

## Minutes



**CENTRAL** & South Planning Committee

**7 January 2021**

**Meeting held at VIRTUAL - Live on the Council's YouTube channel: Hillingdon London**

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Steve Tuckwell (Chairman), Alan Chapman (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Mohinder Birah, Nicola Brightman, Roy Chamdal, Farhad Choubedar and Janet Duncan (Opposition Lead)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger (Head of Planning, Transportation and Regeneration), Neil Fraser (Democratic Services Officer), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), Glen Egan (Office Managing Partner - Legal Services), Alan Tilly (Transport Planning and Development Manager) and Steven Clarke (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
143.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jazz Dhillon.</p>
144.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
145.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 03 December 2020 be approved as a correct record.</p>
146.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that agenda item 7 had been withdrawn by the Head of Planning prior to the meeting.</p>
147.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items 1-12 were in Part I and would be considered in public and items 13-16 were in Part II and would be considered in private.</p>
148.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO 10 KENT CLOSE &amp; 5 FAIRLIGHT DRIVE, KENT CLOSE -</b></p>

**75553/APP/2020/1357 (Agenda Item 6)**

Officers introduced the application advising the Committee that an appeal for non-determination had been received and as such, Members would be deciding whether they would agree with the officer's recommendations had a non-determination appeal not been received.

Members were informed that the application was in outline form and that they were considering matters related to access and layout. Matters relating to appearance, landscaping and scale would be reserved for future determination, should the application be approved by the Committee.

The Committee were informed that Kent Close and Fairlight Drive were dense developments and the availability of undeveloped space provided relief within the vicinity; officers deemed development of the site in question to be against the character of the area. Regarding parking allocation, the intended parking provision was deemed insufficient as the intended space was already allocated to another property and due to a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of two, any resident of the dwelling would be likely to rely on a vehicle for transport. Although details were not available in relation to the dwelling's height and scale, officers felt that given its siting, there may be an impact on adjoining occupiers in terms of visual intrusion, overlooking and loss of privacy.

A petition in objection to the application had been received and written representations from the lead petitioner were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- Petitioners supported the recommendations made by officers in the associated report;
- That the proposed application was considered to be 'backland' development and petitioners saw it as harmful to the character of the area;
- The undeveloped nature of the site made a positive contribution to the open character of the sites surroundings;
- The development of the dwelling close to the side boundary would fill the gap between numbers 10 and 11 Kent Close, this was deemed to provide an important visual break and would disturb the spaciousness of the area;
- There were concerns relating to a loss of privacy for existing and future residents of the adjoining properties.

The agent had also submitted written representations which were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- Although the application had been appealed against non-determination, the agent wanted to address the reasons for refusal as set out in the associated Committee report;
- Regarding the point of overdevelopment, matters relating to scale, appearance and landscaping of the development had been reserved and the Council would have had the opportunity to refuse any subsequent reserved matters application where these aspects of the proposal were deemed unacceptable. Therefore, it was not considered reasonable that the current application be refused for reasons of overdevelopment.
- The proposal was shown to be underdeveloped when considered against the density matrix as prescribed in the London Plan.
- As the scale was reserved and the building was likely to be single storey, the

agent disagreed that the proposal would impact on the openness or spaciousness of the estate.

- As the appearance of the building was reserved, it was not evident how the proposal would cause any overlooking.
- The agent stated that the proposed parking space for the dwelling was in fact owned by the applicant.
- Although it was recognised that the site was in PTAL of two, the dwelling was located less than 600m from Uxbridge Metropolitan Town Centre where there was access to Uxbridge Underground Station.

Members noted that they were only to consider matters relating to access and layout; the Committee deemed the application not to be viable due to the insufficient parking allocation and the likelihood of overlooking when details of height and scale were established.

No further concerns were raised and Members were in agreement with the officer's recommendation.

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

**RESOLVED: That had a non-determination appeal not been received, the application would have been refused.**

149. **1 RAYNTON CLOSE, HAYES - 8096/APP/2020/3154** (*Agenda Item 7*)

This application was withdrawn by the Head of Planning prior to commencement of the meeting.

150. **336 BALMORAL DRIVE, HAYES - 71770/APP/2020/3572** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the item and informed the Committee that the proposal did not result in more than 10% of properties being redeveloped/converted into flats within 500m either side of the site, as was Council policy. It was noted that the site was located within a Public Transport Accessibility Level of three and would therefore require the provision of between one and one and a half parking spaces per dwelling. Members attention was drawn to the additional two conditions recommended in the addendum to the report and were encouraged to explore the possibility amending condition three in relation to widening the existing dropped curb as both parking spaces would need to be independently accessible.

Written representations had been received from the lead petitioner and were read out to the Committee. Key points raised included:

- The property was intended to be a family home since it's construction in the 1930s and the changes proposed would not preserve housing stock of a particular size and style;
- Petitioners claimed the applicant did not have a satisfactory relationship with adjoining neighbours.
- There were concerns of excessive noise coming from the property at present and petitioners felt like this was likely to increase.
- The dropped curb outside the property did not facilitate the parking of two cars comfortably.
- Parking on the street was already at a premium, if either of the flats had more

- than one car, it would further increase parking pressures on the road.
- Conversion of the property into two flats would create additional pressures on drainage and sewage infrastructure.
- There were concerns that if the application were approved, it would set a precedent for similar family homes to be converted into flats in the area.

