

Minutes



CENTRAL & South Planning Committee

6 June 2018

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon and Janet Duncan</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts & Planning Information), James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Anisha Teji (Democratic Services Officer) and Alan Tilly (Transport and Aviation Manager)</p>
21.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>
22.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Edwards and Councillor Duncan declared non pecuniary interests in item 6 – 9 Maygoods Green, as they sat as governors on the same primary school governors board as the petitioner. Councillor Edwards and Councillor Duncan both confirmed that there was no conflict of interest.</p>
23.	<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 22 May 2018 was approved as an accurate record.</p>
24.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
25.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items would be heard in Part I.</p>
26.	<p>9 MAYGOODS GREEN, COWLEY - 73573/APP/2018/621 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. The application sought</p>

planning permission for the installation of vehicular crossover and creation of hardstanding (part retrospective). Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

A petitioner, with 24 signatures from residents living in The Green spoke in objection the application. The petitioner explained that around The Green parking was already extremely limited, particularly in the evenings, during the weekends and also as a result of nearby streets having parking management schemes. The area was also used by students and holiday makers who parked their cars for long periods, causing additional parking stress. If permission was given to this drop curb, it would displace 10 -12 other vehicles that belonged to residents for just one vehicle to be parked on a driveway. Parking in the area was not ideal, however, neighbours worked together to self-govern the parking provision to ensure everyone could park their cars. Prior to the commencement of this planning process, there had been no issues or targeted parking tickets. Parking in the turning head was much less disruptive than parking around The Green. The turning head had been used on The Green for years and the petitioner submitted that it was wide enough to drive around it and allow access for vehicles. Two petitions were submitted at the same time, the other petition sought to review the parking issues on The Green for a longer term solution for residents. The petitioner hoped that the planning committee would refuse the application as per the officer's recommendations.

In response to a Member's question about whether the Council had responded in relation to the parking issues raised, the petitioner confirmed that it had not. The Chairman clarified that this was a matter that would need to be considered outside of Committee and encouraged Ward Councillors to take this forward.

The applicant addressed the Committee and provided a chronology of events. The applicant applied to the highways dropped kerbs team for approval of a vehicle crossing on 7 November 2017, by completing the online application, which did not notify her that she needed to apply for planning permission. The approval for the domestic vehicle crossing was confirmed in writing on 3 December 2017. Following this, the applicant received a quotation for work and instructed a company to commence work; on the basis the application had been granted. The work had been completed in majority and only 5% of the work still remained outstanding. The applicant informed the Committee that on 14 February 2018, she received an email from a project engineer stating that the application had been approved prematurely and planning permission was required. No prior notification or stipulation had been indicated previously. A further email was received on 16 February 2018 which confirmed that the application had been approved ahead of planning permission and such an error was due to an internal process failure. The email advised that all work should cease. The applicant submitted a further application for planning permission on 7 March 2018 and explained that she had not been reimbursed for any costs that she paid and sought to readiness the situation without causing any further delay, stress and anxiety. The applicant asked for the application to be approved, allow the work to continue with the original permission granted or be reimbursed for her costs.

The Chairman read in to the record a statement from the local Ward Councillor, Councillor Mills, which stated:

"Unfortunately I am unable to attend in person this evening; however I would like to add my support to the petitioners in objecting to this application. As has been set out in the report, Maygoods Green is subject to high levels of on street parking stress, and given the lack of public transport nearby there is a large reliance from residents on vehicle usage. The location of this property is in a corner of Maygoods Green, which contains the access to 4 maisonettes and a further 3 family homes. Hopefully images shown to

you by officers will show the current parking situation in this corner, which has been self-governed responsibly by neighbours over the years. Adding a dropped kerb here would remove the parking possibility for all of these cars and there is nowhere else on the Green for them to be displaced to. I trust members see the detrimental impact this proposal would have, and trust they will follow the officer's recommendation and refuse the application."

The Chairman reminded the Committee that many matters raised were outside of the Committee's remit but advised Members to solely consider the planning application and any material planning considerations raised in accordance with the policies and guidance given.

The Legal Advisor advised the Committee that illegal parking was not a relevant planning consideration. The planning considerations were mentioned in the report and reiterated that the application needed to be determined on its merits in accordance with policies and guidance. The Legal Advisor clarified that the Committee ought not to take into account unlawful parking spaces.

The Head of Planning confirmed that there would be the loss of one legal parking space. The Transport and Aviation Manager informed the Committee that there were concerns regarding road safety, the self-governing arrangements and the dimensions of the turning heads. The Transport and Aviation Manager explained to the Committee why the cars in the images provided in the presentation showed unsafe parking and clarified that there would be a loss of one parking space.

Members asked for clarification on how many spaces would be lost. Officers confirmed that the turning head currently provided legal parking for two vehicles. With the drop curb that would reduce to one vehicle, the other vehicle would be able to park off street.

Members sympathised with residents, particularly given the additional parking stress from students, commuters and holidaymakers. Members accepted that this reduced the amount of available parking for residents and commended residents for working together to manage parking in the area. However, there were concerns regarding the accessibility of emergency vehicles being able to access properties, the accessibility for people with disabilities and the unsafe parking arrangements in the area. The main concern was safety and the area urgently needed sorting out by way of a parking management scheme.

Members questioned whether it would be detrimental to highways safety if the Committee was to approve the application. Officers confirmed that road safety would be reduced.

Members asked for clarification on whether this would create an undesirable precedent. Officers confirmed that this application had been discussed at length and the recommendation for approval took into account a number of factors such as unsafe parking and potential changes to the current arrangements. It would be preferable for residents to apply to the Council for a parking management scheme.

Members proposed to overturn the officer's recommendation on the grounds of road safety and add an informative for the Council to help residents with the parking situation. Members also delegated to the Head of Planning to check that no additional conditions needed to be added.

