

Minutes

CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

30 June 2015

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



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Roy Chamdal, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra, Brian Stead, Shehryar Wallana and Raymond Graham (In place of Alan Chapman)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger - Head of Planning and Enforcement, Meg Hirani - Planning Team Manager, Syed Shah - Principal Highways Engineer, Nicole Cameron - Legal Services, Gill Oswell - Democratic Services</p>
32.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Alan Chapman and Ian Edwards with Councillors Ray Graham substituting.</p>
33.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 6 - Former Prince of Albert PH, Pield Heath Road, Hillingdon and left the meeting whilst he application was discussed.</p>
34.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 MAY 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2015 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
35.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There were no items notified in advance or urgent.</p>
36.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was agreed that items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>

37. **PRINCE ALBERT PH, PIELD HEATH ROAD, HILLINGDON 704/APP/2015/1071**
(Agenda Item 6)

Redevelopment of site as a two storey block to provide 9 x two-bedroom flats with associated access, parking and landscaping.

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the applicant/agent addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- Acknowledged that the report made reference to the balcony/patio screening to be provided, which had been a concern for residents in Holly Cottage Mews.
- The petitioner referred to the unauthorised parking that had been on the site when the building had been demolished in 2014.
- Felt that the two previous applications made on this site showed a clear intention for residential dwellings to be built.
- No notice was provided to surrounding residents to advise that the former public house was going to be demolished, which residents felt was carried out illegally.
- Raised concerns about the footprint of the building and felt the proposal would affect sunlight/light to properties in Holy Cottage Mews.
- Asked how calculations in relation to distance and light implications had been made.
- The distance between properties in Holly Cottage Mews and the proposed building would have an imposing impact on the cottages, as the previous use had been as a garden for the former public house.
- Pield Heath Road and surrounding roads had previously flooded and asked what measures would be put in place so that this was not exacerbated by this development.
- Felt that this application would set a precedent for the other public house close by, which had just been put up for sale.
- Clarification was sought as how only 3 additional car movements from the site during peak periods had been calculated.
- Raised concerns about the number of parking spaces being provided as there was only one space per 2 bedroom flat.

The applicant/agent made the following points:-

- The application was to provide 9 - 2 bed flats, which complied with the all relevant policies.
- There had been pre application discussions with officers and changes had been made to the application as a result.
- The application should be considered on its own merits.
- The application was an appropriate use of the site providing much needed housing in the area.
- The development would provide a good standard of accommodation.
- The height and scale of the development would not impact on daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties.

Ward Councillor comments

- Had been contacted by residents in Field Heath Road about the application and supported their concerns.
- Some amendments had been made to the application that may give some comfort to the petitioners.
- 9 parking spaces were being provided, which included a disabled space, how would these be allocated to each unit.
- There was no provision for visitor parking.
- The low parking provided on this site could set a precedent for other sites.
- The site was close to Hillingdon Hospital so parking was the biggest issue.
- It would be useful if clarification of conditions 7 &, 8 and 11 could be provided.

Officers responded to a number of issues that had been raised by the petitioners and the Ward Councillor as follows:

- Distances - the minimum distance standards required between the rear development and the properties in Holly Cottage Mews had been met.
- Light Implications - given the distances proposed the development did not affect the 45° rule to habitable windows.
- Water Management and Flooding - Condition 11 required a sustainable water management scheme to be submitted and approved before any development took place on site. This would require measures to ensure that flooding did not occur on local roads.
- Orange Peel Public House - Each application needed to be considered on its own merits but as the building was listed any demolition would need consent.
- Traffic Generation - This was a small development of 9 dwellings and would not have an impact on local roads, it had been calculated that there could be an additional 3 cars during peak periods so was not a cause for concern.

Members raised concerns at the number of car parking spaces being provided and that this included the disabled parking, bringing the number of spaces being provided to 8.

Officers advised that disabled parking was always included in the overall parking provision. Similar developments had been approved with a 1 to 1 parking ratio; with the site having a PTAL rating of 3, the maximum parking standards had been met. It was suggested that as Members still had concerns about the parking an informative could be added to seek an additional parking space. The Committee unanimously agreed to an informative being added as suggested with the wording being agreed by the Chairman and Labour Lead.

