

## Minutes

### CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

25 January 2011

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) Peter Curling Janet Duncan Dominic Gilham Brian Stead</p> <p><b>Officers Present:</b> James Rodger Matthew Duigan Rory Stacey Manmohan Ranger Nadia Williams</p> <p><b>Also Present</b> Councillors Lindsay Bliss and Roshan Ghei</p>	
169.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Paul Buttivant and there was no substitute member.</p>	
170.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 6 - Underground Operations Room, RAF Uxbridge, Hillingdon Road, Uxbridge, by virtue of being a 'Friend of the Bunker'. He remained in the room and voted on this item. Councillor Stead also declared a non-prejudicial interest in items 12 (Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Hillingdon) &amp; 13 (20 Pield Heath Road, Hillingdon), as the application sites were in his ward. He remained in the room and voted on these items.</p> <p>Councillor John Hensley declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 12 - Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Hillingdon, by virtue of being an academic advisor of the University. He withdrew from the room and did not vote on this item.</p> <p>Councillor Peter Curling declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 12 - Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Hillingdon, by virtue of being an employee of the University. He withdrew from the room and did not vote on this item.</p>	

	<p>Councillor Judith Cooper declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 16 –1 Derby Road, Uxbridge, by virtue of being a neighbour of the application site. She withdrew from the room and did not vote on this item. Councillor Cooper also declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 9 - 51 Chiltern View Road, Uxbridge, as the application site was in her ward. She remained in the room and voted on this item.</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a non-prejudicial interest in item 17 – Tesco Stores, Glencoe Road, Yeading, as the application site was in her ward. She remained in the room and voted on this item.</p> <p>Councillor Judith Cooper Chaired the meeting for Item 12 - Brunel University, Kingston Lane.</p>	
171.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 JANUARY 2011</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 6 January 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
172.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were no items notified as urgent.</p>	
173.	<p><b>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THAT THE ITEMS MARKED PART 2 WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and all items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>	
174.	<p><b>UNDERGROUND OPERATIONS ROOM, RAF UXBRIDGE, HILLINGDON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 585/APP/2010/2902</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a 2.4m high metal railing fence around historic bunker 585/APP/2010/2902</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>That the application be determined by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection under delegated powers, subject to no objections being received before 3 February 2011; and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report and changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>

175.	<p><b>70 STATION ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 2954/APP/2010/1810</b> (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p><b>Erection of a residential building to accommodate 35 flats (consisting of 12 one-bedroom units, 21 two-bedroom units and 2 three-bedroom units) with associated parking and landscaping</b></p> <p><b>2954/APP/2010/1810</b></p> <p>In introducing the report, officers drew the Committee's attention to the changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>The Committee amended informative 15 in the Addendum sheet to include the external spiral case.</p> <p>Members raised concerns about the potential for noise through the use of the roof terrace.</p> <p>Officers advised that the roof terrace would not be in use after 10pm.</p> <p>The Committee attached an additional condition requiring a management plan in respect of the management of access and noise, to prevent potential adverse impact on neighbouring amenities.</p> <p>The recommendation with the amendments on the Addendum sheet and additional condition was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>a) That the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i) The provision of 3 x one bedroom and 3 x two bedroom units as affordable housing.</b></li> <li><b>ii) The provision of a contribution of £102,323 toward educational facilities.</b></li> <li><b>iii) The provision of a contribution of £13,682.71 toward healthcare facilities.</b></li> <li><b>iv) The provision of a contribution of £30,000 toward community facilities.</b></li> <li><b>v) The provision of a contribution of £20,000 toward Town Centre Improvements.</b></li> <li><b>vi) The provision of a contribution of £1,452.45 toward Local Library Facilities.</b></li> <li><b>vii) The provision of construction training either as a formula based financial contribution or in-kind.</b></li> <li><b>viii) A cash contribution equal to 5% of the total cash contribution to enable the management and monitoring of the requirements of the legal agreement.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
------	--	---

