

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting held at the Civic Centre, Uxbridge on 9th December 2008
at 7.00pm

Councillor Bruce Baker (Chairman)
Councillor Allan Kauffman (Vice-Chairman)

Councillors: Michael Markham David Allam
Edward Lavery Anita McDonald

Advisory Members

*	Michael Hirst	Canal Locks Conservation Panel
	Chris Groom	Eastcote Conservation Panel
*	Clive Pigram	Ruislip Conservation Panel
*	John Ross	Harefield Village Conservation Panel
	Pamela Jeffreys	Ickenham Conservation Panel

* Denotes apologies received

Also Present: Councillors Scott Seam-Digby, Philip Corthorne and Andrew Retter.

1. BUSINESS TO BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC

The Committee agreed that all its business would be conducted in public with the exception of item 11, which was considered in Part 2 as it contained exempt information as specified in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985).

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no interests declared.

3. DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS

Decisions on applications are shown below and are based on Agenda and reports for the meeting, and an Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
1.	157-161 High Street Ruislip	West Ruislip	Proposed new development for 13 residential units including extensions to Spa (Involving some demolition to existing) (Outline Application)	64711/APP/2008/2050

The representative of a petition (in support of application) did not wish to address the Committee.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
2.	RAF Northolt West End Road Ruislip	South Ruislip	Reserved matters – Phase 2 (details siting, design, and external appearance in compliance with condition 3 of outline planning permission Ref: 189/APP/2005/1321 dated 8/3/2006: New and refurbished living accommodation, mess facilities, sports, social, health and welfare facilities, new office and technical accommodation (totalling 53,590 sq. metres floor space) improved infrastructure including utilities, access roads and parking (Consultation under Circular 18/84 procedure) Amendments to reserved matters application ref: 189/APP/2008/137.	189/APP/2008/2696

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
3.	1 Rectory Way Ickenham	Ickenham	Change of use of a single family dwelling house and attached annex to a children’s day nursery (Class D1) on the ground floor and first floor together with a one bedroom maisonette in the attached annex, including the provisions of	415/APP/2008/1504

			landscaping/parking at the front and a play area and private amenity space in the rear garden.	
--	--	--	--	--

Representatives of two petitions in objection to the proposal addressed the Committee. The agent spoke on behalf of petitioners and, as an agent in support of the proposal.

In answer to a point of clarification requested by a Member, Officer's advised that the flat had been registered since 1992 as a separate flat under Council Tax and that Officers therefore considered there to be two units on the site.

A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and stated that he had concerns about the noise report and questioned how this could be enforced. The Councillor indicated that there was a need for more nursery provision and the Council was working to bring a nursery in the area. Due to the need to increase housing stock in Ickenham, he added that the Council could not afford to remove desperately needed housing. He suggested that the proposed toilet facilities may result in the loss of space allocated for 18 children, and that the proposed parking for 6 staff would be insufficient. He stated that no provision had been made for covered cycle and that Waste provision was unacceptable. The Councillor requested that an informative be attached to advise that the proposal would be out of keeping with the street scene. The Councillor stated that he endorsed the Officer's recommendation for refusal.

A Member commented that the Hillingdon Childcare and Early years Service when consulted had raised no objection and had welcomed the proposal. He added that there was no requirement for planning permission to separate the two houses, which looked like one house in appearance. The Member pointed out that Policy R13 stated that 'use of residential accommodation for education and childcare premises will be acceptable where, within residential areas, only part of the dwelling can be used...' With regard to the issue of noise, the Member indicated that there was an area between the building and the garage, and noise was more likely to be emitted from the traffic than from the children playing on the other side of the road. For the above reasons, the Member was minded to approve the application.

A Member concurred with the previous comments made and added that they did not see how the loss of one property would have a detrimental effect on housing stock in Ickenham.

In answer to a question from the Conservation Area Advisory Member for Ickenham, Officer's advised that traffic survey information was provided through traffic generation via TRICS in London. They were asked to provide new information based on their traffic count, and this was not considered to be adverse. They observed that with 1 vehicles parked on eastern side, 2 vehicles could still pass on the section of the road south of the proposed access. Given the existing traffic issue at the junction of Rectory Way and Swakeleys Road, if the development was approved the generation of 6 extra vehicles could be addressed.

The Conservation Area Advisory Member stated that even if enforcement on yellow lines were to go ahead, it would not resolve the traffic problem, and the idea of 6

extra vehicles seemed unlikely. The section of Swakeleys Road was single lane traffic with commercial uses further along the road, in approving the application; the Committee would be perpetrating a traffic jam.

A Member added that they could understand concerns relating to traffic reasons and did not agree with comments made about keeping windows shut when talking about children.

The Officer recommendation was put to the vote and was overturned for the reasons mentioned above. The application was then approved subject to S106 Agreement and conditions to be agreed under delegated powers in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to S106 Agreement and conditions to be agreed under delegated powers in consultation with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
4.	173 West End Road, Ruislip	Manor	Provision of additional (second) floor involving construction of new mansard roof incorporating six dormer windows on south west elevation and three dormers on north west elevation, installation of lift shaft to main building and single storey extension to staff/store building and erection of an external staircase	19817/APP/2008/1975

The petition representative was unable to attend the meeting. Members head from the applicant who spoke in support of the development.

A ward Councillor addressed the meeting and stated that the previous application on the site was for a block of flats and would hate for this proposal to be turned down. The Councillor noted that the main opposition to this proposal was due to overlooking and concerns about car parking. He pointed out that the car park was virtually always empty and stated that in his opinion the proposed development would make a nice nursing home.

