

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

28 April 2011

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), Michael Markham, Carol Melvin, David Payne, Brian Stead, David Allam and Jazz Dhillon</p> <p>Officers Present: Meg Hirani (Planning, Environment, Education & Community Services) Syed Shah (Planning, Environment, Education & Community Services) James Rodger (Planning, Environment, Education & Community Services) Sarah Hickey (Legal Advisor) Nadia Williams (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Councillors John Morgan and Philip Corthorne</p>	
153.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Allan Kauffman. Councillor Brian Stead attended in his place.</p>	
154.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest notified.</p>	
155.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 7 April 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
156.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There had been no items notified as urgent.</p>	
157.	<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 would be considered in Part 1 and Part 2.</p>	Action by

158.	<p>LYON COURT AND 28-30 PEMBROKEROAD, RUISLIP 66985/APP/2010/2894 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Erection of part 2, part 3, part 4 storey blocks, plus accommodation in roof space, to provide 71, one, two and three bedroom flats, together with associated parking and landscaping (involving demolition of existing buildings)</p> <p>This application was withdrawn from the agenda at the applicant's request.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
159.	<p>IMADA, 12 KADUNA CLOSE, EASTCOTE 52580/APP/2010/2293 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a first floor side extension to provide 2 two-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in objection to the proposal addressed the meeting and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development concerned a health and fitness club, which was a commercial enterprise and not a residential unit • Discharge from restaurants already impacted on residents in Kaduna Close • The tennis courts in the adjoining tennis club had had grass laid two years ago and had been the only existing leisure activity in the area • The car park in the rear of the site had never been resurfaced • Worked very hard to run the tennis club and provide a very valuable amenity to the local area • Concerned that building works would cause severe disruption to the area • Urged the Committee to refuse this application, as it had no place in an already constrained site. <p>A representative of the Eastcote Village Conservation Area Advisory Panel addressed the meeting raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supported the reasons for refusal set out in the officer's report • The overall size and design of the proposed development would be overdominant, visually intrusive and would fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the original building • Concerned about the effect the development would have on trees that were covered by Tree Preservation Orders (TPO20), as trees severely cut back would affect the view of the River Pinn which was in the Conservation area • Concerned about the lack of amenity space for the proposed development and substandard accommodation for future occupiers • The proposed development would lead to increased parking issues in Kaduna Close, which already housed a sporting facility in a dead end road 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

- Considered that traffic impact assessment should have been conducted and included in the officer's report
- Asked the Committee to refuse the application as recommended in the officer's report.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petition received in support to the proposal addressed the meeting and raised the following points:

- That small business enterprises made up 60% to 70% of the national economy compared to mega organisations which in their view dictated to local authorities
- Suggested that for a small business to survive, it was important for it to be able to maximise its investments and make careful use of its assets
- That the applicant had taken the tennis club and local residents into consideration
- That the application had been put together by using planners, local development officers and estates agents

The applicant's representative made the following points:

- Spoke as one of the owners of the proposed development
- Suggested that many of the objection appeared to be irrelevant
- That only two neighbours had objected
- Suggested that one of the Ward Councillors had taken a personal interest to ensure application was refused
- Considered that they had not been treated equally and that the Human Rights Act of 1994 had not be taken into consideration
- Suggested that the officer's report was biased and contradictory
- That a petition in support of the application had been submitted to mitigate the comments made by the Conservation Urban Design Officer
- That the amenity space was a veranda on the first floor and not the roof top
- That the terrace amenity space on the roof top had been wrongly calculated
- That much importance had been placed on the pruning of the oak tree which would make no difference, as the area got a lot of sun
- Suggested that floodlights would have no adverse effect on the flats as they were focused on the tennis court
- Confirmed that they were prepared to give an indemnity on an agreed amount to the Council
- Considered that it would be democratic to reassess the report before the Committee made a decision.

Officers commented that there had been a typological error on page 55 which should read 'refusal' and not 'approval'.

With regard to the calculation of the amenity space, the Committee noted that this was calculated using usable space less discount around

the door. Members were directed to page 185 of the plans and explained that the amenity space was located at the end of the proposed parking area and with the position of the oak tree; this rendered the proposed amenity space to be unsuitable.

Regarding the issue of floodlighting, officers explained that the floodlight was situated on the boundary of the site with the tennis court and where the proposed flats were situated was in front of the proposed development. It was noted therefore, that the floodlights would have an impact, as they were not designed to limit light spillage.

The committee noted that the application had been assessed in its merit and the report had reflected this.