- b) That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.
- c) That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.
- d) That if within 6 months, the S106 Agreement has not been finalised, delegated powers be given to the Director of Planning and Community Services to refuse planning permission for the following reasons:
1. The development is not considered to have made adequate provision, through planning obligations, for contributions towards educational facilities, healthcare facilities, community facilities, town centre improvements, library facilities and monitoring. Given that a legal agreement or unilateral undertaking has not been secured to address this issue, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations (Adopted July 2008).
- e) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Director of Planning and Community Services under Delegated Powers, subject to the completion of Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers to the applicant.
- f) That if the application is approved, the conditions and the informatives in the officer's report be attached, including the Addendum and the following amendment to informative 15 and additional condition:

**Informative 15 to read as follows:**

*'You are advised that this approval does not override any requirements under building regulations, and in particular those relating to steps, stairs and associated treads, and in particular the stairs to the spiral stair case'.*

**Additional Condition**

*'Before the development hereby approved is occupied, a management plan for the use of the roof terrace area, setting out details of how the external roof terrace is to be managed to prevent adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.'*

	<p><b>Reason</b></p> <p><i>To ensure that the future uses of the roof terrace does not result in noise and disturbance that would cause harm to the residential amenities of near by occupiers and in accordance with policies OE1 and OE3 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</i></p>	
176.	<p><b>43 - 47 AND REAR OF 35 - 43 YEADING LANE, HAYES - 34799/APP/2009/2800 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>2 three-bedroom two storey semi-detached dwellings and 3 three-bedroom two storey terraced dwellings with amenity and parking space, involving the demolition of outbuildings to rear of existing dwelling No.47 and rear extensions from No.43 and installation of new crossover</b></p> <p><b>34799/APP/2009/2800</b></p> <p>The Committee was asked to note that a previous scheme (Ref: 34799/APP/2009/534) had been allowed at Appeal by the Planning Inspector since this application was submitted to the Council. Officers advised that the applicant would be able to implement the scheme that had been allowed on appeal. Conditions had been imposed on this current scheme which had also been improved in design.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, representatives of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioners made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plans were inaccurate and were bigger and suggested that a deliberate attempt had been made to improve the block size</li> <li>• The line had been moved in Bedford Avenue which had now been reduced</li> <li>• The outline boundary plans had been changed between 2008 and 2009, and there were missing plans submitted in 2008</li> <li>• The car outlined parking spaces were not the right size</li> <li>• The bins were located over the line of unit 4 and the bins for unit 5 were not closed bins</li> <li>• The access had been moved to No.47 Yeading Lane</li> <li>• The road was not an adoptable highway and queried how the bins, which were over 23m high would be collected</li> <li>• S106 money had not be conditioned</li> <li>• The bin stall plan showed 10 public cycle shed</li> <li>• The lifetime homes criteria had not been met</li> <li>• There were no marked disabled spaces</li> <li>• No tree survey had been done</li> <li>• There was no continuous footpath to back, and the current use of land was as a garden, which was not immune from PPS3</li> <li>• The development was 23m away from adoptable road in respect of waste collection</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

- Was in possession of documents to show that the original size of the site had not been amended when the access road was removed.

Officers advised that refuse vehicles would be able to enter the site, and that the highway would be used for waste collection.

Two Ward Councillors of the application site addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- Opposed the application and commented that a similar application had been refused last year
- Expressed concerns about the safety of pedestrians who would be forced to walk on the road as there was no public footpath from the entrance of the proposed development
- Expressed concerns about there being no public street lighting in the development
- Expressed concerns about the road being too narrow and suggested that it did not conform to the minimum standards
- Stated that cars would be forced to reverse into Yeading Lane which would be hazardous
- Suggested that there were no provisions for cycle storage
- Stated that the proposed site had been classed as industrial land but had been referred to as back garden and considered that the site was back garden rather than an industrial site
- Expressed concerns that 50% of the trees had been felled, which should not have been done
- Suggested that the drawings with regard to 43 – 47 Yeading Lane were misrepresented in size
- That the original size of the site was not amended when the access road was removed
- Suggested that when looking at the two fences on the back of the trees, which consisted of bricks and old fences, looking at the old fences, 50% of the trees on the other side had been removed
- Expressed concerns that the applicant had removed the trees without first conducting a tree survey
- Suggested that this rendered Condition 16 (page 67) requiring an accurate tree survey plan to be irrelevant
- Urged the Committee to defer and make a site visit before making a decision about the application.