Members were informed that any condition regarding the design of a dropped curb should mention that it would need to conform with the Council's guidelines and it was requested that the exact wording of the condition be delegated to the Head of Planning.

The Committee raised concerns about the delegation of parking spaces to the front of the property as the headlights of any car returning to the property could glare into the front facing bedroom of the ground floor flat. Members were minded to add a condition, with the exact wording delegated to the Head of Planning, allocating the space directly in front of the ground floor window to the residents of the ground floor flat to avoid the intrusion of vehicle headlights.

The officer's recommendation in addition to the agreed upon conditions, was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED: That:**

- 1) The application be approved subject to the additional conditions in the addendum to the report; and**
- 2) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to establish the wording of an additional condition in respect of widening the property's dropped curb and the allocation of parking spaces.**

151. **LAND ADJACENT TO 27 FURZEHAM ROAD - 75891/APP/2020/2961** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Officers introduced the application and outlined to Members the reasons for recommending refusal; that the proposed dwelling would result in an incongruous form of development, that the development would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers and that the dwelling would fail to meet the requirements of people with disabilities.

A petition in objection to the application had been received. The lead petitioner's written representations were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- There was no parking space to the front of the proposed development site and no option to create additional spaces there. The residents did not want the lamppost to be removed;
- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the character of the rest of the street;
- Residents in Ruffles Close would have less sunlight in their gardens and their properties would be overlooked;
- The development would exacerbate sewage and water pressure problems;
- There was the potential for the development to be converted to an HMO at a later stage which would put further pressure on parking. HMOs already existed in the street and, in the past, tenants had been disrespectful and noisy.

Written representations had also been received from Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward

Councillor for West Drayton. These were read out for the consideration of Committee Members. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposal would be a significant overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene;
- The development would have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties in Furzeham Road and Ruffle Close;
- The development would create a property of excessive size and bulk out of character with the neighbouring attractive houses.

Members noted that there were very clear reasons for refusal. The Committee discussed the possibility of an additional reason for refusal due to the lack of off street parking; however, officers informed Members that any residents of the proposed dwelling would be allowed to join the parking management scheme and that insufficient parking allocation should not be used as a reason for refusal.

Members concurred with the officer's recommendation which was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

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

152. **CEDAR HOUSE VINE LANE - 12019/APP/2020/3615** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Prior to the start of this item it was agreed that items 10 and 11 would be heard together as one presentation from officers, with one debate by the Committee. Members would then hold separate votes for each application.

Officers presented the application and noted that strong objections had been received from both conservation and landscaping officers; it was also noted that the site was within a conservation area and a parking management area. Officers outlined the reasons for recommending refusal and informed the Committee that, although the report showed the adjacent building as Grade II Listed, it was in fact Grade II\* Listed, a more significant category of listing.

A petition in objection to the application had been received, however no written representation had been received by the lead petitioner to be read out to Committee Members. Written representations from the applicant were read out for the consideration of the Committee. Key points raised included:

- It was emphasised that the permission sought was temporary and the site would be returned to its previous condition after 31 December 2021;
- Access to the site would be from the existing car park in Vine Lane and would therefore not impact on residents of Cedar Drive and Buckingham Grove.
- That the damaged wall of the access gate would be repaired under a separate listed consent application;
- A Tree Protection Order survey and an Arboricultural Implication Assessment could be submitted by 31 January 2021 which would address any impact on the site's tree roots;
- The temporary surface would not result in any excavation works and would not have a significant impact upon the condition of the ground beneath.
- The wall bordering the car park was separated from the parking area by plant beds. The applicant offered to provide additional barriers to keep cars away from the wall.

- The business had been badly hit by the coronavirus pandemic and many cars were not on the road, hence the need for the overflow car park.

Members considered the site not to be appropriate for the proposal's intended use and highlighted that it would be more appropriate as ancillary parking for people visiting the adjacent office. The Committee expressed agreement with the officer's recommendation.

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

**RESOLVED: That:**

- 1) The application be refused; and
- 2) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend the wording of the reasons for refusal to account for the adjacent building being Grade II\* Listed.

153. **CEDAR HOUSE VINE LANE - 12019/APP/2020/3616** (*Agenda Item 11*)

Prior to item 10, it was agreed that items 10 and 11 would be heard together as one presentation from officers, with one debate by the Committee. Members would then hold separate votes for items 10 and 11.

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

**RESOLVED: That:**

- 1) The application be refused; and
- 2) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Planning to amend the wording of the reasons for refusal to account for the adjacent building being Grade II\* Listed.

154. **S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT** (*Agenda Item 12*)

The report was introduced to the Committee and Members were asked to note the contents.

**RESOLVED: That the monitoring report was noted.**

155. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 13*)

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,
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 it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of

Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

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

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,
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 it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

157. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 15*)

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,
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 it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

158. **ENFORCEMENT REPORT** (*Agenda Item 16*)

**RESOLVED:**

1. That the enforcement action, as recommended in the officer's report, was agreed; and,
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 it issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

This item is declared as exempt from publication as it involves the disclosure of information in accordance with Section 100(A) and **paragraphs 1, 2 & 7** of Part 1 of Schedule 12 (A) to the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), in that the report contains **information relating to any individual, information likely to reveal the identity of an individual and information relating to any action taken or to be taken in connection with the prevention, investigation or prosecution of crime** and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it.

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.36 pm.

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on Telephone 01895 250636 - email (recommended) [democratic@hillington.gov.uk](mailto:democratic@hillington.gov.uk). 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.**