

Minutes

CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 September 2011

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



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) Wayne Bridges Janet Duncan Neil Fyfe Dominic Gilham Robin Sansarpuri Brian Stead</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger – Head of Planning, Trading Standards & Environmental Protection, Matt Duigan – Team Manager, Central & South, Manmohan Ranger – Highways Engineer, Sarah White – Planning Lawyer, Gill Brice – Democratic Services.</p> <p>Also Present: Councillor Peter Kemp</p>	
85.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence</p>	
86.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a personal interest in Item 10 & 8 and remained in the room whilst the items were discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Neil Fyfe declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Items 5 & 6 and left the meeting whilst the items were discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Dominic Gilham declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Items 7 & 13 and left the meeting whilst the items were discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Robin Sansarpuri declared a personal interest in Item 8 and remained in the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p>	
87.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>There had been no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>	

88.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all business marked in Part 1 would be considered in public and all business marked in Part 2 would be considered in private.</p>	
89.	<p>61 ADELPHI CRESCENT, HAYES 60953/APP/2011/1214 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal and the agent addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parking arrangements proposed are not acceptable on a busy junction • There would be a loss of light and privacy to neighbouring properties. • There are no other semi-detached properties in the area converted into 2 separate dwellings. <p>The agent/applicant made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There had been a number of applications on this property. • Permission for a 4 bed house was allowed on appeal. • Apart from the parking layout there was no other concerns. • The agent had tried to contact the planning officer to provide revised plans over the past 5 weeks without success. • A 4 bed family home may have the same number of cars as the proposal before the committee. • Why was parking a big concern now as it had not been in the past? • The application site is on the route of 2 buses and close to the Uxbridge Road, it was likely that the occupiers may not need a car. • Suggest that a condition be added to exclude a parking space for the proposed bed-sit. <p>In answer to an issue raised in regards to the parking officers advised that looking at the plan it was felt that a parking layout could be found that would work on the site. Although, the guidance required that a quarter of the front garden area should be retained for soft landscaping.</p> <p>Members had concerns that they did not have all the relevant information in regards to the parking. It was moved, seconded and agreed that the application be deferred for further information.</p> <p>The recommendation for deferment was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>

	Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable further information to be provided to the committee in relation to the parking area.	
90.	1, 2, 4, 5 & 6 SCHOOL APPROACH, FREDORA AVENUE, HAYES 63421/APP/2011/1035 (Agenda Item 6)	Action by
	<p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal and the agent addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was the 6th time since 2007 that an application has been submitted on this land each time with a slight change. • The application before the committee had already been referred to the Secretary of State. • The access to Pine Medical Centre, The School House and Grange Park School were being restricted. • Every application has provided objections from residents, parents and patients and several hundred signatures had been gathered over this period. • Previous concerns in regard to the right of way and maintenance of existing access had not been resolved by this application, as had been advised in refusal of the previous application. • The proposal was an overdevelopment of the site. • The access road was heavily trafficked already and with the number of pedestrians using this road would cause health & safety issues. • An application had been approved for a new property to be built adjacent to the site and two fence panels would be removed to provide off-street parking for the proposal. • Concerns over access to the school and surgery for Emergency vehicles. • The proposal would cause privacy issues for the school hours breaching private and family life under the Human Rights Act (1998). <p>The agent/applicant made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was an enlargement of an earlier scheme • The previous application was refused but allowed on appeal. • There were 3 basic reasons for refusal – visual amenity, the proposal does not meet Lifetime Homes Standards and does not comply with housing standards. • The proposal would be able to be adapted to meet Lifetime Home Standards, which could be done by condition. • The inspector in his decision letter stated that :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the absence of a common building line or layout within this part of Fredora Avenue, the proposed dwelling would be compatible with the existing street scene. 	<p><i>James Rodger</i> <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a piecemeal appearance in the this area and views were dominated by the flank boundaries to the dwellings in Fredora Avenue and Pine Close and the garages on the appeal site. • The proposal meets the Council's requirements for maisonettes and flats. • In relation to the concerns raise din relation to highway safety the proposal removes 3 garages, which would improve the current situation. • The footprint of the proposal was similar to that allowed on appeal. • Would ask the committee to overturn the officer's recommendation and approve the application tonight. <p>Members asked for clarification in relation to the difference in standards for flats and houses and the what had been allowed on appeal.</p> <p>Officers advised that the standards for houses were different for that of flats, although the proposal had been described as flatted accommodation it was considered that the proposal was not dissimilar in principle to a two bedroom house proposal. This was felt an attempt to overcome the Council's design guide and policies. In regard to the application allowed on appeal was a single dwelling with rooms in the roof space, the proposal had a smaller height and pitch of roof.</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application would have been refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report with the informatives set out in the addendum had the applicant not appealed against non-determination.</p>	
91.	THE FORGE, ST STEPHENS ROAD, YIEWSLEY 67384/APP/2010/2499 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)	Action by
	<p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representatives of the 2 petitions received objecting, 1 petition supporting the proposal and the agent addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The first petitioner objecting to the application made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objections are based on the hours of use and parking, which was Monday to Sunday 6 am to 11 pm. • The area was mainly residential. • The Green Travel Plan stated that at peak times there would be 123 people with 73 of those walking to the site. Concerns about residents being unable to park near to their homes. 	<p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>