Officers advised that conditions could not be imposed for the requirements for bicycle stores for houses. If the Committee wished to, a condition requiring external provisions could be imposed, but this would reduce external spaces in the development.

With regard to the issue of the felling of trees, the Committee was advised that no trees on the site were protected by Tree Protection Orders and the trees cut down did not trigger any breach of Planning Control.

In response to the issue of S106 money, officers advised that Condition

25 covered this issue, and in terms of density of the units per hectare these were in line with the London Plan guidelines including the revised site area.

With regard to the issue of the classification of the site, officers advised that the Inspector's decision was a material planning consideration and that the current scheme was considered better than the scheme approved at appeal.

Officers advised that with regard to the issue of 'pinch point' access, the width of the carriageway was 4.8m wide, which would allow a lorry and a car to pass each other. The 'pinch point' access length was 12.5m and the guidance was 15m maximum.

Members raised concerns about cars reversing into Yeading Lane and sought assurance that there was enough room for two cars to pass between the 'pinch point'.

Officers advised that the width of the carriageway was 4.8m wide, which would allow a lorry and a car to pass each other. The 'pinch point' access length was 12.5m and the guidance was 15m maximum.

A Member expressed concerns that there may be information in the documents that the petitioners had brought with them, which officers had not had the opportunity to look at.

The Chairman suspended Standing Orders for 10 minutes to allow officers to look at documents submitted by the petitioners that had not been previously seen. Members withdraw from the room while officers went through the documents with the petitioners.

On resuming the meeting, officers reported that they had spoken with the petitioners and liaised with colleagues and had established that the issues that had been raised by the petitioners related to boundary disputes. Officers explained that boundaries were difficult to establish without undertaking a detailed study using survey equipment. To better understand the site boundaries in relation to neighbouring properties, it was suggested that the Committee could impose a condition requiring plans of 1:50 scale be submitted by the applicant.

The Chairman added that boundary disputes were outside the remit of the Planning Committee but the Committee would condition for a 1:50 scale plans to be submitted before commencement of the development.

The Legal Advisor advised that it would be lawful for the Committee to impose such a planning condition. The Legal Advisor highlighted that the petitioners had suggested that not all of the redline fell into the applicant's ownership, where as the Land Registry had shown that they were. If there were problems between the owner and the neighbour and there was a dispute over boundary, it would be open to the respective land owners to settle the matter through the courts. It was not for the Council as Local Planning Authority to mediate boundary disputes.

A Member added that it was not for the Committee to get involved in boundary disputes and that the Committee's main concern was to ensure that all the correct certificates had been served to the Council.

The Legal Advisor responded that the applicant had certified that he owned the application site and officers had carried out a land search, which confirmed that the applicant's certificate was correctly given on the basis of the scale plans available. The Legal Advisor observed that Land Registry Plans were not accurate enough to either uphold or dismiss the petitioners' claims that they owned a small part of the application site. The Committee noted that it was not a legal requirement for the Council to go into great lengths to determine the precise boundaries of ownership; and it was acceptable for the Council to rely on certificate given by the applicant which was substantiated by the land registry documents and scaled plans available.

In response to a query about the accuracy of the 'red line', officers advised that there had been some small changes since 2008 where the drawings were shown in a slightly different position to the current scheme.

Condition 13 in the report was amended to ensure that parking was specifically dedicated solely for the properties in the front as well as properties at the back of the development.

An additional condition was attached to ensure that there was adequate manoeuvring space in the hatched area of 35 – 45 Yeading Lane.

