

Minutes

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

23 June 2011

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Allan Kauffman Michael White Tim Barker Carol Melvin David Payne John Morgan David Allam Jazz Dhillon</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning) Meg Hirani (North Team Leader) Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer) Rory Stracey (Planning Lawyer) Charles Francis (Democratic Services)</p> <p>Also Present: Malcolm Ellis (Vice-Chairman Standards Committee)</p>	
195.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Cllr Edward Lavery with Cllr Michael White as substitute and also Cllr Michael Markham with Cllr Tim Barker acting as substitute.</p>	
196.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Carol Melvin declared a prejudicial interest in Item 6 – Former Reindeer Public House, Maxwell Road, Northwood and left the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Michael White declared a prejudicial interest in Item 7 – Southbourne Day Centre, 161 Elliot Avenue, Ruislip and left the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p>	
197.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 19 MAY 2011 AND 2 JUNE 2011 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as accurate records by the Committee and were signed by the Chairman.</p>	

198.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
199.	<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>All items were considered in Public with the exception of Item 12 which was considered in Private.</p>	
200.	<p>FORMER REINDEER PUBLIC HOUSE, MAXWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 18958/APP/2011/873 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to amended recommendation 2 as set out in the Addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the planning inspectors report it advised that the proposal would not impact on the character of the area if proper attention was paid to achieving good design. Later in the report the turrets were mentioned as unusual design. It was the petitioner's contention that the planning inspector had expressed personal opinion rather than apply relevant planning rules in this case. • In relation to amenity space, the design could only meet the requirement of 330m² by including a proportion of the front of the development and balcony space. Since these spaces would not be available to all residents, the design was not complaint with amenity space requirements. • The design did not incorporate outside space for children to play. The closest play space was 500m way and it was unreasonable to expect children to cross two major roads to use it. • The proposed design was flawed as it created an overlooking environment within the development and breached the 21 m rule. <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal takes account of the Council supplementary planning guidance. • The pitch and form of the roof will add to the character of the area. • The scale and bulk of the design meets Council requirements. • With respect to the points raised by the petitioner, the following comments were made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I. The turret design was passed by the inspector II. The amenity space was deemed sufficient 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>III. The use of the site was acceptable and the lack of amenity space available would be a judgement call for any prospective purchaser to make.</p> <p>IV. Overlooking concerns had been addressed in the design.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that it was a substantial site but the issues concerning the turret design and amenity space had been addressed in the inspectors report. Officers confirmed that the proposal complied with the aims of Saved Policy BE4 of the Unitary Development Plan.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval subject to a Section 278 Agreement was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and Addendum.</p>	
201.	<p>SOUTHBOURNE DAY CENTRE, 161 ELLIOTT AVENUE, RUISLIP - 66033/APP/2011/918 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>At the beginning of the item the Planning Officer introduced the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the amendments the Addendum.</p> <p>The Committee agreed the landscaping proposals contained within the report would enhance the development.</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 as set out in the Officer’s report and Addendum.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
202.	<p>LAND REAR OF 74 HALLOWELL ROAD, NORTHWOOD - 67679/APP/2011/651 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The petition had been signed by over 60 local residents which showed the strength of feeling against the proposed development. • The size, scale and bulk of the proposal was inappropriate. • The development would be out of character with the area. • The petitioner felt that not all alternative sites had been assessed e.g. the Northwood Underground station car park or close by industrial area • The height of the proposed mast had been increased from 20 metres to 21.75 metres and there was concern that this might be increased still further. • Surrounding trees would not be tall enough to obscure the mast. The mast would therefore adversely affect the local street 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>scene.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed development had been sited just outside an area of special character otherwise this application would not have been permitted. <p>The agent made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed telecommunications mast was an integral part of an upgrade programme which aimed to improve track safety. The proposed development site was the only one which London Underground had made available to Network Rail. The proposal had tried to make use of surrounding features to limit its visual impact. <p>In discussing the application, the Committee asked about the scope and scale of the Network Rail improvement project. The Committee heard that approximately 2,500 masts were required nationally to complete this and at present 1,500 were in place.</p> <p>The Committee was informed that the reason the proposed mast needed to be located close to the rail side was to ensure the necessary coverage to drivers and to provide a security of access for any emergency maintenance required. In response to a query about mast heights, the Committee heard the reason this was so high was to ensure the signal could be transmitted the required distance having taken factors such as the curvature of the track and topographic changes into consideration.</p> <p>While Members agreed that rail safety was important, there was the view that more sensitivity could be given to the local area and suggestions included the potential to explore either alternative mast locations and or the use of a greater number of smaller, less intrusive masts to achieve the desired coverage.</p> <p>Having discussed the application in detail, the Committee agreed that the application be refused owing to its siting, size, scale and bulk and the detrimental affect this would have on the visual amenity on surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>The recommendation for Refusal was moved, seconded and on being out to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</p>	
203.	<p>41, THE CHASE, EASTCOTE - 67626/APP/2011/412 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee’s attention to the changed plans in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>Officers confirmed that the proposed two storey side extension complied with the Council’s guidelines.</p> <p>The recommendation for Approval was moved, seconded and on being</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>

	<p>out to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Approved for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and the changes set out in the Addendum.</p>	
204.	<p>THE STABLES, MANOR FARM COMPLEX, PINN WAY, RUISLIP - 38669/APP/2011/982 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>The Committee noted that the site was in a designated Archaeological Priority Area and was located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. In introducing the report, officers confirmed that English Heritage had been consulted on the proposed development.</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 as set out in the Officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
205.	<p>THE STABLES, MANOR FARM COMPLEX, PINN WAY, RUISLIP - 38669/APP/2011/923 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</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 as set out in the Officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger & Meg Hirani</p>
206.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</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 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>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm closed at 8.15 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.