

**Minutes****CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE****9 June 2016****Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre, High Street, Uxbridge**

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra and Brian Stead.</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor) and Jon Pitt (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
27.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Roy Chamdal. There was no substitute present.</p>
28.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no Declarations of Interest made.</p>
29.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS HELD ON 19 APRIL 2016 AND 12 MAY 2016</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on 19 April 2016 and on 12 May 2016 were agreed as being accurate.</p>
30.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman advised the Committee that an additional late report had been received and would be considered in relation to agenda item number 16.</p>
31.	<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 Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that the agenda items numbered 1 to 14 were Part I and would be considered in public. The agenda items numbered 15 to 17 were Part II and would, therefore, be heard in private.</p>

32. **6 ABINGDON CLOSE, HILLINGDON - 17794/APP/2016/268** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and first floor front extension.**

Officers introduced the report, which was for a two storey detached property located on the north side of Abingdon Close. The application was for a single storey rear extension and a single storey and first floor front extension.

The application had been the subject of two letters and a petition, with the grounds for the objection being set out within the agenda. Officers had no objection to the single storey rear extension as this complied with the Council's normal requirements.

The main issue for consideration was the impact of the front extension on the character of the property and its visual impact on the street scene and the wider area. It was noted that the Council's supplementary planning document on residential extensions stated that changes and extensions to the front of the house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions that extended across the entire frontage of a house would normally be refused.

A large number of the properties in Abingdon Close were characterised by single storey front projections, which originally had been garages. A number of these projections, including the application site, had a balcony above. The loss of the balcony feature, the addition of a first floor and the squaring off of the ground floor would represent a significant change to the design and appearance of the dwelling. It was considered that these changes would be detrimental to the architectural composition of the property, its character and appearance and would not be in keeping with the appearance of other properties in Abingdon Close. It was confirmed that there were not any protected trees that would be affected by the proposals. The application was recommended for refusal.

A petition had been submitted in objection to the application. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the petitioner addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- Everyone who had signed the petition lived on Abingdon Close.
- Abingdon Close was a cul-de-sac, with no through traffic and was quiet and peaceful, with all the houses being in harmony.
- The petitioners felt that the proposals were ill considered and not in harmony with the houses in the street and they did not want the building line to be changed.
- The officer report had effectively summarised the concerns of the petitioners. UPP planning policy numbers BE1, BE13, BE15 and BE19 were considered to be particularly relevant to the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, the applicant addressed the meeting and made the following points:

- The proposed reduction in the size of the garden to 90 square metres was 10 square metres less than specified by policy.
- A reason for refusal was the change in character of the house due to the proposed front extension.
- The planning officer had acknowledged that the small shortfall in the proposed

size of the garden was not a sufficient reason for refusal of the application.

- The applicant would be prepared to omit the rear extension and to reduce the overall bulk of the extension.
- The substantive reasons for the recommendation for refusal were the proposed changes to the front and side of the property.
- The applicant accepted that the proposed changes would result in a change in the character of the house. However, these would not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.
- The balcony at the front of the house was badly designed and rarely used. The flat roof had leaked many times.
- The proposals would improve the appearance of the property and the street scene.
- Similar developments had been allowed at house number 1 Abingdon Close and number 55 Court Drive.
- The appearance of the property had already been changed by a previously approved extension.

Officers advised that house numbers 2 to 8 in Abingdon Close were properties of a similar character, the majority of which had a balcony feature. The properties at numbers 1 Abingdon Close and 55 Court Drive were corner plots, with different orientations and aspects in comparison to the application site. Therefore, officers did not consider that the appearance of these properties was of particular significance in relation to the application under consideration. The extensions at these properties were also not considered to be examples of good architecture. It was not considered that anything that had been raised by the petitioner altered the recommendation made by officers for the committee to refuse the application.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, comments provided in relation to the application by a ward Councillor for Uxbridge North, Councillor Raymond Graham, were read to the Committee:

"I am familiar with the location and support the petitioners; that being so I am in agreement with the decision to 'refuse' this application, especially with regard to the proposed front extensions by reason of their position, size, scale and design, which would be detrimental to the architectural style of the existing house. The loss of the balcony feature would be regrettable, given that any changes to the street scene ought to set out to blend in with and complement the character of the area."

Members concurred with the officer recommendation and concerns were expressed in relation to the appearance of the proposed roof to the front of the property. Officers advised that the angle of the roof followed the angle of the existing roof and was subsidiary to the main roof. The roof design was not considered to be a reason for refusal. The Chairman stated that while the proposed roof matched the pitch of the existing roof on the left hand side, the angle was different on the right hand side.

