

At a meeting of the Chiswick Area Committee (Planning) held on Thursday, 12 January 2006 at 7:30 pm in The Michael Room, St Michael and All Angels Parish Hall, Priory Avenue, Chiswick W4.

Present:

Councillor Thompson (Chair)
Councillors Barwood, Kinghorn, Lynch, McGregor and Oulds.

Apologies for Absence

Councillors Davies, Day and Lee.

98. Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2005

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 December were confirmed with one amendment – Item 82, page 5, paragraph 4 – sentence reading, ‘The Area Planning Manager confirmed that the original design of the flue, for which permission had been granted, could not be installed’. Add, ‘ ... without the consent of the freeholder.’

99. Old Vicarage, Sutton Lane South

See the report of the Director of Planning and the addendum report– Agenda Item 7.

The Chair had agreed to take speakers on this item.

Councillor Lynch declared that the three ward councillors, namely himself, Councillor Barwood and Councillor Kinghorn had attended presentations by both the objectors and the proposers.

The Chair invited the applicant, Pauline Williamson, to address the Committee. She and a parent, Laurence Norfolk, would divide the allotted five minutes to speak between them.

Pauline Williamson explained that Heathfield House School was a small, family run school, described as outstanding by OFSTED. To continue to grow, the school needed to expand the premises. The Old Vicarage was considered to be an ideal site, close to the existing premises. She explained that the applicants had worked hard with residents. Two evening meetings had been held with local residents and the application had been revised in response, reducing the number of pupils from 125 to 75. It had also been agreed to create a car free zone around the area, which would be a contractual obligation for parents and teachers. There was support from some residents and the applicants were keen to work with residents, as they believed this to be the right site in the local community.

Laurence Norfolk spoke as the parent of a child currently at Heathfield House School, as he believed the children would be most affected by the decision.

He wished to represent the benefits his son enjoyed from the present school and its location locally within the community. He explained how, at only five years old, he was familiar with local bus routes, from his journey to school, and with the height of the church steeple and the work of the fire service, from local visits. Mr Norfolk suggested that the environment of the school and its location affected what children would learn. He believed that school and children should be a part of, not excluded from, the community. He commented that the education of children was more important than where someone parked their car and questioned where schools were to go if local residents' opposition pushed schools out of residential areas. He was aware that another recent application for a school had been turned down but pointed out that this present application was for a school within the community, not within a light industrial estate. He believed that someone needed to say a difficult 'yes' to the application for the wider benefit of the children, rather than the easier 'no' and asked the Committee to approve the application.

There were no questions of the speakers so the Chair invited Stevan Whitehead to speak in opposition to the proposal.

Mr Whitehead thanked the Committee for the opportunity to raise local residents' concerns. He hoped that members had had the opportunity to look through the representations made. These emphasised that local residents had nothing against the school. Members who had attended the meetings organised by the objectors would be aware that the objection related to change of use of the building and the belief that the building was not suitable for a school.

Local residents objecting to the proposal saw no valid reason to overturn the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Stating that this was a good school was not enough. Objectors were dissatisfied with many elements of the report and did not feel that it gave an accurate representation of the case. He did not feel that the concerns of those opposing the application were fully represented. Not all the letters of opposition were reflected in the report.

Having studied the submissions on the Planning file, Mr Whitehead noted that most of the letters of support did not raise planning issues. He did not believe that all should carry equal weight. For example, there were 25 pre-printed letters from Chiswick Studios, one mile from the site.

Objectors did not believe that some of the applicant's plans as submitted were feasible. Mr Whitehead circulated to members of the Committee copies of photographs submitted by residents to identify the traffic/parking situation. The Old Vicarage was at a busy junction with a high level of congestion. Cars could not pass if there was parking both sides in the narrow surrounding streets. It was suggested the school would generate a minimum of 80 extra journeys per day.

