

## Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

7 April 2021

Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Alan Chapman (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Roy Chamdal, Farhad Choubedar, Jazz Dhillon and Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), Desmond Adumekwe (Enforcement Manager) and Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager)</p>
183.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> <i>(Agenda Item 1)</i></p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Brightman. It was noted that Councillor Chamdal was yet to join the meeting.</p>
184.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 2)</i></p> <p>Councillor Chapman declared a non-pecuniary interest in items 8 and 9 as he had previously discussed the application with residents. He withdrew from the meeting and did not take part in the vote on these items.</p> <p>Councillor Chapman also declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as he had been a patient at the dental practice for a number of years. He remained in the meeting and took part in the vote on this item.</p>
185.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> <i>(Agenda Item 3)</i></p> <p>During this item, Councillor Chamdal joined the meeting.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 03 March 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p>
186.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 4)</i></p> <p>None.</p>
187.	<p><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> <i>(Agenda Item 5)</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that items 1-11 were in Part 1 and would be considered in public and</p>

items 12 and 13 were in Part II and would be considered in private.

It was also confirmed that items 8 and 9 would be taken together, with a separate vote taking place for each item.

188. **289 LANSBURY DRIVE, HAYES - 57243/APP/2020/2638 (Agenda Item 6)**

**Single storey rear extension and conversion of a 5-bed, 6-person HMO to a 6-bed, 9-person HMO**

Officers introduced the application noting that the proposed conversion would result in a change in use class from C4 to *sui generis*. Officers highlighted a number of issues that had arisen with the development including: that the size and scale of the extension would have an adverse impact on the adjoining occupier, the only proposed communal space was entirely enclosed with no windows or natural light, and that parking provision did not comply with the Council's standards.

A petition in objection to the application had been received and written representations from the lead petitioner were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- Petitioners stated concerns around increased levels of disruption to the neighbourhood as a result of the expansion of houses in multiple occupation;
- Neighbours would inevitably suffer from increases in noise and extra comings and goings associated with such large, and often transient populations living next door;
- Specific concerns were raised around parking pressures and the impact that the development would have on further exacerbating the problem. It was also noted that since the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, residents had been increasing their level of outdoor exercise, there had been concerns around deteriorating road safety and congestion cause by the development limiting residents' confidence in exercising safely outdoors;
- It was stressed that large HMOs in terraced houses were not cohesive to the community and it was suggested that HMOs should be reserved for detached properties;
- Petitioners highlighted safety concerns around short-term residents in HMOs;

Members were supportive of the recommendations in the officer's report. The Committee were minded to include an additional reason for refusal pertaining to noise and disturbance. Officers noted that the increase from six residents to nine was not initially deemed to warrant a refusal reason based upon noise and disturbance issues; Members highlighted that, when accounting for the additional residents and their visitors, increased levels of noise and disturbance were inevitable. Officers went on to note that previously, a similar application proposing the expansion of a HMO was refused on noise grounds and a subsequent appeal was dismissed. Officers were supportive of incorporating the additional reason for refusal.

Members raised concerns that the four metre depth on the boundary with the adjoining semi-detached property would, due to its north facing orientation, overshadow the private amenity space of the adjoining occupier. Further to this, and in response to comments made by the petitioners, Members suggested that perhaps the Council should be evaluating whether HMOs in terraced and semi-detached properties, or in areas of family housing should be limited by policy, this would alleviate some of the common issues seen around larger HMOs, particularly with regard to noise and

disturbance. It was also noted that criteria three of the Council's HMO policy DMH5 stated that there should be no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

With regard to parking arrangements, it was noted that HMOs of up to six occupants should provide 0.5 parking spaces per occupant. Where a HMO has nine occupants the Council requires a transport appraisal, no such appraisal had been submitted for this application; therefore officers referred to the UDP and Local Plan policies, taking into account the property's low PTAL, and concluded that the development, should it be approved, should provide five parking spaces for its nine residents.

Members queried whether the property had breached Council policy on retaining at least 25% of front garden landscaping. Officers informed Members that there was some landscaping present to the front of the property and that HMOs of up to six people retain their permitted development rights; the developers could therefore hard surface the frontage of the property without planning permission, assuming the hard surfacing was permeable. It was noted that if Members were minded to approve the application, conditions could be imposed to ensure appropriate landscaping at the front of the property.

The officer's recommendation, with the additional reason for refusal, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) **That the application be refused;**
- 2) **That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to draft an additional reason for refusal in relation to noise and disturbance.**

189. **HARMONDSWORTH ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 70429/APP/2021/36 (Agenda Item 7)**

**Installation of a 20m monopole, 12 x antenna apertures, relocation of 1 x 600mm dish and 7 new equipment cabinets and the removal of the existing 17.5m monopole, 3 antennas, redundant equipment cabinets and development ancillary thereto**

Officers introduced the item noting that the application was recommended for refusal on visual amenity grounds and due to the site being on green belt land. It was highlighted that the site was open and prominent and the proposed monopole would be noticeably taller than the surrounding trees which exacerbated the visual impact of the proposals. It was also noted that an existing unrelated monopole was due to be removed roughly 500 metres from the application site.