Committee Members agreed that the proposals were of unsuitable bulk and would be incongruous.

The legal advisor confirmed that the concerns put forward by Members were considered to be valid grounds for refusal and could be put forward at any subsequent appeal in relation to the application.

The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
33.	<p><b>14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2016/203</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>First floor rear extension.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 18 April in order to allow a site visit to take place. This had now taken place, with Members having seen the site and the adjoining site. The application was for a first floor rear extension. The proposals were considered to be acceptable and accordingly, they were recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members expressed some dissatisfaction with the appearance of the proposed development but did not consider that there were any planning grounds for refusal. In response to a Member question, officers confirmed that a condition would be included to ensure that the garage was retained for the parking of cars and was not used for any other purpose.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
34.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO SIPSON ROAD IN HOLLOWAY LANE, HARMONDSWORTH - 46223/APP/2016/492</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p><b>Section 73 application to vary Condition 1 of planning permission 46223/APP/2015/1195 dated 15<sup>th</sup> June 2015 (Variation of Condition 3 of planning permission 46223/APP/2013/2899 dated 4<sup>th</sup> December 2013 (Use of part of the site fronting Sipson Road, for a period of 18 months, as a construction compound and training facility in conjunction with the rebuilding of the structural supports for the A4 Hammersmith Flyover) to allow the continued use of the site until January 2016 (S73 Application))) to now extend the part use of the site until January 2017, as a construction compound and training facility in conjunction with rebuilding of the structural supports for the A4 Hammersmith Flyover.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which was before the Committee for consideration due to works at the site having overrun. The site was not clearly visible from the adjacent road and was due to be dismantled by the end of the year. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>

35.	<p><b>26 BURLEIGH ROAD, HILLINGDON - 70683/APP/2016/1177</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey outbuilding to rear for use as a games room.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report, which was for a single storey outbuilding to be used as a games room. The proposed building would be 30 square metres and its size was considered to be reasonable. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Officers considered that the proposed condition 6, which would restrict the type of usage permissible in the outbuilding, was overly restrictive and requested that the restriction on it being used as a living room or study be removed.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the removal of the words "living room" and "study" from condition number 6.</b></p>
36.	<p><b>88 THE LARCHES, HILLINGDON - 71105/APP/2015/4180</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion from 1 x 3-bed dwelling to 2 x 2-bed self contained flats.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which related to a two-storey, semi-detached property on the south side of the road. The proposal was for a part single-storey, part two-storey side and rear extension and its conversion to a two bedroom self contained flat. The size of the property met the required size for such a conversion to be carried out.</p> <p>Issues had been identified in relation to access to amenity space and parking provision. The ground floor would have access to amenity space, but there was no access to the amenity space from the first floor flat, other than through the ground floor flat. In relation to parking, the applicant had not demonstrated how access could be provided to two parking spaces at the site. For these reasons and due to the location of the bin store, the proposals were considered to be unacceptable and were recommended for refusal.</p> <p>In relation to required room sizes, officers advised that the national space standards had been adopted in March 2015. The overall size of the flats met the required standard. One of the ground floor bedrooms was below the minimum size. It would be 2.4 metres wide, compared to a required width of 2.75 metres. Officers considered that citing this as a reason for refusal would be likely to be overturned at appeal. Members were encouraged to consider whether they wished to be strict in their application of the room size space standards.</p> <p>The Chairman stated that, given that the space standards had been adopted by the London Plan, he would wish for the Committee to consider including the size of the room as an additional reason for refusal. Members agreed that the required minimum width of 2.75 metres should be upheld. Officers proposed that it would be preferable to include reference to the room sizes as part of the reference to amenity space within reason for refusal number 1, rather than including room size as a separate refusal reason. This was due to concern that including room size as a separate refusal reason might not be defensible at any appeal. It was agreed that specific reference would be</p>