Mr Whitehead displayed maps to demonstrate where support and objection lay. These showed that many supporters did not live locally to the school. It was felt that the survey of children arriving by car, taken before the change of the clocks and before dark mornings and evenings, was not accurate. Also the survey had not taken account the area outside the exclusion zone. Many

supporters of the school lived outside Chiswick and Mr Whitehead suggested that this would make the situation worse. If the exclusion area was implemented, and there was no legal base for an exclusion zone, the problem was likely to be pushed elsewhere. Mr Whitehead advised that there were already difficulties arising from the delivery of children by car to the other private schools established in the area. His own children had been hit when walking to the local state primary school by car doors opened carelessly. Cars did use the area as a rat run, the local underpass was in a poor state and they were 10 metres from one of the most heavily polluted stretches of road.

Mr Whitehead noted the applicants proposed in respect of the noise of playtimes to have fixed times but nevertheless believed that local residents would suffer from the impact of noise, as the garden to be used for play was close to living accommodation. Overall, it was felt that the scheme would lead to significant diminution of amenities that local residents enjoyed at present.

There were no questions of the speaker. Councillor Oulds joined the meeting during Mr Whitehead's presentation.

The Area Planning Manager, Marilyn Smith, introduced the report. She explained that the previous vicarage was currently in private residential use. It was proposed to convert the building to a school for a maximum of 75 pupils from Years 2-6. Reception and Year 1 would remain at the Heathfield Gardens site. The site had been chosen to run in conjunction with the present Heathfield House School so that children could continue their education within walking distance. It was proposed to establish physical links so that parents could drop children at one premises and they could be walked to another. This dictated the choice of location.

In respect of the physical change to the building, externally, there would be a new fire escape. The internal change was minimal. The level of support and objection had been demonstrated through the large number of letters and petitions. Additional responses were noted in the addendum report. There was a high level of public feeling for and against.

In respect of the loss of residential accommodation, Ms Smith explained that the UDP stated that residential should be protected, unless there were exceptional circumstances. The property had been marketed for 7 months, but this was not in itself a reason for agreeing to loss of residential. However, use for a primary school, given needs in the area, could be argued to be an acceptable use. The Education Authority had advised that there were only 22 places available in the local state schools, with some schools oversubscribed, but an independent school would attract pupils from a wider catchment.

With regard to the traffic and parking issues, the area had been the subject of consultation about a possible CPZ. It was situated near the M4/A4 and there were problems of rat running, commuter parking and business parking identified by residents. The CPZ consultation had shown that the roads close to the A4 were in favour of a CPZ. Residents had concerns about dangerous parking already from the existing Falconer and Montessori schools.

In response, the applicants had done surveys and produced a Green Traffic

Plan. It was proposed that pupils should be dropped off at Heathfield House and walked under the underpass to the other site. The school provided all day care from 8.00 a.m. to 6.00 p.m. so times of dropping off and collecting children would be more staggered than at other schools. The proposed exclusion zone would be 450m; a large area that would be difficult for the Council to enforce. The school had said that they would make it a condition of the contract with the parent but again it raised the question of whether enforcement was achievable.

In respect of noise amenity, this was a noisy environment near the M4 and in close proximity to some residential. The new vicarage did not appear on the present Ordnance Survey but the application had been assessed in the knowledge that the building was there. The play area would be secured and fenced and could be monitored, with fixed play times, but there would nevertheless be the noise of play.

The Area Planning Manager drew members' attention to paragraph 7.2 of the report. She had received news late that day that the Department for Culture, Media and Sport had listed the building that afternoon. The Grade II listing was on the basis of the group of buildings as the church was by the same architect. The group of buildings was visible across the M4. The listing protected the building from demolition and an application for Listed Building Consent would now be required. Ms Smith pointed out that the fire escape was bulky and very visible.

The Area Planning Manager reported that although the decision was finely balanced, on balance officers were recommending refusal. There were concerns about highway issues, although it was appreciated that the applicant had made attempts to overcome these. Members were advised that they could consider a S106 agreement in respect of such issues. It was felt that there would be increased noise and disturbance from more activity on the site and there were issues about the appearance of the fire escape.

There were no questions of the Area Planning Manager so the Chair opened the discussion.

