

## **CENTRAL** & South Planning Committee

## 20 September 2016

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

	<b>Committee Members Present</b> : Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad- Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Beulah East (In place of Janet Duncan), Manjit Khatra, John Morse (In place of Jazz Dhillon) and Brian Stead
	LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Jyoti Mehta (Trainee Solicitor), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer) and Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager)
93.	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Agenda Item 1)
	Apologies were received from Councillors Janet Duncan and Jazz Dhillon, who were substituted by Councillors Beulah East and John Morse.
94.	<b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (Agenda Item 2)
	Councillor Ian Edwards declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda items 12, 13 and 14 and stated that he would be leaving the room during the discussion of the items.
95.	<b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS</b> (Agenda <i>Item 3</i> )
	The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2016 were agreed.
96.	MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (Agenda Item 4)
	None.
97.	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 (Agenda Item 5)
	It was confirmed that items marked Part I would be considered in public, and items marked Part II would be considered in private.
98.	MANOR COURT, HIGH STREET, HARMONDSWORTH - 25525/APP/2016/1091 (Agenda Item 6)
	Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.
L	I

With the permission of the Chair, a petitioner, speaking in objection to the application, circulated a document to Members and the applicant. The petitioner raised the following points:

- The site contained a barn with Grade I listed status. The petitioners believed that, under Historic England rules, any other buildings within the curtilage of a Grade I listed building should be treated as Grade I listed.
- Harmondsworth had an excessive number of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) which was destroying the community. Around 10-12% of buildings were HMOs yet in other areas of the Borough the Council did not allow more than 5%.

In response, the agent for the applicant raised the following points:

- The HMO application was for three year temporary use. A pre-application consultation was taking place to convert the site to fifteen residential units and this remained the long-term aim. The applicant was happy to share the pre-application plans if the petitioners wished to contact the agent.
- The application complied with Council policy on HMOs.
- The application did not involve changing the physical appearance of the building and there had been no objection from English Heritage which supported residential use of the site.

In response to questions from Members, the agent for the applicant confirmed that:

- The building was already being used as an HMO and the application was retrospective.
- The parking provision exceeded the Council's parking standard for HMOs.
- The applicant did not own the area of land on the approach to the parking area but assumed the building had a right of way across this land.

A Ward Councillor, speaking in objection, raised the following points:

- There were issues with the number of HMOs in the area.
- There was illegal parking in the area which already caused problems for residents.

Officers advised the Committee that:

- The buildings had their own designation of Grade II listed which superseded the Grade I listing of the barn.
- The Council had agreed Article 4 directions for HMOs in some areas within the Borough. Harmondsworth was not one of the restricted areas and the application complied with Council policy on HMOs for the area.
- The Council was aware of unauthorised parking in an area adjacent to the site and enforcement action was being taken.
- The application exceeded the parking requirements for an HMO and there was no evidence of problems with using the right of way to access the site.

The Chairman advised petitioners that the application was not within an Article 4 restricted area and they could raise their concerns regarding the number of HMOs in Harmondsworth with their Ward Councillor.

A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, upon being out to a vote, was agreed by a majority of 5 to 3.

**RESOLVED:** That the application was approved. 99. 20 VINE LANE, HILLINGDON - 21231/APP/2016/1015 (Agenda Item 7) Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. A petitioner, speaking in objection to the application, raised the following points: The use of the property as an HMO was unsuitable for the area, which was predominantly family homes. The proposal would lead to increased vehicular activity at an already busy • crossroads. The blue lights on the house were out of character with the area. There were two protected trees in the front garden. No representative of the applicant indicated a wish to speak in reply. A Ward Councillor, speaking in objection, raised the following points: 47 people had signed the petition objecting to the application. If the Committee was minded to approve the application, the Ward Councillor requested that the conditions be strengthened to strictly limit the occupants to not more than 8, to require that the kitchen be updated and that a detailed plan be provided by the applicant for the maintenance of the house and garden. Officers advised that: The house was already in use as an HMO for six people which was permitted • without planning permission. The hardstanding to the front of the property had been in place since at least • 2008 and enforcement action could not be taken as it had been there over four years. The parking for the HMO complied with the Council's policy and it was officers' • opinion that the addition of one more car would not have a severe impact on traffic. The blue lights on the building were permitted development and not within the Council's control. It was moved that the application be approved with the following amendment to the wording of the conditions: Condition 7 to be amended to allow routine maintenance of garden plants without • the need to obtain permission from the Council. Condition 5 to be amended to read "Not more than 8 persons shall reside at the premises at any time". Upon being out to a vote, the motion was agreed by a majority of 7 to 1, with 1 abstention. **RESOLVED:** That delegated authority be given to the Head of Planning to approve the application, subject to amendments.

	Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.
	<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the application was refused.
101.	20A KEATS WAY, WEST DRAYTON - 18417/APP/2016/1878 (Agenda Item 9)
	Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.
	<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the application was refused.
102.	21 PARKFIELD AVENUE, UXBRIDGE - 31591/APP/2016/1937 (Agenda Item 10)
	Officers introduced the report and addendum and provided an overview of the application.
	The building for which permission was sought was independent from the main house, backed onto a rear access road and would have its own shower room. The applicant had stated they wished to use the building as a gym.
	In response to a question for a Member, officers advised that the Council had refused permission for buildings of a similar size where the applicant had not demonstrated the intended use to the satisfaction of the Council.
	Members expressed concern that the building's size, location and facilities could enable it to be used as a separate dwelling. The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.
	<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the application was refused.
103.	132 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES - 3125/APP/2016/2172 (Agenda Item 11)
	Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.
	<b>RESOLVED:</b> That the application was refused.
104.	ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 12)
	The Chairman, Councillor Ian Edwards, having declared a non-pecuniary interest and left the meeting, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor David Yarrow, took the Chair for consideration of this item.
	RESOLVED:
	1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.

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).

105. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (Agenda Item 13) The Chairman, Councillor Ian Edwards, having declared a non-pecuniary interest and left the meeting, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor David Yarrow, took the Chair for consideration of this item. **RESOLVED:** 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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).

### 106. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (Agenda Item 14)

The Chairman, Councillor Ian Edwards, having declared a non-pecuniary interest and left the meeting, the Vice-Chairman, Councillor David Yarrow, took the Chair for consideration of this item.

#### **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).

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on 01895 250833. 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.