

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

2 March 2017

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon, Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra and Brian Stead</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer), Jyoti Mehta (Planning Lawyer) and Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
206.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
207.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Dhillon declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of Item 7 - Highways Verge, Fronting 247 Station Road, in that he lived close to the application site. Councillor Dhillon confirmed that he would leave the meeting when the item was deliberated.</p>
208.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2017 be agreed as a correct record.</p>
209.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that whilst Item 7 - Highways Verge, Fronting 247 Station Road, was not a late or urgent item, the report had not been available for publication with Agenda A, and so had been published as supplementary Agenda B.</p>
210.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that agenda items 1-10 were marked as Part I and would be considered in public. Agenda item 11 was marked as Part II and so would be considered in private.</p>

211. **212 HIGH STREET, HARLINGTON - 1373/APP/2016/4087** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Proposed change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to Thai Massage Clinic (Use Class D1)

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the application site had been subject to an enforcement investigation in regards to a n unauthorised change of use from a retail unit (Use Class A1) to a hot food takeaway (Use Class A5). An enforcement notice was served in July 2015 and required that the use of the site as an A5 Hot Food takeaway to cease. This was appealed against, with the appeal subsequently dismissed as the Inspector considered that it had not been demonstrated that the change of use form A1 to A5 would not harm the vitality and viability of the Harlington Core Shopping Area.

Officers confirmed that the loss of the retail unit would undermine the retail function of the shopping area, contrary to Policy S9 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part two, Saved Polices (November 2012) and it was therefore recommended that the application be refused.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

212. **HIGHWAYS VERGE, FRONTING 247 STATION ROAD - 72544/APP/2017/295** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Installation of a 15m high streetworks style telecommunications monopole and ancillary works (Application under Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)

Following his declaration of interest, Councillor Dhillon left the room before the item was introduced.

Officers introduced the report, highlighting the addendum, and confirmed that the plan attached to the report related to an incorrect site. A corrected site plan was included within the presentation.

The Committee was informed that the proposal was for prior approval for the installation of a telecommunication mast and cabinets, on a central reservation on Station Road. Officers asserted that the installation would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area, due to an increase in clutter. In addition, the applicant had not fully investigated alternative sites within the immediate and surrounding area. Officers highlighted that correspondence received from the applicant had confirmed that representations had been made to the owners of a nearby industrial estate, but that a reply had not been received. This did not preclude the applicant from potentially using the site, and it was felt that more effort should be made to this effect. For these reasons, it was recommended that the application be refused.

The Chairman confirmed that a petition in objection to the application had been received, but that the petitioner was not present. In addition, it was confirmed that petitioner had not included his reasons for the objection within the petition.

Members deliberated the matter, and sought clarity on a number of points. In response

to questions, officers confirmed that as the proposed site was not on Green Belt land or in a Conservation Area, the likelihood of winning an appeal, should the application be refused, was low. If an appeal was upheld, conditions could be requested to the inspector to limit the number of cabinets associated with the mast.

Members were concerned that no information had been provided regarding areas of coverage for existing masts, the potential for mast sharing, and the reason for why the applicant felt the mast must be installed at the proposed location. Officers confirmed that they were satisfied that there was no possibility of mast sharing, and that information assessed by officers during the review of the application would have included existing mast coverage. It was reiterated that the reasons for recommending refusal were based on the detrimental impact the proposal would have on the street scene and local area.

Members shared the officers' concerns that the installation of the mast and cabinets would have a detrimental impact on the street scene due to clutter, and expressed concerns that the mast would dominate the skyline. Additional concerns included the potential precedent for additional technology and furniture to be installed at the site, should this application be allowed, which would removed valuable amenity space for residents. For these reasons, the recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

213. **2 HERCIES ROAD - 9771/APP/2016/3074** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Retention of the existing building as a 12 room bed and breakfast hostel (Sui Generis), amendment to parking layout and provision of a new crossover

Officers introduced the report, confirming that the site had been in use as a hostel since 2001. A site visit had confirmed that the premise was now in use as a hostel/bed and breakfast, and the application sought the retention of the existing building as a bed and breakfast. Officers highlighted a previous enforcement notice, details of which had been forwarded to Members prior to the meeting. This notice was amended by the Inspector to require that the 'premise be returned to its condition before the breach took place'. However, due to the unique history of the site, it was unclear exactly what the previous condition of the site was.

Upon review, officers felt that a bed and breakfast was a reasonable use of the site, and that as the site was isolated, its use as a bed and breakfast did not have an impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. As such, it was recommended that the application be approved, subject to conditions relating to the tidying up of the site and its appearance.

Members discussed the application, and felt that as the site had been use as a hostel/bed and breakfast for a number of years, it was satisfactory for it to remain as so, and that improvements to the appearance of the site would be a good thing. However, concerns were raised at the site's proximity to the M40 and the resultant noise experienced by guests. It was therefore moved that application be approved, subject to the Head of Planning agreeing an additional condition relating to soundproofing at the site. This was seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

1. That the application be approved;
2. That the Head of Planning be delegated authority to agree an additional condition regarding soundproofing at the site.

214. **2 CASTLE AVENUE - 33995/APP/2016/3713** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Conversion of single family dwellinghouse (Class C3) into a 7 bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (Sui Generis)

Officers introduced the report, highlighting that the Highway Engineer had raised no objections to the existing access, parking layout, and provision of cycle storage. As the development would have minimal impact on the character and appearance of the area, or the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, it was recommended that the application be approved.

Members discussed the application, and were concerned that the plans showed provision for a communal lounge that included a toilet. It was suggested that this room would instead be used as an en-suite bedroom. Officers confirmed that there was a requirement for a communal lounge within an HMO of this size, and that enforcement action could be taken in the event that this room was not used for this purpose. In addition, it was confirmed that rooms met the minimum size requirements, and that conditions included a restriction on the number of occupants within the dwelling. On this basis, the officer's recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

215. **10A HIGH STREET - 72203/APP/2016/3394** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) and conversion to 2 x 2-bed self contained flats (Use Class C3)

Officers introduced the report, confirming that although the application property was located within a Secondary Shopping Area, it was considered to be in an isolated location, not within a traditional parade of shops. As the proposal was considered to comply with all policies including the requirement for parking and pedestrian safety, it was recommended that the application be approved.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

216. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 11*)

ENFORCEMENT REPORT (*Agenda Item 13*)

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).

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.05 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Neil Fraser on 01895 250692. 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.