Councillor Lynch moved the recommendation for refusal with some sadness. He had visited the school in Heathfield Terrace and was aware that it was an excellent organisation. However, whilst he would like to encourage good practice and a good school, he believed the reasons for refusal were compelling. He believed that the traffic reasons had been understated. He was aware that the delivery and collection of children to and from primary schools by car created very serious problems. He was aware of unbelievable incidents of people acting in a way that was oblivious to the safety of any children. Such incidents were attested around both state and private schools in a number of areas.

Councillor Lynch suggested the starting point for any new school must be a site where the traffic was mostly safe, such as a straight road with no strange turnings. This site was asking for an accident to happen. He did not believe that the school or parents could be relied on to comply with an agreement, although he commended the school for working towards this.

Councillor Lynch advised that he had experienced the traffic difficulties in the vicinity first hand when attending the residents' consultation meeting in the church by car. He noted difficulties with Sutton Lane South and the junction with the A4/M4. The turning was very tight without the school and such a manoeuvre would be exceptionally difficult with a school there. Councillor Lynch was prepared to accept that a number of pupils would approach the school on foot, but suggested this made matters worse because of the dangers from cars. He believed that it was asking for trouble to introduce a school into an area that had every kind of traffic problem already. Hence, with regret for the ambitions of an excellent school, he believed that refusal was the correct decision.

Councillor Barwood seconded the motion for refusal.

Councillor Kinghorn agreed that the traffic issue was a serious problem. Indeed members had recognised the severity of traffic problems in this area and had asked officers to investigate options, including a CPZ and a traffic management scheme. He agreed that parking around primary schools was a serious issue and had personal experience of the appalling attitude of some parents when dropping children to school. He also believed that this was probably now a dead application, following the listing of the building, since it could not be used as a school without a fire escape.

However, Councillor Kinghorn was concerned at the lack of consistency in the comments of the Local Education Authority. He recalled that last time members had discussed an application for a private school in Chiswick, they had been advised that there were plenty of places. The comments in the current report suggested that the area was short of places. Members had criticised the Department when discussing the first application. He wondered whether the change of mind suggested the Department had taken on board members' criticism.

Councillor McGregor echoed Councillor Kinghorn's point about the lack of consistency in the Education Authority's comments. He deprecated the listing of the school, with the use of outside force for local issues and believed the application was dead and buried as a result. On the issue of the Education Authority he asked officers to clarify which information was correct. Councillor McGregor also expressed sympathy to residents about the parking issues and thanked them for their representations and taking the opportunity to present their case.

Councillor Barwood acknowledged that this was a difficult decision as she would like to see a school on the site, if there were not the difficulties with parking and traffic. She believed that members must listen to the residents. From her own experience of living nearby, she was aware that Elmwood Road was already impassable until about 10.00 a.m. each morning.

The Chair called a vote on the recommendation for refusal. This was carried with three in favour of refusal, one against and one abstention. Councillor Oulds did not participate in the vote as he had joined the meeting during this item.

Resolved:

That Application No. P/2005/3331 – 01094/59/P4 for change of use from residential to an independent primary school for 75 pupils from 6-11 years of age in conjunction with the existing Heathfield House Day Nursery and School. Erection of an external fire escape staircase and alterations to dormer windows be refused – as per the recommendation in the report.

100. 26 Duke Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 4.

The Area Planning Manager explained that the application was for a roof extension in a mid terrace property. Whilst the application did not strictly meet the guidelines, it was considered to be subservient to the main roof and acceptable.

Councillor McGregor had looked carefully at the area and moved approval of the application. He felt that the response to the objections was reasonable and the extension was to be set back by 1.0m, twice as far as the regulations required. He felt this met the previous objections.

Members approved the application.

Resolved:

That Application No. P/2005/2754 – 00373/26/P2 for erection of roof extension to first floor flat to create additional bedroom and bathroom be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

101. 56 Wilton Avenue

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 5.

Marilyn Smith, the Area Planning Manager, explained that this application for a rear and side roof extension had been put to the previous Committee meeting. There had been concerns about the light to the kitchen window of the adjacent first floor flat and it had been agreed that the Area Planning Manager should visit to assess the situation.