The recommendation for approval with amendments and changes to the Addendum sheet was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

**Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and changes in the Addendum. Condition 13 was amended as set out below, the following two additional conditions were attached and the Signage condition in the Addendum was amended:**

**The Signage Condition on page 3 of the Addendum was amended by adding the following after the last sentence:**

***'In addition, the surface of the hard paved manoeuvring area shown on plan 2498-2-104 to allow refuse and other vehicles to undertake a 3 point turn, shall be hatched or otherwise marked in a distinctive manner to clearly identify this portion of the access-way as not being acceptable for use as a car parking area'.***

**Condition 13 in the Addendum was amended to read as follows:**

**Additional conditions**

- i) *'No development shall commence until revised plans of the development at scale of 1:50, which show in particular the***



***proposed layout, clearly and accurately identifying the boundaries of the site, and demonstrating that each dwelling benefits from at 60sq of external amenity space, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There after the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans'.***

**Reason**

***To ensure that future residents living in the scheme would be provided with adequate garden areas and to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and to ensure adequate access and manoeuvring areas are provided for vehicles and pedestrians within the boundary of the site and to accord with Policies OE1, BE21, BE23, and AM7 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).***

- ii) ***'Before commencing development, plans and details of a low wall or other means of separating the access for pedestrian to the path leading to the rear of dwelling unit 2, from the car parking spaces to the front of dwelling unit 1 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There after the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans'.***

**Reason**

**To ensure pedestrian safety and ensure adequate access is provided for pedestrian s to the pathway leading to the rear of dwelling unit 2, and to accord with Policies AM7 and AM8 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).**

**Condition 13 was amended to read as follows:**

**'Development shall not begin until details of all traffic arrangements (including details of the allocation and dedication of car parking spaces to the dwellings, for the sole use of the occupiers of the relevant dwellings where appropriate carriageways, footways, turning space, safety strips, sight lines at road junctions, kerb radii, car parking and marking out spaces, loading facilities, closure of existing access and means of surfacing) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall demonstrate car parking for 2 cars being provided for each of the properties at 43 – 47 Yeading Lane, dedicated and allocated for the sole use of the respective occupiers of 43 and 47 Yeading Lane. The approved development shall not be occupied until such works have been constructed with the approved details. Thereafter, the parking areas, sight lines and loading areas must be permanently retained and used for no other purpose at anytime. Disabled parking bays shall be a minimum of 4.8m long by 3.6m wide, or at least 3.0m wide where two adjacent bays may share an unloading area'.**

177.	<p><b>51 CHILTERN VIEW ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 64176/APP/2010/2097</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class A4 (Drinking Establishment) to Class C3 (Residential Units) for use as 2 one-bedroom and 1 two-bedroom, two storey terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space, including a two storey rear extension, alterations to existing front and side elevations, repositioning of vehicular access to side and alterations to existing vehicular crossover to front with demolition of existing single storey rear extensions and outbuildings to rear</b></p> <p><b>64176/APP/2010/2097</b></p> <p>In introducing the report, as well as other amendments in the Addendum sheet, officers drew the Committee's attention to the revised plans listed. Copies of the revised plans were also handed out to Members.</p> <p>Officers advised the Committee not to approve the revised drawing numbers 4d, 5d and 11a.</p> <p>The Committee asked for Condition 15 in the Addendum sheet to be amended to ensure that parking spaces for each of the dwellings were specified and Condition 23 in the officer's report was replaced with standard Condition TL20.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>1. That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, changes in the Addendum sheet and amendments as follows to condition 15 and Condition TL20:</b></p> <p><b>Revised Condition 15 (the following was added after the last sentence in the Addendum sheet)</b></p> <p><b><i>'One car parking space shall be allocated and dedicated to each of the dwellings as follows:</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b><i>i) The car parking space immediately to the front of the easternmost dwelling (located at the corner of Whitehall Road and Chiltern View Road) shall be allocated to the easternmost dwelling;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>ii) The car parking space immediately to the front of the central dwelling shall be allocated to the central dwelling;</i></b></li> <li><b><i>iii) The car parking space at the rear (northern end) of the property shall be allocated to the western most</i></b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
------	--	---

