

Minutes

MINOR APPLICATIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE

30 September 2021

Meeting held at Council Chamber - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Mohinder Birah Nicola Brightman Allan Kauffman Carol Melvin (In place of John Morgan) John Morse (Opposition Lead)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Neil Fraser, Democratic Services Officer Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Manager Kerrie Munro, Legal Advisor Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Roz Johnson, Planning Services Manager</p>
48.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Councillor Morgan, with Councillor Melvin present as his substitute.</p>
49.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
50.	<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 01 September 2021 be approved as a correct record.</p>
51.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
52.	<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 were Part 1 and would be considered in public.</p>

53. **6 ST LUKES CLOSE, COWLEY - 73927/APP/2021/2500** (*Agenda Item 6*)

Officers introduced the application, which was recommended for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

A petitioner objecting to the application addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- The property appeared to be currently vacant, so changing to an HMO and filling it with multiple new people would be a big change.
- There were concerns over the maintenance of the property, with gardens/fences overgrown and in a state of disrepair. It appeared that steps to rectify this were only taken after submission of the application.
- Parking provision would be insufficient for what was a site with minimal parking space already.
- The flats are too small and would result in poor standard of living for occupants.
- Water pressure in the location is poor already, and the proposed development could exacerbate this problem.
- The number of residents who signed the petition highlighted the depth of feeling towards this proposal; none who were spoken to were in favour.
- It was requested that the application be refused.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee. Key points highlighted included:

- Four people were currently living in the property. 1 more occupant/room would have a minimal effect on the area.
- Maintenance at the property had been undertaken prior to submission of the application.
- Existing permission allowed the applicant to convert the property to a licensed HMO, but this proposal reduced the number of occupants for hygiene/safety concerns due to the pandemic.
- 3rd party companies could provide on-street parking surveys but the Council had not requested this.
- It was acknowledged that the flats were under Hillingdon's size requirements, but a review of similar properties in the Borough showed most did not abide by this requirement.
- It was requested that the application be approved.

In response to questions from the Committee, the agent/applicant advised that the application had been submitted prior to being aware of the requirements for room size and numbers within a property. Exits from the property in the event of a fire were sufficient for all rooms via direct external doors and staircases.

Ward Councillor Richard Mills addressed the Committee by way of written statement. Key points highlighted included:

- The ambition to convert a semidetached house into 6 single unit flats was too overbearing for what was a small cul de sac, and was not in keeping with the existing street scene and character of the road.
- The parking provision was inadequate for 6 individual units that would likely result in multiple cars, thus causing further challenges in a road that was unsuitable for a significant development of this size.
- The proposals would create unfit living accommodation for future occupiers given the small size of each unit along with lack of sunlight, ventilation and

amenity space.

- For these reasons the application should be refused.

The Planning Service Manager set out the rules for HMOs, and confirmed that ordinarily, conversion of a dwelling to an HMO for up to six persons would not require planning permission. However, there was an Article 4 restriction on this particular site, which meant that for an HMO for between three to six people, planning permission was required. Therefore, a six person HMO was not a fallback position that the Committee needed to consider.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation for refusal, for the reasons set out in the report. The recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

54. **78 HIGH STREET - 32265/APP/2021/1437** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Officers introduced the application which was recommended for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

A petitioner objecting to the application addressed the Committee by way of written statement. Key points highlighted included:

- The outlook for the future occupiers was poor and the internal layout was poor;
- The amenity space was on the roof and without a lift, which meant anyone in a wheelchair or with a disability would be unable to get there. The space also allowed overlooking of the adjacent properties.
- Any children would only have the roof space as outdoor play space.
- The site was cramped and the proposed development would result in cramped housing that would not meet the requirements of the Hillingdon Local Plan part 2, which stated that housing developments should have adequate provision of internal space to provide an appropriate living environment.
- The proposed development would not be in line with the uniform character of the High Street which currently contributed to the charm and appeal of the High Street. As per the site map, the property was surrounded by other residential units and as such this development would affect the privacy of homes neighbouring this property.
- For these reasons, the application should be refused.

The Committee supported the officer's recommendation for refusal, for the reasons set out in the report. The recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

55. **2 GATEHILL ROAD - 10808/APP/2021/2360** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Officers introduced the application. It was confirmed that the concerns raised by the petition in objection, as well as separate representations from residents, primarily related to light pollution. However, the applicant had since withdrawn the proposed lighting from the scheme, which resolved these concerns. In addition, the applicant had since proposed changes to landscaping including resin bound gravel for the car park and light grey coloured porcelain paving top paving slabs for the patio area. The

	<p>Council's heritage officer had reviewed these amendments and had concluded that there were no objections.</p> <p>In relation to representations received which questioned the ownership certificate submitted as part of the original planning application, the Planning Service Manager advised that Officers had sought legal advice on the matter and had contacted the site owner to confirm they had been aware of the planning application. As a result, Officers were satisfied that the planning permission stands and that the Council could proceed to determine the details application being considered.</p> <p>Following the amendments to the scheme as outlined above, there were no concerns over the proposal and the application was therefore recommended for approval.</p> <p>The Committee supported the officer's recommendation for approval, for the reasons set out in the report. The recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
56.	<p>SAINSBURYS SUPERMARKET, YORK ROAD - 39439/APP/2021/2230 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the application which was recommended for approval for the reasons as set out in the report.</p> <p>In response to questions from the Committee, officers confirmed that condition 6 set out the requirement that a landscaping plan must be submitted prior to implementation of the scheme, and so the Council would have the opportunity to review this and make comment at that time.</p> <p>The Committee supported the officer's recommendation for approval, for the reasons set out in the report. The recommendation was moved, seconded, and when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved + Sec 106.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 6.00 pm, closed at 6.38 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Democratic Services on 01895 250636. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.