Ms Smith displayed photographs taken during her visit. She understood that members' concern related to the layout of the kitchen at No. 58. She advised that this was an unusually small kitchen, of a size that would not now be allowed in a new conversion. However, the photographs demonstrated that it was necessary to lean over to the window itself in order to view the roof extension. The application was, therefore, still recommended for approval.

Councillor McGregor declared that he had received representations from Mr Greenstreet, the applicant, and his neighbour, Ms Murphy and had made a site visit. He commended the applicant and the objector for the civil way in which they had conducted themselves. He considered the nature of the

application was within reasonable guidelines. He noted that if it were passed, it would allow Ms Murphy the opportunity to make a similar application. Councillor McGregor queried that the light to the kitchen was discounted as a non-habitable room when the kitchen had been given planning permission. Ms Smith clarified that although the conversion had been done in the 1970s, the recommendation had been made on the basis of current planning law.

A vote for approval was carried with four members in favour and Councillor McGregor abstaining.

Resolved:

That Application No. P/2005/02827 – 01211/56/P2 for erection of a rear dormer to rear elevation to house and side dormer to side elevation of house be approved, subject to the conditions in the report.

102. Land Adjacent to Chiswick Bridge, Dan Mason Drive, Dukes' Meadows

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 6.

The Area Planning Manager explained that the proposal was to erect a new boathouse near Chiswick Bridge. The building would be part single storey, with two storeys at the front, to accommodate boat storage and an indoor training room. Currently, there was informal parking under the trees on land owned by CIP. It was proposed to undertake a tree survey and for the Thames Tideway Scullers to take over the lease for this area for parking, to manage the land and supplement the landscaping.

In appearance the building would be two- storey at the front. The side elevation showed how it swept down to a single storey. There were differences in levels and the building would be visible from Chiswick Bridge. The poplar trees would be retained. Inside the building, there would be storage and an indoor rowing training facility as part of a centre for excellence. Previous permission had been given in 1996 for a single storey boathouse on this site but it had never been built, although the Inspector had approved the principle. A further application had been agreed subject to a S106 agreement that was never signed.

The site was Metropolitan Open Land and within the area covered by the Thames Strategy. The proposal was for a low level building that was considered to have minimum impact on the landscape. Appropriate materials would be used. Residents had raised issues relating to parking and there was also concern about the views from the Richmond side of the river. The parking under the trees would be in use by members of the club early mornings and evenings.

The Area Planning Manager considered that the application was overall in accordance with the Thames Strategy as it supported the recreational use of the river, with 80% of the rowing clubs in the UK based on the Thames.

Planning officers had looked at the alternative of links with other nearby clubs, for example the Thames Tradesmen. However, although there was capacity in

other parts of the building, their boathouse was fully used, with a flourishing junior section. There would be safety difficulties to separate activities off to another club.

The application was recommended for approval, subject to an S106 agreement requiring planting and the marking out of a footpath and sign for the Thames Path. It was also proposed (at the suggestion of CIP) that a stone marker should be installed, identifying the University Boat Race finish.

The Chair invited questions from members.

Councillor Lynch noted the traffic at the corner and asked whether visibility would be good in every direction. He questioned whether there would be sufficient room for vehicles with trailers to manoeuvre. Ms Smith agreed that it was a tight corner but believed that the application would allow more room to manoeuvre trailers. She suggested that if the boats currently stored around the area were under cover in the new boathouse, there would be an overall improvement, with more space to turn.

Councillor Lynch asked if this left the road meeting the standards for safe pedestrian movements and whether the plan envisaged a safe route for pedestrians. Ms Smith replied that the Thames Path would be laid out and signposted. At present there was no footpath. She believed that the area at the back of the boathouse could be improved through what was proposed.

Councillor Lynch sought more precise comment on whether there would be safe access to the Thames Path. In reply, Ms Smith explained that at present the path hugged the building towards the bridge. The intention was to lay out a signposted Thames Path through the site.

