommodation for future occupiers. Parking provision accords with the Council's standards and the Council's Highway Engineer raised no objection to the proposed means of access.</p> <p>The current scheme addressed the reasons for refusal of a previous scheme and a Unilateral Obligation had been signed, securing contributions towards the funding of additional school places, health care, construction training, libraries, public open space and management and monitoring. This application was therefore recommended for approval.</p> <p>The Chairman confirmed with the Committee that as the petitions for this application had been withdrawn there was no right to address Committee on behalf of this application from residents or the applicant.</p> <p>Members questions officers on the involvement of the applicants with</p>	Action by
------	--	-----------

	<p>officers which officers confirmed had been detailed. That the applicants had also involved residents, had a public consultation and amended plans to suit. Members were happy with the work that the applicants had carried out with residents and the changes they had made to the application.</p> <p>Members discussed the parking provisions which satisfied the requirements for the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet; 2. That in advance of, or at the time of implementation of the development, the Council enter into a legal agreement with the applicants under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to deliver the off site highway works; 3. That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions outlined in the report. 	
103.	<p>UNIT 3, RUISLIP RETAIL PARK, VICTORIA ROAD, RUISLIP 43510/APP/2010/1979 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Construction of a 1,810 sq.m mezzanine within Unit 3, Ruislip Retail Park.</p> <p>43510/APP/2010/1979</p> <p>Planning permission was sought for the installation of a mezzanine sales and storage area, which would add an additional 1,810m² in floor space to an existing vacant retail unit, formally occupied by MFI, at the Ruislip Retail Park, Victoria Road.</p> <p>The application was supported by a detailed planning and retail impact statement which concluded that the proposal would not result in a significant detrimental impact on retailing in the adjoining local centre, given the type of business likely to operate from this particular unit. Subject to the existing sales restrictions, and a condition preventing the sub division of the unit, the additional floorspace would not have a significant detrimental impact on the vitality or viability of nearby centres. Accordingly, there were no objections to the principle of the development.</p> <p>The increase in showroom area was unlikely to translate into a significant increase in customers visiting the store or in vehicle trips. The existing car parking and servicing facilities for the retail park would be retained for use by the proposed unit and would continue to meet the needs of the proposed unit and retail park as a whole.</p>	Action by

	<p>The proposed external amendments were minor and would remain in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development would not result in any detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby residential occupiers, subject to conditions.</p> <p>The development proposes acceptable accessibility arrangement which could be secured by way of condition. Subject to conditions, the proposal was considered to be acceptable and to accord with the provisions of the development plan. Accordingly, approval was recommended.</p> <p>Members questioned why the Green Travel Plan had been applied as a condition on this application. Officers stated that this was something the applicants had offered to be put forward as a condition of the application. Members agreed that this should be included as an informative rather than a condition on the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report, addendum sheet and the deletion of condition 9; 2) An Additional informative be added as follows: ‘The applicant is encouraged to produce and implement a Green Travel Plan which relates to the whole unit and sets targets for sustainable travel arrangements and a commitment to achieving the travel plan objectives’. 	
104.	<p>8 ST MARTINS APPROACH, RUISLIP 44613/APP/2010/2283 (Agenda Item 10)</p> <p>Single storey rear extension, involving demolition of existing garage.</p> <p>44613/APP/2010/2283</p> <p>The application site was located on the east side of St Martins Approach and comprised of a two storey semi-detached house with a detached garage to the rear along the northern side boundary, forming a pair of semi-detached garages with that at 10 St Martins Approach. The attached house, 6 St Martins Approach, lies to the south and had not been extended. To the north lies 10 St Martins Approach, also a two storey semi-detached house. The street scene was residential in character and appearance comprising two storey semi-detached houses of similar design, with pairs of semi-detached garages to the rear, and the application site lied within the Moat Drive Area of Special Local Character, as identified in the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007). The application site was also covered by an Archaeological Priority Area.</p> <p>It was proposed to erect a part single storey rear extension involving</p>	Action by