	<p>made to habitable room size within reason for refusal number 1.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report and that delegated authority be granted to Head of Planning to amend reason for refusal number 1 to include reference to the width of one of the habitable rooms being less than the minimum required.</b></p>
37.	<p><b>53 PETWORTH GARDENS, HILLINGDON - 71076/APP/2016/860</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of single dwelling house into 2 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space involving alterations to elevations (Retrospective).</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was for the conversion of a house into self contained flats and the provision of parking. The application was considered to provide an acceptable level of residential amenity but it would not provide sufficient off-street parking provision. The application was recommended for refusal.</p> <p>Members were referred to the addendum sheet circulated which clarified the internal floor areas. One of the proposed flats had slightly less floor space than required and it was requested that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to add a third reason for refusal that would reflect this and also that the size of the double bedroom of one of the flats was below the required standard.</p> <p>Members asked whether there was the possibility of a drop kerb crossover being provided at the site. Officers advised that one could be installed but that this would result in the loss of an on street parking space.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report, subject to amendments proposed in the addendum sheet and that delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to add a third reason for refusal that the size of one of the flats and one of the bedrooms was below the required standard.</b></p>
38.	<p><b>3A HARVEY ROAD, HILLINGDON - 71825/APP/2016/599</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer, 1 x side rooflight and 1 x front rooflight.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, noting that a number of applications at the site had been to Committee previously. An application had previously been refused for the retention of side and rear dormers. The application currently under consideration proposed to remove the side dormer and to include a smaller rear dormer in the hip roof. Officers considered that this amendment was acceptable and accordingly, approval of the application was recommended.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p>

	<p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
39.	<p><b>10 WEST COMMON ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 5313/APP/2016/260</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Creation of additional habitable roofspace to include a front dormer, enlargement of rear dormer with Juliette balcony, 1 rear rooflight and alterations to elevations.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report which was for the installation of one front dormer and the enlargement of an existing rear dormer. The enlargement of the dormer was considered to be acceptable as it was relatively small in proportion to the roof. Front dormers were normally only permitted where they were in keeping with the character of the road as was the case for road that the application site was located on. The proposals were considered to be acceptable and the application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Concerns were raised with regard to the step up and step down of the dormers and how they might vary in comparison to the technical guidance. Officers advised that the current guidance was that dormers should be subordinate to the roof of the property and a key characteristic was that they should be set in from the side. It was therefore considered that the proposals complied with the guidance.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns in relation to the architectural merit of the proposed dimensions of the dormers. Officers advised that the proposed dormers were considered to match the existing street scene as other properties contained similar dormers.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised that the plans could allow overlooking neighbouring gardens. Officers advised that permission for Juliet balconies at the site had previously been refused in 2008. Officers advised that the current proposals were not considered to be objectionable because they did not provide a platform for seating. Previous appeal decisions had demonstrated that Juliet balconies were permitted developments. The distance of the dwelling from neighbouring properties was also such that overlooking was not considered to be problematic.</p> <p>Overall, Members considered that the proposals were acceptable and that there were no grounds for refusal. The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</b></p>
40.	<p><b>24 GORDON ROAD, YIEWSLEY - 19783/APP/2016/266</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion from 1 x 3-bed dwelling to 2 x 3 - bed flats with associated parking and amenity space.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application, which was for a two storey and part single storey side and rear extensions and their conversion to two, three bedroom flats. It was noted that an application had been approved earlier in 2016 for extensions at the site. The</p>

proposals met all the relevant size specifications. Associated parking spaces were proposed, which were both accessible and usable. The extension would retain a significant separation distance from adjoining properties and would not impede a 45 degree line of sight from the closest first floor window of a neighbouring property. The application was recommended for approval.

Members were referred to the addendum sheet that had been circulated in advance of the meeting. This reflected the Mayor of London's supplementary planning guidance that had been updated in March 2016. This specified that section M of building regulations only applied to new build properties and did not apply to conversions. Therefore, condition 7 of the officer report did not apply and was proposed for deletion.

The Chairman asked whether any steps could be taken to minimise parking difficulties in the area surrounding the application site and asked whether a condition could be added to the approval conditions, in the event that Committee were to approve the application, to specify that no parking permit would be granted to residents of the new flats. Officers advised that the development would provide off street parking that met the Council's standards and that case law cast doubt with regards to whether planning authorities could specify that particular residents would not be eligible for parking permits. It was also noted that the proposals were considered to be well designed, with refuse areas in the correct locations, separate access to each rear garden area and an appropriate layout.

A Member raised concerns with regard to parking difficulties in Gordon Road and the parking that Rabbsfarm Primary School generated.

The recommendation for approval was proposed, seconded and upon being put to the vote, was agreed unanimously.

**RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and the deletion of condition number 7 of the report.**

41. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 15*)

**Resolved: That:**

**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 6a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).*



42.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved: That:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was 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>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 6a of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
43.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved: That:</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was 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>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 6a 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 8.20 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Jon Pitt on 01895 277655. 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.**

This page is intentionally left blank