Councillor Barwood declared that she had visited the site that day and it was a sea of mud. She understood that the Thames Path ran in front of the club and then towards the bridge. She felt that it would be more sensible to install railings to protect pedestrians. She also asked how many boats would be in the new boathouse and whether all the boats there currently would be taken off trailers and accommodated. Councillor Barwood had also noted a bus by the club and asked where this would park.

Ms Smith knew nothing of the bus, which had not been mentioned in discussion. She confirmed that it was intended to keep all boats under cover. On the question of extending the footpath, there were differences of levels so that anyone with a bus chair would need to go round the back.

Councillor Barwood also queried the size of the site and whether the current gravel path would be touched. Ms Smith explained that the lease covered the building. The land around belonged to CIP but it was intended to lease the land to the rowing club to manage. Before this was done, there would need to be a tree survey in conjunction with CIP and a scheme to protect the trees. The club currently had parking provision for about 5 cars. Others parked under the trees. To protect the area, it was proposed to mark out the parking under the trees and plant more trees to protect views across the river.

Councillor Kinghorn asked how marked parking bays would be visible if the grass was growing in the area. Ms Smith advised that regular users would be familiar with the parking places. This had been used as a parking area for a number of years. CIP considered that it would be advantageous for the club to do the maintenance, but the opportunity to protect the trees under the lease would be better than the current situation.

Councillor McGregor moved approval of the application. He considered it had merit, with one proviso. He was concerned about the conditions in paragraph 11 of the report and wished to receive a report back with the detail of the agreed conditions. The motion for approval was not seconded.

Councillor Lynch spoke against approval of the application. He believed that there were problems with the report, which he did not feel to state the case sufficiently. Whilst he was sorry to speak against the wishes of the rowing community, he believed that there were a number of problems with the application, which he set out as follows:

- The issue of the Thames Path had not been dealt with properly. The Thames Path came underneath the bridge to join a section where the road was very narrow and there was a blind corner. Councillor Lynch felt that the application did nothing to protect pedestrians against cars that were manoeuvring and towing unwieldy boat trailers.
- The application would create traffic problems.
- In respect of the car parking area, two sets of bollards had been removed overtly. CIP had not proved effective at enforcement, since he believed that the current parking on the grass and under the trees had been the result of negligence by CIP. Car parking for the boathouse should be near the Golf Range or where the boathouse currently had trailers.
- Councillor Lynch pointed out that the path had been laid out by the Friends of Dukes' Meadows, using S106 and money raised, so that people could walk the Thames, but it ended because of the building.
- He stressed that members wanted to encourage the club. Councillor Lynch had visited the site with the Lead Member for Regeneration, as they had wanted to look at Dukes' Meadows and rowing as a whole. Councillor Lynch had written to the Assistant Chief Executive for Corporate Policy and Regeneration requesting a meeting to look at this issue and how they might assist rowing clubs, such as the Thames Tradesmen, in the effective use of unused facilities. That meeting had not been called as officers had not responded to the request.
- Councillor Lynch suggested that the application should not be looked at in isolation, but in the wider context of Dukes' Meadows, where there was an underused facility a short way away, which there were attempts to develop. The present application raised a traffic risk, when there was unused parking space nearby.
- He also had concerns about the height and aesthetics of the building in a prominent site.

Councillor Kinghorn also supported rejection. He was sympathetic to the club but not convinced that the proposal would help. Getting trailers in and out was already difficult, but he believed that it would be more difficult for non-

professional drivers to come down further and reverse into the proposed parking area. He did not believe that parking under the trees was suitable. Also the proposed building was too large and would impact adversely on views from the A316 and across the river, together with views of parking under the trees. Councillor Kinghorn felt that this visual impact was unacceptable along the riverfront. He opposed the application on grounds of traffic problems, over-development and unsuitable development in this area.

The Chair confirmed that there was no seconder for the motion for approval. The motion for refusal had been moved and seconded. A vote in favour of refusal was carried with three votes in favour, one against and two abstentions.