Members indicated that whilst it was true that more accommodation was needed in the Borough, substandard developments were unacceptable. The proposed amenity space was considered not to be inadequate as the idea of the flats being so close to the tennis court, with a car park on the other side was considered not to be an appropriate place to add two additional flats.

In respect of the issue of parking, officers advised that the Highway Engineer had considered that parking was an issue which may impact on existing demand and would therefore merit an additional reason for refusal on highway grounds as follows:

- Inadequate provision for refuse vehicles
- No information provided about existing demand for the car park
- No information on spare capacity of car park and on-street parking which would lead to;
- Inadequate car parking for the proposed development.

The Committee requested officers to provide the wording for the additional reason for refusal in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

The recommendation together with the additional reason for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report together with the following additional reasons for refusal:

The proposals fail to provide an assessment of the existing parking demand for the car park, on-street parking stress and swept paths for refuse vehicles. In the absence of information, the proposals are considered to have inadequate car parking, unsatisfactory layout for refuse vehicles and are likely to lead to situations detrimental to highway and pedestrian safety contrary to the Council’s Policies AM7 and AM14 of the UDP.

160.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 26A WINDMILL HILL, RUISLIP 67242/APP/2011/145 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Two storey 3 x bed detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front of No 26a</p> <p>This application was withdrawn from the agenda at the applicant's request.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
161.	<p>37 KEWFERRY ROAD, NORTHWOOD 29369/APP/2011/155 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a front porch (Part retrospective application)</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
162.	<p>37 KEWFERRY ROAD, NORTHWOOD 29369/APP/2011/156 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Boundary wall to front/side (Part retrospective application)</p> <p>The Committee raised objection to the proposal for the vehicle crossover being used for vehicle exit and entrance.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
163.	<p>LAND OPPOSITE 144 JOEL STREET, NORTHWOOD 58424/APP/2011/494 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Replacement of existing 15m high mobile phone mast with a 17.5m high mast with 3 no. antennas, replacement of one equipment cabinet and installation of one new equipment cabinet</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that an application that had been refused in 2005 was granted on appeal in 2006.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor of the application site addressed the meeting and made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested that consideration must be given to the impact this application would have on residents, particularly those living in Acre Road • At 17.5metres high, the proposed development would be exceptionally large and would not resemble a telegraph pole or a lamp post 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed cabinet would result in the loss of even more green hedges and paces • Urged the Committee to refuse this application because of the detrimental impact it would have on the health of residents in the area. <p>In response to a question about the size of the green equipment cabinet, officers advised that the current 1.4metre cabinet would be replaced by a 1.7metre cabinet.</p> <p>A member commented that as such applications were on the increase, the Council should engage on an open discussion with other boroughs to develop a dialogue with telecom companies.</p> <p>Officers advised that liaison with other boroughs was already in place where chief planning officers from other boroughs met regularly with the Association of London Borough of Hillingdon’s planning officers.</p> <p>It was noted that this type of application was a London wide issue which could be included on the agenda in order to open up possible discussions with operators.</p> <p>The Chairman asked for the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection to include this issue on the agenda with a view to Hillingdon Borough taking the lead.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
164.	<p>MCKENZIE HOUSE, BURY STREET, RUISLIP 19033/APP/2010/1088 <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p>Erection of replacement warehouse and alteration to existing parking layout (involving demolition of existing warehouse)</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and changes in the Addendum circulated at the meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
165.	<p>114 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP 28254/APP/2011/239 <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p>Installation of new shop-front and awning (Part retrospective application)</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

	informatives set out in the officer's report.	
166.	<p>114 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP 28254/APP/2011/454 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from Class A1 (Retail) to Class A1/A3 (Retail/Restaurants and Cafes)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that the inspectors at recent appeal decisions had considered mixed use to be acceptable.</p> <p>The Chairman sought clarification about the split usage on this application to which officers explained that 60% would be for non-retail use (including take away service for coffee).</p> <p>A Member added that this sort of retail outlet could only add to the longevity of high streets.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
167.	<p>114 HIGH STREET, RUISLIP 28254/ADV/2011/6 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Installation of 1, internally illuminated fascia sign, 1, externally illuminated projecting sign and 1, awning to front</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
168.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed. 2. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the officer's report to be released into the public domain, solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned. 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>

169.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p>Enforcement Report</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>3. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</p> <p>4. That the Committee resolved to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in the officer's report to be released into the public domain, solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Meg Hirani</p>
170.	<p>ANY ITEMS TRANSFERRED FROM PART 1 (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
171.	<p>ANY OTHER BUSINESS IN PART 2 (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
<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 Charles Francis on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.