- At certain times the Community Centre had been used outside of the hours being requested.
- There were concerns about the early morning usage of the centre.
- There had been people seen leaving the centre at 3 am & 4 am.
- The noise from people leaving the site caused residents noise and disturbance
- The weekend attendance at the centre would impact on residents.
- The area had a Parking Management Scheme to stop commuter parking during the day.
- People using the centre often park across residents driveways causing access issues.
- Cars are often parked dangerously in the road.
- The facilities offered to visitors to the centre are not adequate.
- For special events visitors had been guided to Morrison's car park, there were concerns about parking if this agreement was withdrawn

The petitioner supporting the application made the following points:

- Have been a resident of the borough for over 40 years and a business for 26 years.
- The centre met the needs and the faith related activities met the needs of the local community especially the elderly and children.
- The nearest facility was in Uxbridge and had reached capacity.
- The Centre had been in operation at The Forge for 10 months and had demonstrated they were good neighbours.
- There had been no formal complaints received since the building had been in use as a centre.
- The proposed use would contribute to the regeneration of the area.
- The building had been in a dilapidated state and had not appealed to business as it was not fit for purpose.
- Research had been carried out, which had confirmed that here was a surplus of office and industrial land available within a mile of the centre.
- A large Industrial estate was to be built at Stockley Park.
- The centre would provide employment opportunity's for the local community.
- St Stephens Road Parking Management Scheme, the area is a residential area with some commercial uses.
- The proposed use of the site was a more peaceful use than Industrial.
- There was no significant traffic nor noise/chanting.
- The two parking spaces on site is reserved for Blue Badge Holders and visitors to the centre either come on foot or by bus.

A Ward Councillor attended the meeting and made the following points:-

- Here to represent the views of the opponents of the scheme.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The are Parking Management Scheme and the Industrial and Business Area are the key issues. • Support the recommendations contained in the report. <p>The committee recognised that there was a clear need for the facility but the use was not appropriate for this site.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>	
92.	<p>4 HAROLD AVENUE, HAYES 60953/APP/2011/1214 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>
93.	<p>ST GEORGES MEADOW, MILL ROAD, WEST DRAYTON 33658/APP/2010/263 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>The committee asked for a condition to be added that the fence to be maintained in a good condition. Officer's suggested that this could be included as part of Condition 6.</p> <p>The Planning Officer's requested that the report be amended at section 1 by deleting the words 'and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of West Drayton Green Conservation Area and the setting of a Grade II listed building'.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval with condition 6 amended was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the change to the report, conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and Condition 6 being amended as follows:-</p> <p>Amended Condition 6</p> <p>Development shall not commence until details of spaces beneath the fencing hereby approved to enable wild species to pass under the fence (including hedgehogs), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The fence shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall thereafter be maintained in good condition.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>