Resolved:

That Application No. P/2005/2911 – 00503/R/P6 for erection of a two storey boathouse, on ground floor to accommodate storage of single sculls and first floor for use as training suite with changing facilities, re-development of south east site to accommodate parking facilities be refused – on the following grounds:

- Traffic problems would be created by trailers manoeuvring.
- Concerns about pedestrian safety.
- Inappropriate parking arrangements.
- Size and height of building unsuitable for the area and detrimental to visual amenity of views from A316 and across the river.
- Design and size of building over-development and unsuitable appearance for the river frontage.

103. 7 Harvard Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 8.

The Area Planning Manager explained that the application to confirm a Tree Preservation Order related to a sycamore tree that was highly visible in a rear garden within a Conservation Area. A Tree Preservation Order had been put on the tree to protect the amenity value for the streetscape. The objection was that the tree was over-dominant in a small rear garden. There could be tree works to reduce the crown of the tree.

Councillor McGregor declared that he had made a site visit. He suggested that the report gave the impression that this was the only tree, which was not the case. The tree was at the rear curtilage of the property, with industrial garages behind. Councillor McGregor did not accept that there was amenity value and was not impressed by the report. He felt that officers served a Tree Preservation Order when there was any request to knock down a tree and that it was not appropriate to serve a Tree Preservation Order when the owner of the property had reasonable grounds to remove the tree.

Councillor Barwood understood that the reason for applying a Tree Preservation Order was that enabled the authority to seek a replacement tree. She did not believe that a sycamore was suitable in this position and

suggested removing the tree and asking the owner to plant a suitable replacement.

The Chair clarified that this would mean the Committee confirming the Tree Preservation Order so that a replacement could be required of the owner.

Councillor Lynch did not believe that members should confirm the Tree Preservation Order, but instead, when notifying the applicants of the decision, suggested that the owners should be asked to replace the tree with a tree of their choice. Councillor Kinghorn agreed, believing that it would be ludicrous to confirm a Tree Preservation Order, only to agree to the felling of the tree as it was an old tree in the wrong place.

The Chair clarified that members were clear that if the Tree Preservation Order were not confirmed, the authority would have no power to require a replacement tree.

A vote in favour of not confirming the Tree Preservation Order was carried, with four in favour, one against and one abstention.

Resolved:

1. That in respect of Application P/2005/1788 – 00571/7/TPO1, Tree Preservation Order (No. 453) 2005 should not be confirmed.
2. Members asked that officers in notifying the applicants ask them to replace the sycamore with a suitable tree of their choice.

104. 578-586 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 9.

Councillor Thompson and Councillor Barwood declared that they would not comment on this application, reserving the right to comment when the application came before the Sustainable Development Committee. The Area Planning Manager advised that the application could be dealt with under delegated powers and need not necessarily be considered by the Sustainable Development Committee.

The application related to the Singapore Airlines offices within the Gunnersbury and Thorney Hedge Conservation Area. It was proposed to demolish the present office block and replace with a larger office block, increasing the height by one storey. The original design had raised concerns from the West Chiswick and Gunnersbury Society and the Conservation Officer, but this had been amended to reflect the design principles of the Business Park and the position of the building at the edge of the Park. The Area Planning Manager noted that this was an accessible location for a development maximising office space. Officers were minded to approve the application.

Councillors Kinghorn, Lynch, McGregor and Oulds commented on the application. Members were broadly supportive but Councillors Kinghorn and

Oulds had some reservations about the additional height. Members comments are reflected below.

Resolved:

That in respect of Application No. P/2005/3308 – 00248/578-586/P12 for demolition of existing office building and erection of part five storey and part four storey office building with associated parking spaces, members made the following points to be taken into account when considering the application. It was noted that the application did not have to be reported to the Sustainable Development Committee but could be dealt with under delegated powers.