	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>dwelling (located at adjacent to 49 Chiltern View Road).</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The car parking spaces for each relevant dwelling shall be dedicated for the sole use of the occupiers of the relevant dwelling.'</i></b></p> <p><b>Condition TL20</b></p> <p><b><i>'None of the dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until the outdoor amenity area serving the dwellings as shown on the approved plans (including balconies where these are shown to be provided) has been made available for the use of residents of the development. Thereafter, the amenity areas shall so be retained.</i></b></p> <p><b>Reason</b></p> <p><b>To ensure the continued availability of external amenity space for residents of the development, in the interest of their amenity and the character of the area in accordance with Policy BE23 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and London Plan (February 2008) Policy 4B.1.</b></p> <p><b>That the Committee did not approve drawing numbers 4b, 5d and 11a.</b></p>	
178.	<p><b>GROUND FLOOR, OLD POST OFFICE, STATION ROAD, HAYES - 35807/APP/2009/2363 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</b></p> <p><b>Change of use from Class A1 (Retail) to Class D1 (Non-Residential Institutions) for use as a Health Centre, with associated internal alterations</b></p> <p><b>35807/APP/2009/2363</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded, and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>That delegated power be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission subject to the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The Council enter into an agreement with the applicant and all other relevant legal interests under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to ensure that:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>(a) The provision of 21 car parking spaces are provided at the existing health centre adjacent to 52 Station Road for the exclusive users of the Development. Of these 21 spaces, 18 are permanent, including two spaces to be reserved for disabled drivers. A further 3 spaces would be provided in a stacked arrangement as detailed on drawing.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p>referenced 35807/100.</p> <p>(b) That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.</p> <p>2. That Officers be authorised to negotiate and agree detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</p> <p>3. If a S106 agreement or other similar associated documentation is not signed within 6 months, or any other period deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning and Enforcement, then the application is to be referred back to Committee for further consideration.</p> <p>4. That subject to the above, the application be determination by the Head of Planning and Enforcement under delegated powers subject to the completion of the Agreement or associated documentation under section 106 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.</p> <p>5. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives in the officer's report be attached.</p>	
179.	<p><b>THE ARENA, STOCKLEY PARK, STOCKLEY ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 37800/APP/2010/1669</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class B1 (Office) to Class D1 (Non-residential institutions) for use as further education college and management training premises</b></p> <p><b>37800/APP/2010/1669</b></p> <p>The Committee queried paragraph 3 of the officer's report as it considered that the applicant had failed to demonstrate that there was a local demand for the proposed teaching facility and indicated that the information provided would be irrelevant to the decision of the Committee. This was because the school would be for foreign students who lived overseas and not in the local area.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor advised that it was not in order for Members to delete any part of the officer's report, which at the time of the Committee meeting was a public document and existed as a question of fact. It was however open to the Committee to disagree with officer's report but not to actually change the advice; it was also open to the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Services to correct errors in the report.</p> <p>Following discussion, the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Services advised that the third paragraph of section 1 of the report, and final sentence of the penultimate paragraph of section 7.01 were to be deleted.</p> <p>The committee attached an additional informative to inform the</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p>applicant.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal and two additional informative was move, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report, subject to the amendments in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and the following additional informatives:</b></p> <p><b>Additional Informatives</b></p> <p><i>i) You are advised that the Council does not accept that there is demand locally for the proposed teaching facility, as it is a facility specifically aimed at educating foreign students who at present do not reside in the United Kingdom.</i></p> <p><i>ii) ‘You are advised that in reviewing the latest information supplied by the agent in relation to the management and control of the car parking arrangements, discrepancies were found between the latest submission and the earlier submission, and these informed the decision to refuse the planning application.</i></p>	
180.	<p><b>BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE, HILLINGDON - 532/APP/2010/1964 (Agenda Item 12)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of a galvanised/ timber framed compound to house 2 external chillers</b></p> <p><b>532/APP/2010/1964</b></p> <p>The Committee attached an additional informative asking for construction vehicles not to use Cleveland Road to access or leave the site due to existing traffic congestion.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer’s report, changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and the following additional informative:</b></p> <p><b>Additional Informative</b></p> <p><i>‘You are advised that there is considerable existing traffic congestion on Cleveland Road and that the use of this road for construction traffic would exacerbate existing conditions, as such construction traffic is not to use Cleveland Road to access or leave the site’.</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

