

## Minutes

### CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

16 October 2013

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) Wayne Bridges Neil Fyfe Dominic Gilham Brian Stead Mo Khursheed (Labour Lead) Janet Duncan</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Matthew Duigan, Planning Service Manager Adrien Waite, Major Applications Manager Manmohan Ranger, Highways Engineer Rory Stracey, Legal Advisor Charles Francis, Democratic Services Officer</p>	
16.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence</p>	
17.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Wayne Bridges declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 as he had spoken to the applicant about the application before the meeting. He left the room and did not participate in the item.</p>	
18.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF 4 SEPTEMBER 2013</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2013 were agreed as a correct record.</p>	
19.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman explained that Items 16 and 17 in Agenda B were urgent items.</p>	
20.	<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</i></p>	

	<p><i>Item 5)</i></p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in public with the exception of items 12, 13, 14 and 15 which were considered in private.</p>	
21.	<p><b>48 POLE HILL ROAD, HILLINGDON - 33924/APP/2013/1696</b> <i>(Agenda Item 6)</i></p> <p><b>Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as garage.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The petitioner objecting to the proposal made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design of the building with double doors to the front and rear meant that it was not a garage.</li> <li>• The design of the building meant that access and egress were virtually impossible.</li> <li>• The building had been connected to mains water, sewage and drainage and was the beginning of preparing the building for occupancy.</li> <li>• The appearance of the building made it look as though it had been designed as a home of multiple occupation.</li> <li>• The building was incongruous and out of character with the local area.</li> <li>• The building should be demolished</li> <li>• The building was effectively a 'beds in sheds' application.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant /agent made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The garage had been constructed within permitted development rights.</li> <li>• Permission had not been granted to extend into the roof space of the primary dwelling and so additional space had been created through the garage.</li> <li>• The highways officer confirmed that the floor level was higher than the garden.</li> <li>• In relation to the access and egress points raised by the petitioner, the applicant confirmed that the building could be accessed without problems.</li> </ul> <p>Members discussed the application and noted that it had been built more in accordance with accommodation in mind rather than as a garage. A number of further concerns were raised which included the need for cavity walls, access to the rear of the property via the garage and its overall dimensions. In response, the applicant informed Members that there was room to access the rear of the property with a vehicle inside the garage and that its size conformed to permitted development.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>A ward Councillor was unable to attend but asked for a written statement to be read out at the meeting in support of the petition in objection to the proposal. The following points were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents were upset and disappointed at the removal of the mature trees, and a hedge.</li> <li>• Residents felt that the building was not acceptable by condition of design, height and size.</li> <li>• Residents were concerned that drainage, electric and water utilities had been installed.</li> <li>• Residents were concerned that the building might be converted at a later date into residential accommodation.</li> <li>• A Highways Inspector had reported that there was insufficient space for a vehicle to manoeuvre in and out of the garage.</li> </ul> <p>In the course of discussions, Members noted there was a disparity between the level of the floor within the garage and the road at street level and a ramp would be required for this to become fully functional.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application was Refused for the reasons set out in the officers report and addendum circulated at the meeting and reason for refusal 2 to include 'level of the internal floor, ' between 'sightlines' and 'and'.</b></p>	
22.	<p><b>11 CEDARS DRIVE, HILLINGDON - 1985/APP/2013/197</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>Boundary wall to front and installation of steel gates (Part Retrospective)</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and outlined the changes as per the addendum.</p> <p>In this particular case, Officers highlighted that there were a number of discrepancies with the approved plans which included: the lights and pillars, and the amount of hard standing. Despite these differences, the Highways Officer confirmed that there was good visibility in both directions and the design was not visually harmful to the street scene.</p> <p>Neither the petitioner, nor the applicant / agent attended the meeting.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee queried the height of the lights, the amount of hard standing and whether or not delegated authority might be given to officers to address these issues. In response to these points, the Legal Officers confirmed that these were not major discrepancies.</p> <p>The Committee asked that Enforcement investigate whether any action</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>is expedient regarding discrepancies between plans and as built development with regard to lights, height of pillars and hard surfacing.</p> <p>It was moved and seconded with 6 votes in favour and 1 abstention that the application be approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That had the item been referred to Committee the application would have been Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting</b></p>	
23.	<p><b>67 BERRYDALE ROAD, HAYES - 64145/APP/2013/2176</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey side extension (Part retrospective).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be Refused, for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>
24.	<p><b>1B HIGH STREET, COWLEY - 69295/APP/2013/1803</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of Use from A1 [Internet Cafe] to A2 [Estate Agents].</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application was Approved for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
25.	<p><b>HOLIDAY INN, SIPSON ROAD, WEST DRAYTON - 6843/APP/2013/2182</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>The installation of 2 x 1.2m microwave dishes, equipment cabinet (to be installed internally) free standing hand railing and ancillary equipment on the rooftop.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the application be Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and addendum circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	
26.	<p><b>S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT UP TO 30 JUNE 2013</b> <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the Central &amp; South Planning Committee area up to 30 June 2013 where the Council has received and holds funds.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the report be noted</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>
27.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p>The recommendations as set out in the officer report were moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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.</b></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><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>
28.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p>The recommendations as set out in the officer report were moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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.</b></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>	
29.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 14)</b></p> <p>The recommendations as set out in the officer report were moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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.</b></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><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>
30.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 15)</b></p> <p>The recommendations as set out in the officer report were moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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.</b></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>	
31.	<p><b>LORDS BUILDERS MERCHANT, DAWLEY ROAD, HAYES 43554/APP/2013/1028 (Agenda Item 16)</b></p> <p><b>Single storey detached shed, raising of roof of existing warehouse and alterations to cladding.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.</p> <p>Officers explained that the proposed development would see a partial infilling of a Brownfield Site within the Green Belt, which would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. It was noted that the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer had raised no objections to the application and that the proposed development was considered to comply with National, Regional and Local Green Belt Policy.</p> <p>Officers proposed the following changes:</p> <p><i>That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning to approve the application subject to the conditions in the report and that a tree preservation order has been put in place before permission is granted.</i></p> <p><i>To amend condition 6 to replace the word 'until' with 'of' and To amend condition 8 to delete point 2.d.</i></p> <p>Members raised concerns about the height of storage within the site and whether or not this could be reduced given that it was a green belt site. In response, the Legal Officer explained that this could not be altered as it had been set out in a Legal Agreement.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That the recommendation be altered to give delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>

	<b>permission following confirmation of a TPO to the retained tree in the yard and subject to the conditions in the report and as amended above</b>	
32.	<p><b>LORDS BUILDERS MERCHANT, DAWLEY ROAD, HAYES 43554/ADV/2013/36</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of 1 x free standing sign.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes as set out in the addendum.</p> <p>In discussing the application, the Committee agreed that the Officer recommendation in the agenda should be amended to give delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission following confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order to the retained tree in the yard and subject to the conditions in the report.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the recommendation in the agenda should be amended to give delegated authority to the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture to grant planning permission following confirmation of a Tree Preservation Order to the retained tree in the yard and subject to the conditions in the report.</p> <p><b>Resolved –</b></p> <p><b>That No decision to be issued until TPO is confirmed.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p>Matthew Duigan &amp; Adrien Waite</p>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.35 pm.	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 250813. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.