A Member added that whilst there was a need for care homes for the elderly, this particular proposed development was far to big for the area.

The Chairman commented that the current development was acceptable but the proposed development was too big and no transport statement or travel plans had been submitted.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
5.	70 Coniston Gardens, Eastcote	Northwood Hills	Erection of two two-storey three-bedroom semi-detached dwellings, involving the demolition of existing dwelling	48529/APP/2008/2154

The petition representative was unable to attend the meeting. Members heard from a Ward Councillor who stated that as indicated in the Officer’s report, the proposed development was likely to generate children of nursery or primary school age. He Councillor added that provision for educational contribution would therefore be required, and that the proposed development would result in overdominance.

The Councillor supported the Officer’s recommendation for refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
6.	Land rear of 81 – 93 Hilliard Road Northwood	Northwood Hills	Two storey building comprising 4 two-bedroom flats, with associated car parking, cycle store and bin store involving demolition of existing buildings	64786/APP/2008/2373

The Committee heard from a petition representative who spoke in objection to the application.

A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee and stated that the area with its appalling traffic and parking issues was well known to him. He indicated that the road was very bad with potholes, bumps and highway safety issues. The Councillor stressed that traffic generated from the school in the extremely tight road was unacceptable, and that the development was totally at odds with the Council’s policies.

The Councillor supported the Officer’s recommendation for refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
7.	28B Kingsend Ruislip	West Ruislip	Erection of 5 two-bedroom terrace houses and garage to side of plot 5, to include the demolition of existing dwelling (Outline application for the approval of access, appearance, layout and scale.	5740/APP/2008/2969

Three petition representatives addressed the Committee and spoke in objection to the proposal.

A Ward Councillor spoke in support of the petitioners and stated that the principles of development should not be conceded and that the assertion of the access arrangements should be challenged. He expressed concerns about the proposed development being squeezed into a narrow space and stated that the principles of backland development should be discouraged. The Councillor added that Policy H12 should have been highly emphasized. He welcomed the Tree Preservation Order to protect the cedar tree and the extended preservation area.

The Councillor endorsed the Officer's recommendation for refusal.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer's report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
8.	Rear of the Ferns Withy Lane Ruislip	West Ruislip	Erection of a three storey building with roof terrace and ground floor vehicular access to rear parking area to provide 5 one-bedroom flats (involving demolition of the existing workshop and associated store) (Outline application for approval of layout, appearance scale and access only)	6885/APP/2007/3707

The applicant spoke about the development, following the receipt of a petition that had been received in support of the application.

In answer to questions from a Member, the applicant advised that she had tried and failed to sell the property and had hoped that it would be easier to sell the property with planning permission.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
9.	16 Elm Avenue Eastcote	West Ruislip	Two storey building comprising two flats (one 1-bed and one 2-bed) and two car parking spaces at the front, involving demolition of existing dwelling.	64195/APP/2008/2605

RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to conditions and informatives in the Officer’s report.

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
10.	21 Frithwood Avenue Northwood	Northwood	Two-storey side extension on the east elevation to provide six additional bedrooms to the existing nursing home, with internal alterations.	42456/APP/2008/2981

The petitioner was not present at the meeting. A Ward Councillor’s letter of support was read at the meeting.

In answer to a question, Officers advised that it was a balancing exercise between allowing an increase in the number of bedrooms and the impact on the street scene and the adjoining occupiers. The property had been extended considerably and HDAS states that no more than 3.5 to 4 metres was allowed and looking at 1 Cullera Close, it goes the whole length of the property.

A Member added that the Urban Design Officer did not appear to be objecting but merely commented on the impact on the property in Cullera Close.

Officers advised that the development would not impact on Frithwood Avenue because it was set back, but would have an impact on Cullera Close.

A Member suggested that the application should be deferred for a visit to enable Members to judge the impact of the development on Cullera Close.

The Head of Planning commented that whether an extension was for a nursing home or housing, these types of proposals would not be acceptable in a conservation area.

Members denoted strong support for a site visit and unanimously agreed to make a site visit.

The Committee deferred the application to enable Members to visit the site to see the effect the impact of the development would have on Cullera Close.

PART 2

This report was considered in Part 2 because it contained exempt information as defined in paragraph 6 of the schedule to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985. The report contains information, which if disclosed to the public, would reveal that the authority proposes –

- a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
- b) to make an order or direction under any enactment (Paragraph 13 of the Schedule to the Act).

Item No.	Address	Ward	Proposal	Application No.
11.	45 Kingsend Ruislip	West Ruislip	Hoarding/fence around the site	ENF/527/08

RESOLVED

1. The Committee considered it expedient to take enforcement action under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2. That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to issue an Untidy Site Notice in respect of the loss of amenity caused by the condition of the site.
3. That the notice shall require the following steps to remedy the breach of planning control:
 - i) Demolish the existing hoarding, and replace with a like hoarding of new materials to match those replaced.
 - ii) The removal from the land of all debris and building materials resulting from compliance with requirement (i) above.
4. That in the event of non-compliance, the Borough Solicitor, in conjunction with the Corporate Director of Planning and Community Services, be authorised to take all further proceedings necessary to ensure compliance with the Notice, including direct action under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to remove all the material as set out above, and to recover the costs from those with an interest in the land.

The meeting closed at 10.29pm.