<p>181.</p>	<p><b>20 PIELD HEATH ROAD, HILLINGDON - 21661/APP/2010/1716</b> (Agenda Item 13)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class C3 (residential) to Class D1 for use as medical centre and single storey rear/side extension</b></p> <p><b>21661/APP/2010/1716</b></p> <p>Officers advised that condition 30 in the officer's report should be amended by deleting the words 'and the provision of 20% of the sites energy need', as it was considered too excessive for the scale of the development.</p> <p>The Committee attached an additional informative requiring the applicant (when discharging Condition 24) to ensure that vehicle access gates were shut and locked when the surgery was not in use.</p> <p>Members attached an additional informative requiring any proposed changes to be made by the PCT to the design and layout of the building to be reported back to a Committee meeting for a decision.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives in the officer's report, changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting, amendment to Condition 30 and the following additional informatives:</b></p> <p><b>Additional informatives:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i) 'You are advised that in discharging condition 24, the Council will expect that details on measures taken to ensure the property is protected from robbery by persons seeking drugs. Measures should include ensuring vehicular access gates are shut and locked when the surgery is not in use.'</i></li> <li><i>ii) 'Should the design and layout of the premises change as a result of requirements imposed by the Primary Care Trust, then further planning approval is likely to be needed for the changes'.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
<p>182.</p>	<p><b>103 PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 32648/APP/2010/1408</b> (Agenda Item 14)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class A1 (Shops) to Class A5 (Hot food takeaway) and installation of extraction flue to rear</b></p> <p><b>32648/APP/2010/1408</b></p> <p>The Committee indicated that it would be unlikely to consider any extension of hours in respect of parking, given the traffic issues in the area. An additional informative was attached to advise the applicant.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, amendments in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and the following additional informative:</b></p> <p><b>Additional Informative:</b></p> <p><i>‘You are advised that given the car parking and traffic congestion, and highways safety issues that exist in the vicinity of the site, further intensification of the use is unlikely to be acceptable, the Planning Committee are highly unlikely to approve any extension of the hours of operation over those approved in this application’.</i></p>	
183.	<p><b>GRASS VERGE REAR OF 109 AND 111 SWEETCROFT LANE, HERCIES ROAD (CLOSE TO BUS STOP), HILLINGDON - 67517/APP/2010/2930 (Agenda Item 15)</b></p> <p><b>Installation of 12.5m high imitation telegraph pole mobile phone mast and ancillary equipment cabinet (Consultation under Schedule 2, Part 24 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995)</b></p> <p><b>67517/APP/2010/2930</b></p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
184.	<p><b>1 DERBY ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 60777/APP/2010/2713 (Agenda Item 16)</b></p> <p><b>Alterations and extension to existing roof to create habitable roofspace to include 2 gable end windows and 4 side rooflights</b></p> <p><b>60777/APP/2010/2713</b></p> <p>The Committee attached an additional reason for refusal as concerns were raised about the proposed windows in elevations in the eastern side of the roof facing properties. It was considered this would lead to overlooking and would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining properties.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and subject to the changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting, and the following additional reason for refusal:</b></p> <p><b>Additional Reason for Refusal</b></p> <p><i>‘The proposed development by reason of the side facing roof lights in the eastern side of the roof and its proximity to the neighbouring property No.3 Derby Road would result in a form of</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p><i>development which would not provide satisfactory amenities for that adjoining property, due to the loss of privacy that could arise. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy BE24 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the HDAS Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Layouts, July 2006'</i></p>	
185.	<p><b>TESCO STORES LTD, GLENCOE ROAD, YEADING - 36999/APP/2010/2512</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Rear extension to bulk storage area</b></p> <p><b>36999/APP/2010/2512</b></p> <p>The Committee attached an additional informative to requiring the applicant to be mindful of the hours of operation, to ensue that vehicles waiting to enter the loading area did not leave their engines idling.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, changes in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and the following additional informative:</b></p> <p><b>Additional informative:</b></p> <p><i>‘This permission does not override any existing conditions relating to the site, and in particular your attention is drawn to the need to adhere to the approved hours of operation and to ensure trucks do not wait with engines idling in the access way to the loading area’.</i></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
186.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p>The Committee attached an additional recommendation to allow the release of the decision to the public domain solely for the purpose of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</b></li> <li><b>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.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>



187.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>3. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>4. 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.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
188.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 20</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>5. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>6. 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.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
189.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 21</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <p><b>7. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>8. 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.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.00 pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.