- Support was expressed for the application, as consistent with the design of the Business Park and, although large, more attractive to modern specifications than the present office building and providing a proper entrance vista to the Business Park.
- It was felt that the building was more likely to be let than the present building and hence would create employment opportunities. This was welcomed.
- It was a moderate size development compared with some previous applications in the area.
- Members expressed some concern at the additional height of the building and the implications for opposing any future applications for high buildings if the average height within the area were increased.
- It was suggested that some modification to create one storey less at the frontage or a staggered effect might be preferable to bring the design more in keeping with the height of the historic John Bull Public House.

105. 257a Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 10.

Members agreed to a proposal from Councillor McGregor that they consider Items 10-13 of the agenda together, although they would vote on each separately. From a site visit, Councillor McGregor was aware that the nature of the process was the same for all the properties. The Area Planning Manager confirmed that the enforcement reports related to a terrace of roof extensions. Three had been built larger than the permission granted and the enforcement sought to reduce the extension to reflect the permission. One had no permission and the action sought to remove the conversion at the back.

257a had permission for a front dormer, but this had been built larger than the permission and the detail of the windows was different to that given permission. At the rear of the property on dormer had been built larger than approved and one built without permission.

Resolved:

That Members approved the recommendations of the report for enforcement action.

106. 259a Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 11.

Two dormers had been built to the rear of 259a larger than approved.

Resolved:

That members approved the recommendations of the report for enforcement action.

107. 265 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 12.

Planning permission was granted in January 2003 for two small dormers but they had been built substantially larger than the designs given permission, with different details.

Resolved:

That members approved the recommendations of the report for enforcement action.

108. 267 Chiswick High Road

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda item 13.

In the case of 267, rear dormers had been built without permission. An application had been submitted and the applicant advised that permission for the proposed scheme was unlikely, but the applicant went ahead and built anyway.

Councillor McGregor questioned why it had taken so long to seek enforcement action. The Area Planning Manager apologized and reminded members of the problems of being short staffed experienced by the Enforcement Team, prior to recent successful recruitment.

Resolved:

That members approved the recommendations of the report for enforcement action.

109. Netheravon Road, Stopping Up

The report was unavailable for this meeting and deferred to be reported to the next Chiswick Area Planning meeting on 1 February 2006.

110. Traffic Schemes for funding from the Area Committee's Capital Allocation

See the report of the Director of Street Management and Public Protection – Agenda Item 15.

Jay Gopal, Traffic and Developments, introduced the report, which set out in detail the investigations into various schemes and the resulting recommendations. Members considered the details of each scheme and the recommendations in turn and, following a full discussion, came to the following conclusions:

Gunnersbury Park Garden Estate

Residents Parking Scheme

Members agreed to defer consideration of the scheme to remove parking bays to allow the Chair the opportunity to seek the views of the residents.

One-way traffic flow

Introduction of traffic calming measures

Members recalled that in 2004 the Committee had agreed that a 20 m.p.h. scheme should be introduced, with speed humps kept to a minimum and the position of the humps to be determined in consultation with the Chair. This had not happened. Members felt the current scheme proposed at a cost of £50k was too expensive and excessive.

In order to progress the scheme, members agreed that they wished to see a 20 m.p.h. zone, with a minimal number of humps, well positioned – with delegated authority given to the Chair to agree the details. The Chair also wished to see a copy of the regulations relating to speed humps.

Closure of rear service roads

Members noted the recommendation.

Closure of Triangle Way

Members noted the work that the Residents Association had done and supported the recommendation. The scheme would need to be reported back to the Area Committee when finalised.

Devonshire Road

Members agreed to:

- Monitor the impact of the Stamford Brook Bus Gate scheme and revisit the situation in the summer.
- Introduce two Vehicle Activated signs, preferably those saying slow down and showing speed.
- That the introduction of a Home Zone in the area should be an aspiration.

Bath Road

Members agreed to the introduction of two Vehicle Activated signs, one at each end, and increased parking provision.

Prebend Gardens

- Members did not agree to the proposal for bollards under the bridge.
- Members asked officers to work up a proper scheme for the area to report back to Committee within 6 months.
- Members suggested the area should also be considered for a Home Zone.

Abinger Road

Members noted the recommendation in the report that a further report on consultation proposals would be put to the Committee at a future date.

