

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

7 February 2018

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Alan Chapman, Raymond Graham, Edward Lavery, Brian Stead, Peter Money and John Oswell</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager) and Liz Penny (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
175.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Edwards with Councillor Graham substituting, from Councillor Chamdal with Councillor Lavery substituting, from Councillor Khursheed with Councillor Oswell substituting and from Councillor Morse.</p>
176.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
177.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting on 11 January 2018 were approved.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting on 11 January 2018 were approved as an accurate record.</p>
178.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
179.	<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 the items of business marked Part I would be considered in Public and that the items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>

180. **42 HUGHES ROAD, HAYES - 28763/APP/2017/4032** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 front rooflights to create 1 x 2-bed flat, 1 x studio flat and a 4-bed HMO

Officers introduced the application and explained that the proposed extensions to the property were identical to those recently approved by planning under a separate application as a single private dwelling. The new application in question sought permission for the sub-division of the property. The principal concerns of planning officers had regard to the impact on neighbours, the quality of the proposed accommodation and the parking provision (2 spaces in total) which failed to meet the Council's approved parking standards. Officers highlighted the fact that 7 individuals could reside in such an HMO which was more than the average large family.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application stating that many of the petitioners' key concerns had already been addressed in the planning officer's report. However, the petitioner highlighted an additional area of concern which related to the inadequate distance between the existing bedroom window to the side of 40 Hughes Road and the wall of the proposed side extension at no. 42 which would be approximately 8m. This would be considerably less than Hillingdon Council's required minimum distance of 15m. The petitioner also drew attention to a proposed window to a habitable room at no. 42 at first floor level; this would be opposite the existing bedroom window at no. 40 and would result in an unacceptable distance between the two windows.

The petitioner also drew Members' attention to the statement in section 7.08 of the report regarding impact on neighbours and commented that this statement was inaccurate as the proposed extension would cause loss of outlook, privacy and light to no. 40.

The petitioner requested that an additional reason for refusal be added relating to the proximity of the development to no. 40 and the impact on residents there.

Members expressed concern regarding the reported 8m distance between the two properties but were advised by officers that permission for the extension had already been granted and could not be revoked. At the time, the room to the side of the property was a study. Neighbours had been consulted and had not raised any issues with the development itself; only concerns regarding parking and use. It was reported that the extension could therefore be built and Members could only consider the use of the property at this stage. It was agreed that the report already included 5 sound reasons for refusal and a 6th reason was not necessary or feasible.

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

RESOLVED: That the application was refused.

181. **LAND FORMING PART OF 12 DAGNALL CRESCENT, COWLEY - 72273/APP/2017/4203** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Two-storey, 2-bed attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and extensions to vehicular crossovers to front

Officers introduced the application and explained that a previous application had been refused in August 2017 as it failed to incorporate sufficient off street parking and

amenity space. It was explained that the new application had addressed the parking issue, but the sub-division of the plot would result in the existing dwelling having an area of external amenity space that failed to meet the minimum area requirement set out in the HDAS SPD.

Councillor Burles spoke on behalf of the petitioners and commented that petitioners believed the application should be refused for a number of reasons:

1. one concern related to additional parking stress - particularly in the evenings and at weekends; this also impacted on neighbouring roads. Members were advised that it was at times difficult for emergency vehicles and commercial vehicles to get through. It was reported that the proposed additional new vehicular crossover would result in a reduction in on-street parking;
2. petitioners felt that the site was unsuitable for two dwellings and the amenity space at both of the proposed properties would be inadequate;
3. concerns were expressed regarding the impact on privacy as the distance between bedroom windows would barely exceed the minimum requirement of 21m. Members were also advised that neighbouring properties would experience a loss of privacy due to overlooking of their patio areas. A Thames Water sewer would also need to be relocated which would necessitate the removal of trees on the site;
4. it was felt that the street scene would be impacted negatively by the development as it would not match the street scene when viewed from the side and the rear.