Members concurred that the prominence of the location was not appropriate and the use of green belt land for this purpose was not suitable. After clarifications were sought, officers confirmed that the cabinets and monopole would be situated away from the pavement on a grassed area.

Members had concerns over the noise that emanates from the equipment associated with monopole installations, particularly within more populated areas and asked officers to assess whether the noise was considered a disturbance. Officers confirmed that they could liaise with colleagues to ascertain, for prospective applications in more built up areas, whether the noise emanating from monopole equipment would be deemed a

disturbance to the locality.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

190. **5 - 31 GARAGE COURT, REAR OF BRAMPTON ROAD, HILLINGDON - 74993/APP/2020/4002 (Agenda Item 8)**

**Proposed demolition of the existing garages and construction of 3 x 4-bedroom houses with all parking spaces and external works**

Items 8 and 9 were heard together, with a separate vote taking place for each item. For the duration of this item, Councillor Chapman remained muted and his camera was turned off.

Officers introduced the item noting that the overall development had previously been approved and before Members for consideration were proposed amendments to the development. Planning permission had previously been granted in April 2020 for the demolition of the garages and the construction of 3 4-bedroom houses. The amendment from the approved plans, before Members as item 8, was the addition of single storey rear elements. Amendments from the approved plans, before Members as item 9, were changes in the design of the roof design and loft layout which would increase the size of the rooms within the roof space.

Members deemed the proposals as maximising the development in an acceptable way. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. Councillor Chapman did not take part in the vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation.**

191. **5 - 31 GARAGE COURT, REAR OF BRAMPTON ROAD, HILLINGDON - 74993/APP/2020/4001 (Agenda Item 9)**

**Demolition of existing garages and construction of 3 x 4-bedroom houses with associated parking spaces and external works**

Items 8 and 9 were heard together, with a separate vote taking place for each item. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed. Councillor Chapman did not take part in the vote.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation.**

192. **SWEETCROFT DENTAL PRACTICE, 267 LONG LANE - 4479/APP/2021/905 (Agenda Item 10)**

**Conversion of part ground floor and part first floor residential flat (Use Class C3) to create additional floorspace for dental surgery (Use Class E(e))**

Prior to the commencement of this item, Councillor Chapman returned to the meeting.

Officers introduced the item highlighting that an overriding policy throughout London was that the loss of residential property was deemed unacceptable unless exceptional

reasons were given. In consultation with the Council's Planning Policy team, the loss of residential property for the provision of health and community facilities was deemed a justified reason for allowing the loss of residential property. The application was recommended for approval.

It was noted that Ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, Councillor Ray Graham, had given his support to the proposed development. Members were pleased to see the proposals as it satisfied a need for more provision of health infrastructure in the Borough, particularly with respect to an increasing local population.

It was also highlighted that, including Sweetcroft Dental Practice, there were eight dental surgeries within roughly a one-mile radius of the site; it was queried whether this still validated the reasons for accepting the loss of residential property. Officers confirmed that the development would alleviate pressure on Hillingdon Hospital by providing additional in-house x-ray facilities at the practice.

Members sought clarification on the term 'Real World PTAL', which in this case was seen as a better rating than the PTAL two given to the dental practice. Officer's confirmed that residents attending the dental practice would be familiar with the journey required to reach the practice by virtue of visiting on a semi-regular basis; this familiarity was why the PTAL of two should be considered better in the 'Real World' setting. Concerns were raised with the use of the term as it could be regarded as a non-specific way to view planning matters.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, agreed with six votes for and one abstention.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved as per the officer's recommendation.

193.	<b>S.106/278 PLANNING AGREEMENTS - QUARTERLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 11</i> )
	<p>The report was introduced to the Committee and Members were asked to note the contents. Members requested, going forward, a printout of Community Infrastructure Levy reports to be included in the quarterly monitoring report.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the monitoring report be noted.</p>
194.	<b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> ( <i>Agenda Item 12</i> )  <b>RESOLVED:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,</li><li>2) That the Committee resolved to release their decision, and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</li></ol> <p>This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and paragraphs 1, 2 &amp; 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the</p>

**identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

195. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 13)**

**RESOLVED:**

- 1) That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,**
- 2) That the Committee resolved to release their decision, and the reasons for it outlined in the report, into the public domain, solely for the purposes of it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.36 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on Telephone 01895 250636 - email (recommended) [democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillingdon.gov.uk). Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**