Burnaby Gardens/St. Mary's Grove area

Members noted the recommendation of the report and supported a 20 m.p.h. scheme when funding was available. They also suggested the following options:

- Making Harvard Hill one- way from A4 to stop rat running.
- Improvements to traffic flow in Sutton Court Road so traffic did not feel the need to divert to side roads.
- Considering the area for a Home Zone.

Staveley Road

- Members agreed to the recommendation to consult on three options.
- Members reminded officers that at a previous meeting they had asked about the possibility of addressing consultation letters by name.
- It was agreed that this would be investigated and reported back but that the consultation should not be delayed if this proved difficult to achieve.

General issues

Members were concerned that they were considering the same areas again without visible progress. Members proposed an informal meeting outside the committee to progress schemes. It was proposed that members should have information on all potential schemes so that they could prioritise according to funding available.

Members also noted that there had been a petition from Grove Park Road and asked for information on when this would be reported to Committee. Members were also advised that there was progress on the Dolman Road crossing, which should be completed by the end of March.

Resolved:

That members made decisions on the recommendations of the report as noted above.

111. Planning applications determined under officers' delegated powers

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 16.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

112. Delegated Decisions: Trees with Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) or in a Conservation Area

See the report of the Director of Planning – Agenda Item 17.

Resolved:

That the report be noted

113. Conservation Area Character Appraisals

See the report of the Director of Planning/Borough Conservation Officer – Agenda Item 18.

Members agreed to suspend standing orders at the start of this item, in order to continue the meeting beyond 10.00 p.m.

Maggie Urquhart, Borough Conservation Officer, informed members of the requirement in the Unitary Development Plan for statements for every Conservation Area, so that they could become Supplementary Planning Guidance. This was now being replaced by a new planning regime. For the future conservation character appraisals could be adopted by the council as supporting documents to give due consideration to conservation areas in the planning process. The report set out where the Council had got to in the process and what needed to be done to comply with the legislation and the requirement of Best Value.

It was proposed to undertake consultation to establish the pressures and principles within a conservation area and any amendments that might be required. Chiswick had ten Conservation Areas. The intention of the report to the Area Committee was to set out the history and background, what made them important at the point of designation, current pressures of modern life and proposals and opportunities. For example, some of the traffic schemes members had considered earlier in the meeting were in conservation areas. The introduction of a Home Zone would affect the ethos of an area. If this were within a Conservation Area, it was important to consider the knock-on effect of matters such as signage, quality of materials and the impact of parking on open space.

Work was underway to produce visual aids such as maps that would show historic and listed buildings, boundaries of historic maps to show historic patterns and aerial views of conservation area boundaries to see trees and the pattern on the ground. These would be available as part of the consultation package for the public, once they had been verified.

The consultation offered the opportunity to look at enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, extending the boundary and adding buildings to the Local list. Alternatively, it might suggest reducing boundaries or de-designating areas. The review process would offer the opportunity to bring the character statements up to date.

The Chair thanked Maggie Urquhart for her report, which members welcomed. He was particularly interested in the option of extending some conservation areas. Given the lateness of the hour, the Chair proposed that rather than bring this back to a future meeting, it would be more productive to send comments directly to the Borough Conservation Officer in writing or by email.

Councillor McGregor made one particular point on behalf of the Bedford Park Society. The Society was constantly concerned about the different street furniture introduced in the part of Bedford Park within the London Borough of Ealing and Hounslow residents generally preferred that introduced in Hounslow. Councillor McGregor stressed the importance of considering Bedford Park as a whole and of talking to the London Borough of Ealing about street furniture to try to achieve consistency.

Resolved:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That members agreed to send any comments and suggestions directly to the Borough Conservation Officer, Maggie Urquhart.

114. Results of Planning Appeals

See the report of the Director of Legal Services – Agenda Item 19.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

115. Update on Balans, 214 Chiswick High Road - verbal update

Members had asked to receive a regular update on any developments in respect of 214 Chiswick High Road at each meeting. However, there was nothing further to report at this time.

The meeting finished at 10:15 pm.