The agent spoke in response to the petition stating that, in his opinion, the two reasons for refusal given in August 2017 had now been resolved in the revised application. Members were advised that the removal of the porch would enable two parking spaces to be provided side by side. It was also reported that the issue regarding the lack of amenity space for the existing and proposed dwellings had been addressed by arranging the car parking spaces side by side enabling the required 60m amenity space to be provided. The agent stated that the 60sqm amenity space requirement should only apply to new houses and should not apply to the existing dwelling. It was suggested that the guidelines for residential extensions would be more appropriate and should be applied instead; this requirement was for 40sqm rather than 60sqm. The agent reported that paragraph 7.09 of the officer's report did not recognise that the proposal was for bedroom one to be reduced in size with the addition of a dressing room, avoiding the need for a condition to ensure that no internal room partitions were erected in the future.

Councillor Cooper spoke as Ward Councillor in objection to the application and expressed satisfaction at the officers' analysis regarding amenity space for future residents. Councillor Cooper also stated that local areas should be improved rather than squeezing in additional properties unnecessarily.

The Head of Planning and Enforcement addressed the issues raised by the agent. With regard to interpretation of the guidance, Members were advised that the guidance relating to applications for new dwellings was deemed to be the most appropriate in this case and it was logical that the same numerical standards would be applied both to the proposed new dwelling and to the existing dwelling. It was reported that the existing dwelling would be reduced to 44 square metres in size under the proposal and this was insufficient.

RESOLVED: That the application was refused.

182.	<p>6 HAMILTON ROAD, COWLEY, UXBRIDGE - 5670/APP/2017/3929 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>This agenda item was withdrawn prior to commencement of the meeting.</p>
183.	<p>1190 UXBRIDGE ROAD, HAYES - 3976/APP/2017/3729 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>This agenda item was withdrawn prior to commencement of the meeting.</p>
184.	<p>LAND FORMING PART OF 28 AND 28 WEST WALK, HAYES - 71945/APP/2017/3032 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Two storey, 2-bed, attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space and part two storey, part single storey rear extension to existing dwelling and installation of crossover to front.</p> <p>Officers presented the application which sought to construct a new 2-bedroom house as an extension to the existing end terrace dwelling with associated crossovers, parking and amenity space. Members were advised that the proposal would result in a cramped form of development and would be at odds with the predominant character, appearance and scale of buildings within the surrounding street scene. It was also reported that the proposal failed to ensure sufficient parking provision to meet Council standards.</p> <p>Members stated that there were already some sizeable extensions along West Walk and the proposed development would therefore be in keeping with the rest of the road and would not spoil the character of the area.</p> <p>Officers drew Members' attention to the comments of the Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer and it was highlighted that this was an area of special local character. It was suggested that the item be deferred to enable a site visit to be arranged.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed to defer the item pending a site visit.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the item was deferred subject to a site visit.</p>
185.	<p>UNIT 102, INTU UXBRIDGE, THE CHIMES SHOPPING CENTRE, HIGH STREET, UXBRIDGE - 55969/APP/2017/3277 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from retail (Use Class A1) to use as a laser hair removal facility (sui generis)</p> <p>Officers presented the application which sought to change the use class of Unit 102 from retail to sui generis.</p> <p>The Committee moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application was approved.</p>
186.	<p>254 YEADING LANE, HAYES - 73287/APP/2017/3974 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from a mixed use comprising shop/vehicle repair workshop (Use Class A1/B2) to a mixed use comprising alternative therapy centre (Use Class</p>

D1/D2) and beauty salon (Sui Generis) involving installation of new shop front and alterations to elevations

Officers presented the application which sought planning permission for the change of use from Use Class A1/B2 (shop/vehicle repair workshop) to a mixed use comprising alternative therapy centre and beauty salon.

Members requested clarification regarding accessibility and it was confirmed that this issue was covered by other legislation as detailed on page 83 of the report under informative no.4.

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

RESOLVED: That the application was approved.

187. **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 the 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).

188. **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 the 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).

189.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <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>
190.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 the report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned. <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 8.02 pm.</p>

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.