When put to a vote, the officer's recommendation was overturned and Members agreed

the above approval reasons. There were seven votes in favour and one abstention.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved.**
- 2) That the Head of Planning clarify whether any additional conditions need to be added, subject to the agreement of the Chairman and Labour Lead.**

27. 105 SWEETCROFT LANE, HILLINGDON - 2703/APP/2017/2579 (Agenda Item 7)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for the conversion of single dwelling to a seven-bed house in multiple occupation.

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

The Chairman read into the record a written submission from the petitioner, which stated:

“My questions are:

1. If the only change to present use of 105 Sweetcroft Lane is to add another bedroom, why does there need to be a change of status to HMO?
2. At present 105 Sweetcroft Lane is a home for people with learning disabilities and, as the paperwork states, a valuable asset to the community. My concern is, that once the status is changed to HMO, this could change and the dwelling used for other reasons. What guarantees can be put in place to ensure that this does not occur?
3. What guarantees do we have, that the number of occupants will not exceed 7? The report states that the number of occupants could be 14, but a limit of 10 is in place at present. Even an increase of four occupants is a substantial increase and fourteen occupants is over a 100% increase.”

The applicant addressed the Committee and explained that the property was being used as home for people with learning disabilities. There were currently six residents living in the property and they had been living there for 18 months. In order to increase from six to seven residents, there needed to be an application for the change of use. This is why the application for a HMO had been put forward. There was a high demand from the Social Services Department from the London Borough of Hillingdon.

In response to Member questions, the applicant clarified that there were no members of staff resident on site and in terms of staff movement there was usually one core staff member on shift but usually approximately three to four movements a day.

The Chairman confirmed that the application was for an additional bedroom but the matter had been slightly complicated by the wording of condition three where it allowed the occupation of the building to go up to 10. There was also a concern that the number of support staff attending would increase if the occupation was to increase. Officers indicated there would be not be an issue in relation to this, save for the reason in the addendum to be amended to reflect this.

Members were mindful that this application was an easy way to change the use to a student HMO. However, after being made aware of the current use and operation, Members were minded to approve the application subject to limiting the occupancy to a maximum of seven. This was due to the possible impact on residential amenity. Members considered strengthening the condition to a HMO for supported living, but

	<p>were advised that it would be difficult to formulate a form of wording that would be supported by a planning inspector.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to confirm the final wording of condition three restricting the occupancy, was moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to delegated authority to the Head of Planning and Enforcement to confirm the wording of condition three restricting the occupancy.</p>
28.	<p>GARAGE SITE ADJACENT TO 45 CORWELL GARDENS, HILLINGDON - 72968/APP/2018/199 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for a two storey building with habitable roof space, parking and amenity space for use 4x two bed flats and 2 x studio flats. Officers made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
29.	<p>THE PRINCE ALBERT PH PIELD HEATH ROAD, HILLINGDON - 704/APP/2016/3689 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the variation of condition 2 of planning permission Ref: 704/APP/2015/1071 Dated 5 October 2015) to allow internal and external alteration to the layout and design of the building. Officers made a recommendation for approval.</p> <p>Members supported the officer's report and commented that it was good to fill the open space. Members queried what on balance in the report meant. Officers confirmed that the term on balance related to the conservation officer's comments. Members discussed the privacy of the residents on the ground floor and the lift, officers confirmed that there was an obscure glazing condition and amendments could be made to ensure windows were part of the obscure glazing.</p> <p>Members moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved, subject to the amendments in relation to obscure glazed windows and the lift.</p>
30.	<p>28 OAKENE ROAD, HILLINGDON - 4247/APP/2018/1451 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for a part two storey, part single storey side/ rear extension and conversion of a 3-bed dwelling to 1x 3- bed and 1x 1- bed dwellings with associated parking and amenity space. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.</p> <p>Members considered strengthening condition one to ensure that there was not a design</p>

change and strengthening the refusal reason. Members moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be refused.
- 2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Planning to strengthen the wording of condition one.

31. **LAND FORMING PART OF 84 CHURCH ROAD, HAYES - 72944/APP/2018/1225**
(Agenda Item 11)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview. Planning permission was sought for a two bed, detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space. Officers made a recommendation for refusal.

Members considered the planning harm and whether the desire to create another housing unit outweighed the fact that it did not strictly comply with policy. Members proposed to overturn the officer's recommendation on the grounds that the property was not particularly out of character in the neighbouring areas. On balance, there was no excessive or material harm.

When put to a vote, the officer's recommendation was overturned. This was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED:

- 1) That the application be approved.
- 2) That the Head of Planning clarify whether any conditions need to be added, subject to the agreement of the Chairman and Labour Lead.

32. **LESSER BARN HUBBARDS CLOSE, HILLINGDON - 5971/APP/2017/4190** (Agenda Item 12)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the installation of two additional first floor windows to east elevation, minor realignment of ground floor opening and increase in roof, height.

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

33. **LESSER BARN HUBBARDS CLOSE, HILLINGDON - 5971/APP/2017/3478** (Agenda Item 13)

Officers introduced the application and provided an overview of the application. Planning permission was sought for the variation of condition 2 Variation of Condition 2 (approved plans) of planning permission ref: 5971/APP/2016/3922, dated 31/05/2017 (Rebuilding of existing barn with internal and external alterations to create two three-

bedroom dwellings with associated parking and landscaping) for two additional first floor windows to east (front) elevation, minor realignment of ground floor openings and increase in roof height

Officers highlighted the addendum and made a recommendation for approval.

Members supported the officer's report, and moved and seconded the officer's recommendation. Upon being put to a vote, the recommendation was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.17 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Anisha Teji 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.