The recommendation as set out in the officer's report with an additional informative seeking the provision of one additional parking space was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to grant planning permission, subject to the following:

A) That the Council enter into a Section 106/S278/S38 Agreement or other appropriate legislation to secure:

1. Widening and re-instatement of the adjoining public footpath.

B) That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the S106 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 and conditions of approval.

D) That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised before the 31st July 2015, or any other period deemed appropriate that delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to refuse the application for the following reason:

'The applicant has failed to ensure that the necessary works to the adjoining public footpath would be undertaken in a timely manner and to an appropriate standard. The scheme therefore fails to ensure that highway and pedestrian safety would not be prejudiced and conflicts with Policies AM2 and AM7 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).'

E) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning and Enforcement under delegated powers, subject to the completion of the legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and other appropriate powers with the applicant.

F) That if the application is approved, conditions and informatives set out in the report be attached and an additional informative to seek the provision of one additional parking space on the site bringing the number of spaces to 10.

38. 132 RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON 1728/APP/2015/1070 (Agenda Item 7)

Single storey side extension to ground floor shop, conversion of first and second floors from 2 residential units to 1 x 1 bed and 2 x 2 bed flats, provision of amenity area first floor level and installation of external metal staircase at first floor level to the rear. Two storey detached building at the rear of the site to provide 2 x 1 bed flats, provision of amenity area at ground floor level and provision of 9 car parking spaces at the front of the site involving increase in width of existing crossovers

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application. The Committee was informed that a Ward Councillor had asked for his views about the application to be given to the Committee as he was unable to attend the meeting.

Ward Councillor comments included concerns about highway and pedestrian safety, Ryefield Avenue was on a main bus route through the estate, the proposal was overdevelopment and cars often double parked outside the shops.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the applicant/agent addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- The main objection to the proposal was in relation to parking and traffic that already existed in the local area.
- The two storey building within in the rear yard would not match the existing building line.
- The development would be out of character with the area.
- Ryefield Avenue was a wide road and on a main bus route, cars double park outside of the shops causing pedestrian and highway safety concerns.
- If this application was approved there were concerns that parking in Berkley Road would be exacerbated, which had already been raised with officers.

The applicant/agent made the following points:-

- Several aspects needed to be considered and the application considered on its own merits.
- There had been no objections or concerns raised in relation to residential flats above 132 Ryefield Avenue.
- The required amenity space, refuse and cycle storage had been provided.
- The access was not significantly different to existing arrangements.
- The additional crossover being provided was only 7.9 metres, which equated to 1½ car parking spaces.
- The two storey development does not overlook surrounding properties or gardens, as they overlook the amenity space being provided for the flats.
- There was adequate amenity space provided for the existing units with an 18 metre wall erected to reduce the impact the compressors would have on the units.
- The street scene would not be affected as the application was development at the rear with no established character.
- The existing garage was to be retained and parking provided at the front of the building as this would be safe, secure and well lit. Parking at the rear was unmanageable and unsecure.

In answer to a question raised by members as to whether reason for refusal 1 was sufficient in regards to beds in sheds, officers advised that the reason for refusal was sufficient in relation to back land development.

Members felt that there were a lot of issues with the application and the recommendation for refusal was correct. The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officers report.

39.

CRIMSON COURT, 1390 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HILLINGDON 11982/APP/2015/1426
(Agenda Item 8)

Installation of new roof with 3 front and 3 rear dormers to allow conversion of roofspace to habitable use to create 3 x 2-bed flats with associated cycle store (part retrospective)

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application and informing the Committee that the application approved had provided for amenity space on the roof. A condition attached to the permission required the development to meet secure by design accreditation. In trying to meet this requirement the Met Police had advised the applicant that the amenity space would fail the secure by design accreditation and this should be removed. The application had therefore been re-submitted to remove the roof space amenity area.

The recommendation for approval 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 officers report.

40. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 9*)

RESOLVED -

- 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.**
- 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.**

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

41. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 10*)

RESOLVED -

- 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.**
- 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.**

This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).

42.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED -</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
43.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED -</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.30 pm.</p>

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