94.	<p>62A BROOKSIDE ROAD, HAYES 22476/APP/2010/2879 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>A member asked whether the reason for refusal should include the quality of the living environment for future occupiers.</p> <p>Officers suggested that an informative be added to inform the applicant that the level of intensification of development on this tight site was likely to affect the quality of the living environment for neighbouring occupiers.</p> <p>The addition of the informative was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>The Planning Officer's requested that the report be amended at section 1 by deleting the words 'harm the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area'.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal with an additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and an additional informative added as follows:-</p> <p>INFORMATIVE</p> <p>The proposed intensification of the use of the site would result in adverse impacts on the living environment of neighbouring occupiers due to noise and disturbance.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>
95.	<p>AGGREGATE INDUSTRIES UK LIMITED, THORNEY MILL ROAD, IVER, SLOUGH. (CONSULTATION BY BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL) 39707/APP/2011/1988 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p>	<p>Action by</p>
	<p>The committee raised concerns about the proposed increase in hours to the operation of the recycling plant on Green Belt land.</p> <p>A member stated that she was aware that an objection had been made to the proposal by the Garden City Resident's Association and felt that the committee should make objections to the proposal.</p> <p>Concerns were raised in relation to the width restriction within Hillingdon, which was usually broken, which enabled lorry's from this site to use Hillingdon roads.</p> <p>In answer to an issue raised the Legal Officer advised the committee that access through a particular route was outside of planning and needed dealt with by the Street Enforcement Officer. As the recommendation was for no objection to be raised the committee would need to provide reasons for their objection to the proposal.</p> <p>Members stated that the points they had objections to the proposal were as follows:-</p>	<p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>

1a. The barrier to prevent Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) from travelling into the London Borough of Hillingdon (located on Thorney Mill Road) is often damaged by HGV's, to the extent that it is often not in a fit state to prevent HGV movements into the London Borough of Hillingdon, as such there is evidence that HGV's are entering the London Borough of Hillingdon from Thorney Mill Road.

1b. If Buckinghamshire County Council is minded to approve the application, then Buckinghamshire County Council is requested to fund the provision of a more robust barrier which would prevent HGV movements from the site into the London Borough of Hillingdon. The details of the barrier should be agreed with the London Borough of Hillingdon.

2. The London Borough of Hillingdon raises concern in principle to the extension and intensification of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

3. Residents have complained to this Council that there are adverse environmental impacts on London Borough of Hillingdon residents as a result of noise and dust generated by the scheme. In addition during winter (when leaves fall from the trees around the site) the site is easily visible detracts from the visual amenities of the Green Belt. The objection from a local resident association is attached.

4. The increased hours on Sundays have an adverse impact on residential amenity and there is an objection to any continuation. Members also suggested that an informative be added reminding Bucks County Council of the objection put forward by Hillingdon residents. This would be subject to confirmation that the objection had been received prior to 6 September 2011.

The objections and informative put forward by members was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the following objections be raised with Buckinghamshire County Council:-

1a. The barrier to prevent Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV's) from travelling into the London Borough of Hillingdon (located on Thorney Mill Road) is often damaged by HGV's, to the extent that it is often not in a fit state to prevent HGV movements into the London Borough of Hillingdon, as such there is evidence that HGV's are entering the London Borough of Hillingdon from Thorney Mill Road.

1b. If Buckinghamshire County Council is minded to approve the application, then Buckinghamshire County Council is requested to fund the provision of a more robust barrier which would prevent HGV movements from the site into the London Borough of Hillingdon. The details of the barrier should be agreed with the London Borough of Hillingdon.

	<p>2. The London Borough of Hillingdon raises concern in principle to the extension and intensification of inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p>3. Residents have complained to this Council that there are adverse environmental impacts on London Borough of Hillingdon residents as a result of noise and dust generated by the scheme. In addition during winter (when leaves fall from the trees around the site) the site is easily visible detracts from the visual amenities of the Green Belt. The objection from a local resident association is attached.</p> <p>4. The increased hours on Sundays have an adverse impact on residential amenity and there is an objection to any continuation.</p>	
96.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</p> <p>2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>
97.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>3. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</p> <p>4. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p><i>James Rodger Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i>	
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.42 pm.	

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 is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.