

## Minutes



**NORTH** Planning Committee

**30 May 2017**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Eddie Lavery (Chairman), John Morgan (Vice-Chairman), Duncan Flynn, Raymond Graham, Henry Higgins, Manjit Khatra and John Oswell</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Mandip Malhotra (Major Applications and Business Development), Zenab Haji-Ismail (Principal Planning Officer), James McClean Smith (Major Planning Applications Officer), Manmohan Ranger (Transportation DC Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Planning Lawyer), Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
4.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Dhillon (no substitute) and Councillor Duducu (Councillor Stead substituting).</p>
5.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
6.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
7.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that the items of business marked Part I would be considered in public and items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
8.	<p><b>THURGA, 19 GLENALLA ROAD - 43884/APP/2017/401</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey rear extension, enlargement of roof to create additional habitable roof space to include 4 side dormers and conversion of dwelling into 1 x 2-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats with associated parking, amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to front.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report and highlighted the proposed changes to the roofline, gardens and the relationship between adjacent properties. Officers expressed concern that the proposed development would not be in keeping with the character of the</p>

neighbourhood and would appear cramped due to the close proximity of neighbouring properties. Further concerns were raised regarding the lack of parking at the development which would increase pressure on street parking in the area.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application and expressed concern that the development would be incongruous since the road predominantly comprises detached bungalows. Concerns were also raised regarding the detrimental impact on the local area and the fact that the development would potentially set a precedent for more flat-building in the future. The petitioner also stated that there would be insufficient parking at the application site since only 2 spaces had been allowed for, whereas there could potentially be 10 people and 10 vehicles associated with the development. The petitioner cited current difficulties with parking in the area which he believed would be exacerbated by the new development. It was also mentioned that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties in terms of light and privacy.

Members reiterated the above comments and moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application was refused.**

9. **38 & 40 DUCKS HILL ROAD - 71798/APP/2017/803** (*Agenda Item 6*)

**Erection of a three storey building to create 9 x 3-bed self-contained flats with car parking within basement, with associated parking and landscaping, installation of vehicular crossover to front and detached summerhouse to rear, involving demolition of existing houses (Resubmission).**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the addendum. Officers stated that this was a resubmission; the previous application was refused for a number of reasons including flood risk concerns. In this latest application, balconies to the rear had been removed, obscure glazing incorporated and the roof remodelled. Officers recommended that the application be refused due to concerns regarding the detrimental impact on the character of the area and the overbearing nature of the rear projection. Officers also stated that the development would be in breach of the Council's current threshold which states that no more than 10% of the original plot can be converted to flats in a 1km area.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that the development would be on green field land apart from the footprint of the current houses and citing policy DMH6 which related to inappropriate development in residential gardens. The petitioner suggested that a third reason for refusal should be added regarding the development of land which had not been developed previously.

The applicant spoke in support of the application stating that pre-application advice was sought prior to submitting the original application in June 2016 and that the application was supported by planning officers at the time. When the application was refused, a revised one was submitted which had been changed significantly at the behest of the Council to meet the requirements of planning officers. The applicant stated that the 10% issue had only been raised one week before the meeting and claimed that they had been unfairly treated by the Council's planning department.

The Ward Councillor raised concerns regarding the density of the site, loss of light and privacy, the risk of flooding, lack of parking and the drastic alteration to the street scene.

The Head of Planning was invited to comment on advice given to the applicant and stated that the 10% rule was outlined clearly in the written pre-application advice supplied to the applicant on 6 June 2016. Reference was also made to the overwhelming detrimental impact on the outlook at the neighbouring property and these 2 robust reasons were given for recommending that the application be refused.

The Committee referred to the applicant's complaint regarding the handling of the application and stated that this should be dealt with outside the meeting through the Council's official complaints process.

Members suggested that refusal reason one be strengthened to incorporate the additional third reason for refusal raised by the petitioner. It was proposed that the item be delegated to the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation and recommended that the application be refused due to concerns regarding intensification and the breaching of the 10% rule.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused and that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of the reasons for refusal in conjunction with the Chairman and the Labour Lead.**

10. **LAND TO THE REAR OF ROBINS HEARNE & LITTLEWOOD, DUCKS HILL ROAD - 41674/APP/2017/381** (*Agenda Item 7*)

**Erection of 4 x two storey, 4-bed detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space (Outline application for access and layout with some matters reserved).**

Officers presented the report and explained that this was a resubmission of an application which had previously been refused. An appeal was lodged but was dismissed on 20 February 2017. Officers stated that the current application had not addressed the reasons for the previous refusal or the Planning Inspectors' concerns and did not harmonise with the existing area.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that the revised application was essentially the same as that submitted in June last year and rejected by the Inspectorate in February 2017. It was suggested that further applications should be dismissed immediately if they had not addressed the concerns raised.

Members stated that the proposal was too similar to the original one which was refused and supported the officer's recommendation. The Legal Advisor confirmed that the Council has the discretion to refuse to determine a future planning application that is similar to a previous planning application under the Town and Country Planning Act.

Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application be refused.**

11. **7 HEDGESIDE ROAD - 38605/APP/2017/554** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable use, porch to front, part conversion of garage and alterations to front and rear landscaping.**

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the significant changes proposed in terms of width and depth. It was recommended that the application be refused on the grounds of excessive size and bulk, loss of light and the overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.

A petitioner spoke in opposition to the proposal claiming that the development would contravene Hillingdon's Local Plan. Concerns were raised regarding the loss of light and outlook, the size of the rear extension and lack of outlook from the habitable rooms in the roof. The matter of the loss of the neighbour's privacy was a further cause for concern as was the impact on local parking. The petitioner also stated that the increase in hardstanding could potentially result in flooding. It was requested that the matter of the balcony overlooking the neighbour's property be added as an additional reason for refusal.

Officers responded stating that a screen was proposed which would eliminate concerns regarding the balcony therefore it was not deemed necessary to add this as a reason for refusal.

Councillors supported the officer's recommendation and expressed concerns around the lack of outlook from habitable rooms, the possibility of flooding and the lack of natural light.

Members moved, seconded and agreed the officer's recommendation.

**RESOLVED: That the application was refused.**

12. **1 MANOR HOUSE DRIVE - 27306/APP/2016/4520** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Two storey building with habitable roofspace to consist of 6 x 2-bed flats with associated amenity space and parking, involving demolition of existing dwelling.**

Officers presented the report and the Head of Planning and Enforcement circulated an additional paper suggesting two further reasons for refusal relating to the scale of the development and the impact on parking. It was stated that the suggested allocated parking proposal was insufficient and would result in increased stress on local street parking.

A petitioner spoke in opposition to the application and expressed concerns regarding the over-development of the area and the loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. It was felt that the development would be out of keeping with neighbouring houses and would impact negatively on local parking which was already under stress.

The agent spoke in support of the application and responded to the 5 reasons for refusal outlined by officers. Points raised were:-

- The need for housing in Hillingdon.
- The fact that the proposed development would be on previously developed land.
- A section of the garden would be deemed to be for the private use of occupants of the ground floor flats.

- Parking capacity was deemed to be sufficient.
- The development would not be overbearing and would be in keeping with the current street scene.
- The 45° line had been respected.

Members expressed considerable concerns regarding the loss of space and light and supported the officer's recommendation.

The Committee moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation with the additional two reasons for refusal which had been tabled relating to overbearing impact and parking.

**RESOLVED: That the application was refused with authority delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of the two additional reasons for refusal.**

13. **THE OLD SHOOTING BOX, HIGH ROAD - 20652/APP/2017/905** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Repositioning of existing vehicle entrance and associated groundworks to existing residential property.**

Officers presented the report and highlighted the fact that the current access into the site was dangerous therefore the proposed works were deemed to be necessary.

A representative of Eastcote Conservation Panel spoke in support of the proposal stating that the current entry and egress points at the site were very dangerous as people often drove at speed along the road; hence the need for gates to the front of the property. It was emphasised that the proposed works would not adversely affect neighbouring properties and were not for financial gain. The proposal was solely to ensure the safety of the residents and to protect the Grade II listed building. The design of the gates would be submitted for approval prior to being fitted. The Council Conservation Officer had visited the site as had the Highways and Tree Officers. No concerns had been raised.

The Highways Officer indicated that the Council would need to view further details of the crossover and dropped kerb.

Members were happy to support the officer's recommendations subject to an additional condition 6 to address Highways' requirements. This was to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement. Further amendments to the informative were required; both to indicate that there were no plans to further extend the property and to correct the Ward details.

**RESOLVED: That the application was approved with authority delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of an additional condition.**

14. **THE OLD SHOOTING BOX, HIGH ROAD - 20652/APP/2017/906** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Repositioning of existing vehicle entrance and associated groundworks to existing residential property - listed building consent**

Officers presented the report and highlighted the fact that the current access into the site was dangerous therefore the proposed works were deemed to be necessary.

A representative of Eastcote Conservation Panel spoke in support of the proposal stating that the current entry and egress points at the site were very dangerous as people often drove at speed along the road; hence the need for gates to the front of the property. It was emphasised that the proposed works would not adversely affect neighbouring properties and were not for financial gain. The proposal was solely to ensure the safety of the residents and to protect the Grade II listed building. The design of the gates would be submitted for approval prior to being fitted. The Council Conservation Officer had visited the site as had the Highways and Tree Officers. No concerns had been raised.

The Highways Officer indicated that the Council would need to view further details of the crossover and dropped kerb.

Members were happy to support the officer's recommendations subject to an additional condition 6 to address Highways' requirements. This was to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement. Further amendments to the informative were required; both to indicate that there were no plans to further extend the property and to correct the Ward details.

**RESOLVED: That the application was approved with authority delegated to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to agree the wording of an additional condition.**

#### **ADDENDUM**

#### 15. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 12*)

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed subject to the timeframe changing from 2 months to 3 months (Section 1.4 of the report).

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).*

#### 16. **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).*

17. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 14*)

**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 8.50 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Liz Penny on 01895 250185. 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.**