	<p>the demolition of the existing garage. An application for a larger single storey rear extension was refused planning permission in June 2010. The applicant attempted to overcome the previous reasons for refusal by reducing the width and depth of the rear extension, and by replacing the dummy-pitch roof previously proposed with a pitched roof. The single storey rear extension would be in set 250mm from the side boundary with 10 St Martins Approach. It would measure 4.38 wide, 4.96m deep and finished with a ridged roof, 2.6m high at eaves level and 3.65m high to ridge level.</p> <p>The proposed extension would be attached to the rear elevation of the original house via a link extension measuring 1.65m wide, 1.2m deep and finished with a ridged roof 3.4m high at its highest point. The single storey rear extension would comprise a hall (with side doors), w.c and kitchen (with front and rear windows and side doors). An additional parking space measuring 2.0m wide and 3.8m deep was provided in the front garden of the application property.</p> <p>The previously refused application proposed a part single storey rear extension incorporating the existing detached garage. It was shown to measure 4.6m wide, 6.7m deep and finished with a flat roof with dummy pitches on all sides, 2.6m high at eaves level and 3.6m high at its highest point. The proposed extension was shown to be attached to the rear elevation of the original house via a link extension measuring 1.7m wide, 1.2m deep and finished with a ridged roof 3.4m high at its highest point.</p> <p>Members discussed that this application was deeper than they would usually approve but the existing block was currently deeper than the proposed so this change would reduce the depth.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
105.	<p>FORMER MILL WORKS, BURY STREET, RUISLIP 6157/APP/2010/2384 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Variation of condition 4 (to enable erection of two garages to Plots 2 and 3) of planning permission ref: 6157/APP/2009/2069 dated 02/03/2010: Erection of 66 dwellings comprising 2, three-storey apartment blocks providing 30 apartments (1 studio; 5 one-bedroom; 21 two-bedroom; and 3 three bedroom units) and 32 three-bedroom and 4 four-bedroom houses with associated car parking, landscaping and access (involving the demolition of existing buildings.)</p> <p>6157/APP/2010/2384</p> <p>This was a S73 application to make minor material amendments to the approved scheme for 66 residential units at the former Mill Works Site.</p>	Action by

	<p>The application sought to vary condition 4 of planning permission ref: 6157/APP/2009/2069, to enable changes to be implemented to the consented development, involving the inclusion of 2 detached garages to serve plots 2 and 3, located in the north east corner of the site.</p> <p>The inclusion of the detached garages was supported, having regard to the scale and nature of the built development, the opportunity for new tree planting and the limited impact the proposal will have on the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The development would not detract from the amenities of future or surrounding occupiers.</p> <p>Subject to conditions originally imposed, in so far that they were still relevant to the scheme and still capable of being discharged, and a Deed of Variation to the S106 Agreement, the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Officers explained to Members that rumours of a pink tiled roof on the site were inaccurate. The sheeting on the roof had a pinkish colour to them but this was temporary. A tiled roof would be covering this and the pinkish coloured would be hidden.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be approved</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>That the application be approved as set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
106.	<p>LAND O/S SORTING OFFICE, JUNCTION OF EAST WAY AND PARK WAY, RUISLIP (<i>Agenda Item 13a</i>)</p> <p>Replacement of existing 12.5 metre high monopole mobile phone mast with a 15 metre high monopole mobile phone mast, replacement equipment cabinet and ancillary works (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995) (as amended.)</p> <p>59076/APP/2010/2931</p> <p>It was proposed to replace the existing 12.5m high monopole mobile phone mast with a 15m high (including antennas) monopole mobile phone mast incorporating six antennas. An existing equipment cabinet would also be replaced with a larger equipment cabinet.</p> <p>The proposed telecommunications mast by virtue of its size and location would detract from the street scene as it would be a readily apparent and incongruous element. The mast would not harmonise with the existing street scene and as such is contrary to Policies BE13, BE37 and OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Polices (September 2007).</p> <p>Members wished to make it clear to operating companies that they needed to go through the proper processes when making changes to applications.</p>	Action by

	<p>It was moved, seconded and was unanimously agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>1) That prior approval of siting and design was required; 2) The details of siting and design were refused for the reasons stated in the report.</p>	
107.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>The enforcement report was presented to Members.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and approved that enforcement action be agreed as per the report.</p> <p>Resolved –</p> <p>The Enforcement Report was unanimously agreed by the Committee.</p>	Action by
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.30 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nav Johal on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank