

**Minutes****Central & South Planning Committee****Tuesday, 26 January 2010****Meeting held at 7.00 p.m. in Committee Room 5 -  
Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW****Published on:****Come into effect on: Immediately**

	<b>Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) David Allam Michael Bull Paul Buttivant Janet Duncan Patricia Jackson  <b>Officers Present:</b> James Rodger Nigel Bryce Matthew Duigan Syed Shah Nikki Deol Gill Brice	
<b>120.</b>	<b>Apologies for Absence</b>  No apologies had been received.	
<b>121.</b>	<b>Declarations of Interest in matters coming before this meeting</b>  There were no declarations of interest notified.	
<b>122.</b>	<b>To sign and receive the minutes of the previous meeting held on 5 January 2010 (to follow)</b>  The minutes of the meeting held on 5 January 2010 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.	
<b>123.</b>	<b>Matters that have been notified in advance or urgent</b>  There were no items notified as urgent.	
<b>124.</b>	<b>To confirm that the items of business marked Part 1 will be considered in Public and that the items marked Part 2 will be considered in private</b>  Confirmation of items in Part 1 and Part 2 was agreed.	

<p>125.</p>	<p><b>FORMER WAGGON AND HORSES PUBLIC HOUSE, 15 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES</b></p> <p><b>Erection of part five and part nine storey mixed use building comprising of 44 residential units and 462m<sup>2</sup> of Class B1 floorspace, including ancillary amenity space, landscaping and car parking.</b></p> <p><b>5519/APP/2009/2437</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution the agent addressed the meeting. The petitioner was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The following points were made by the agent:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been no prospect of the site being used as industrial warehousing for a long time.</li> <li>• The site had been marketed for 3 years as industrial warehousing but no buyers had come forward.</li> <li>• The scheme provides for a mixed use with 45 officer jobs and 90% affordable housing.</li> <li>• An acoustic assessment had been undertaken and mitigation measures provided as part of the application.</li> <li>• The application complies with policy LE2</li> </ul> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the disabled parking and storage for mobility vehicle. Officers informed the meeting that the floor space exceeded the HDAS requirements and would be able to accommodate a mobility vehicle and charging points.</p> <p>A Member asked for consideration to be given for two additional informatives one to ensure that in any re-submission 10% of parking provided would be disabled and secondly that storage for mobility vehicles would not be at the detriment of habitable floor space. The two additional informatives suggested was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>Further concerns were raised in relation to the excessive density being proposed on this site. This was felt to be to the detriment to the living environment of future occupiers. The development required a number of windows to be obscure due to overlooking and how would the policing of the play areas be possible. The proposal was contrary to Community Safety.</p> <p>Officers advised that there had been a lot of pre-application work undertaken with the agent on the application. The application complied with HDAS requirements and exceeded the required outside amenity space. There was a lift to reach the play areas provided , which would be used by younger children. Minet Country Park was a short distance from the development, which would be suitable for older children.</p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
-------------	--	---

	<p>There were still concerns about the security of the play areas being provided and an informative was suggested recognise the concerns raised. The committee agreed to the additional informative.</p> <p>In regard to the excessive density members felt that this was overdevelopment resulting in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It was moved and seconded that an additional reason for refusal be added on grounds of density. This was agreed by the committee with the final wording of the refusal reason being agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal with the additional reasons for refusal and 3 additional informatives 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 report and addendum sheet and an additional three informatives as follows:-</b></p> <p><b>Add the following 3 informatives:-</b></p> <p><b>The applicant is advised that 10% of all parking spaces disabled spaces are required to service the whole development (residential and office spaces).</b></p> <p><b>The developer is advised that further discussion is required with the Councils Access Officer to reflect changes in Council guidance on the internal layout of flats which are proposed as wheelchair accessible housing, in particular layouts that enable storage of mobility vehicles.</b></p> <p><b>The Committee in determining the application had concerns regarding inadequate natural surveillance of communal amenity areas and security in general, you are encouraged to seek advice from the Metropolitan Police Crime prevention officer prior to any re-submission.</b></p>	
126.	<p><b>505-509 (INCLUDING 89-91 GRANGE ROAD) UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES</b></p> <p><b>Redevelopment of site to provide 45 residential units with associated access, amenity space, landscaping and car parking. (Amended plans)</b></p> <p><b>9912/APP/2009/1907</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

	<p>The committee agreed to an additional condition being added on the provision of space to accommodate a mobility vehicle not impinging on the floor area of the units.</p> <p>In answer to issues raised in relation to overlooking and overshadowing to No. 511 Uxbridge Road members were shown an overshadowing diagram. Officers advised that the overlooking distance met policy requirements.</p> <p>Reference was made to the recent appeal decision in, which the Inspector stated that the proposal was acceptable along as the blocks were set back from the road. The current proposal only provided limited set backs and this impacted on Elmlea Drive/Grange Road and the open character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Clarification was sought on the impact of the development on Elmlea Drive and why there had been a decrease in the number of parking spaces being provided.</p> <p>Officers advised that the building fronting Elmlea Drive had been set back from the footway. The developer had provided a Car Club space for use by occupiers of the flats and there was a condition requiring a travel plan promoting sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Members raised concerns that as there was a high affordable housing element to the proposal, the Car Club would not be affordable to some of the residents.</p> <p>The Legal adviser reported that if members were concerned about the affordability of the Car Club this could be incorporated into the Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised in relation to the increased vehicular traffic that would be using Grange Road.</p> <p>Officers informed members that there are regular trips from the existing uses on the site. The proposal would have only one access which would be from Grange Road from a highway safety point of view this was the better access.</p> <p>In answer to a question raised in relation to parking being allocated and designated this would be difficult as not all units would be able to be provided with a parking space.</p> <p>As there had been concerns raised in regard to the proximity of the building to Elmlea Drive, decrease in parking being provided and the access to the site it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for further information on these issues and a site visit arranged so that members could look at the plans on site. On being put to the vote deferral was agreed.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Members asked that when the report came back to committee the drawings reflect the issue raised in relation to accommodation of mobility vehicles not impinging on the floor area of the units. The condition as sought in the acoustic report be included in the report.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred to enable further information to be provided and a site visit. On being put to the vote deferment was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved: That the application be deferred to enable members to make a site visit and for further information to be provided.</b></p>	
127.	<p><b>505-509 (INCLUDING 89-91 GRANGE ROAD) UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of former workshop and garage buildings (Nos.505-509 Uxbridge Road) and demolition of a pair of semi-detached dwellings (Nos.89-91 Grange Road) (Application for Conservation Area Consent.) 14/08/2009</b></p> <p><b>9912/APP/2009/1908</b></p> <p><b>Resolved – That this application be deferred for further information to be provided and to enable members to make a site visit.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
128.	<p><b>1-1A BATH ROAD, HARLINGTON</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a seven storey, 262-bedroom hotel, basement and surface car parking, bar/restaurant, meeting rooms and other associated works.</b></p> <p><b>35805/APP/2009/2433</b></p> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to car park security it was suggested that an informative be added that due to the results of car crime in the area this needed to be addressed.</p> <p>The committee raised concerns in regard to impact the proposal would have on the Green Belt. The application was refused on this ground previously and it was not felt that the step back at the front of the hotel was sufficient to soften the impact. It was felt the previous refusal reasons had not been addressed sufficiently and the application should be refused.</p> <p>Officer's advised that the applicant had addressed the Green Belt issue with two elements. The front of the building had been stepped back and the glazing patterned to reduce the impact on</p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

	<p>the Green Belt. There are areas of the site that would be enhanced as part of this application and a robust landscaping scheme had been proposed to overcome the issues of scale and massing.</p> <p>A member stated that the 7 storeys was excessive and not in accordance with policy, does not enhance the Green Belt and if allowed will set a precedent for the area.</p> <p>The committee shared the concerns raised and asked if there were any existing comparable buildings in the area.</p> <p>Officers advised that they were unsure if there were any comparable buildings within Hillingdon.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable the information on the height of buildings in the area to be provided and a site visit. On being put to the vote deferral was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable further information to be provided and a site visit arranged.</b></p>	
129.	<p><b>269 BALMORAL DRIVE, HAYES</b></p> <p><b>Conversion of dwelling into 2 one-bedroom flats with associated parking.</b></p> <p><b>6700/APP/2009/2294</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The following points were made by the petitioner:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbours had been subject to a considerable amount of stress from the tenants of this property during the past 5 years.</li> <li>• The landlord has shown the neighbours and the council utter disregard.</li> <li>• The house was divided into two separate units in 2005 without consent.</li> <li>• Late night parties were a regular occurrence at the property.</li> <li>• The garden had already been made into two separate areas.</li> <li>• Adjoining gardens have had rubbish thrown in to them by the occupiers.</li> <li>• The front of the premises is constantly strewn with rubbish, posing a health hazard.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landlord has made no effort to control the tenants living in the property.</li> <li>• An enforcement notice was issued and an appeal was lodged and lost, the tenants had been given 3 months to return the property back to its original state or be fined.</li> <li>• It appeared that the property was still being used as two separate dwellings.</li> <li>• Residents concerned the council was allowing this to continue, after the same thing was previously refused.</li> <li>• If the conversion was allowed it would be detrimental to the surrounding area.</li> <li>• The deeds for these houses state they are not suitable for such alterations.</li> </ul> <p>A member asked for the additional reasons for refusal on the addendum sheet to be amended to add after 'facilities', 'as there appears to be no'. The committee agreed to the change.</p> <p>The committee asked officer's to ask the Enforcement Team to re-visit the site to ensure that the property was being used as a single dwelling and not two separate units.</p> <p>The recommendation with the amended reasons for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agree.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report with the reason for refusal on the addendum sheet being amended as follows:-</b></p> <p><b>The proposal has failed to provide adequate waste storage facilities, <i>as there appears to be no suitable location</i>, in accordance with the council's adopted standards, and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy MIN16 of the Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007 and policies 2A.9, 4A.3, 4A.21, and 4A.22 of the London Plan (February 2008).</b></p>	
130.	<p><b>Ground Floor, Old Post Office, 52 Station Road, Hayes - 35807/APP/2009/2363</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><b>This application was withdrawn from the agenda by the Head of Planning and Enforcement to enable issues in relation to land ownership to be clarified.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

131.	<p><b>MEAD HOUSE, MEAD HOUSE LANE, HAYES</b></p> <p><b>Single storey side extension with new access ramp and railings (Application includes samples/details of materials.)</b></p> <p><b>12298/APP/2009/2297</b></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 set out in the officer’s report and in the addendum circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
132.	<p><b>15 BOMER CLOSE, SIPSON, WEST DRAYTON</b></p> <p><b>Alterations to rear garden including demolition to southern half of outbuilding and retention of northern half.</b></p> <p><b>2653/APP/2009/2571</b></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 set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
133.	<p><b>LANSDOWNE HOUSE, ST PETER’S WAY, HARLINGTON</b></p> <p><b>Single storey rear extension for use as day care centre with 2 large roof lanterns, involving demolition of existing rear extension.</b></p> <p><b>13466/APP/2009/1690</b></p> <p>The committee asked for an additional Informative to be added to advise that fruit trees and conifers should not be used.</p> <p>The recommendation with the additional informative 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 set out in the officer’s report and on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and an additional informative as follows:-</b></p> <p><b>Any semi-mature tree planting required to discharge condition 12 shall exclude fruit trees and fir tree species.</b></p>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>



134.	<p><b>LANSDOWNE HOUSE, ST PETER'S WAY, HARLINGTON</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of existing rear extension (Application for Conservation Area Consent).</b></p> <p><b>13466/APP/2009/1691</b></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 set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	Action By:
135.	<p><b>15 FAIRFIELD ROAD, UXBRIDGE</b></p> <p><b>Amendment (to allow for alterations to roof profile, alterations to windows and new false chimneys) to planning permission ref.59469/APP/2007/1756 dated 02/08/2007: Erection of a two storey (with accommodation in roofspace) building comprising 6 two-bedroom self-contained flats with associated parking, landscaping and installation of new vehicular crossover (involving demolition of existing dwelling house and closure of existing vehicular crossovers.)</b></p> <p><b>59469/APP/2009/2134</b></p> <p>Members were informed that this application had been submitted to make alterations to an earlier application for 6 residential units in a two storey building (including accommodation within the roof space). The development as constructed was not built in line with the approved plans.</p> <p>In terms of visual appearance the proposed alterations improved what had been built. The alterations offer similar bulk and scale as previously approved and there would be no additional adverse visual impact. The proposal was now considered acceptable with regard to its appearance within the street scene and the area of Special Local Character. There are still concerns in regard to the terraces and changed levels in relation to accessibility of the amenity space and privacy of the neighbouring property.</p> <p>The committee raised concerns in relation to the two front doors and the canopy's over the side doors. This had been raised as a concern previously and that as the application was to be determined by the Planning Inspectorate they should be advised that these concerns still exist. It was suggested that an informative be added to this effect.</p>	<p>Action By:</p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

	<p>The recommendation with the additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed. The wording of the informative to be agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That had an appeal against non-determination not been received the application would have been Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report plus an additional informative as follows:-</b></p> <p><b>The Central and South Planning Committee in considering the impacts of the "as built development" being retained on site raised concerns associated with those design features (not benefiting from planning consent) that the applicant has sought to retain, including the two entrance doors located at the front of the development, and the multiple entrance canopies located on the side elevations of the development, which are not features that are present within the street scene and which cumulatively reinforce the flatted nature of the scheme.</b></p>	
<b>136.</b>	<p><b>S106 Quarterly Monitoring Report - up to 30 September 2009</b></p> <p><b>Resolved – That the report be noted.</b></p>	
<b>137.</b>	<p><b>13 Bourne Avenue, Hayes - ENF/160/06</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</b></li> <li><b>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
<b>138.</b>	<p><b>62 The Greenway, Uxbridge - ENF/589/07</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</b></li> <li><b>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>

139.	<p><b>72 Yew Avenue, Yiewsley - ENF/625/09</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</li> <li>2. That the decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report be released into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action By:</b></p> <p><b>James Rodger Nigel Bryce</b></p>
	<p><b>The meeting closed at 22.26 p.m.</b></p> <p><b>Date of next meeting 18 February 2010</b></p>	

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

This page is intentionally left blank