

Minutes

BOROUGH PLANNING COMMITTEE

1 November 2022

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre



	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Henry Higgins (Chairman) Steve Tuckwell (Vice-Chairman) Farhad Choubedar Ekta Gohil Gursharan Mand Jagjit Singh</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: Katie Crosbie, Planning Team Leader Salleh Jobbi, Legal Advisor Roz Johnson, Planning Services Manager Liz Penny, Democratic Services Officer Fiona Rae, Planning Team Leader Haydon Richardson, Principal Planning Officer Alan Tilly, Transport Planning and Development Team Manager</p>
52.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Raju Sansarpuri.</p>
53.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>There were no declarations of interest.</p>
54.	<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 dated 4 October 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.</p>
55.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
56.	<p>TO CONFIRM THAT THE ITEMS OF BUSINESS MARKED PART I WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PUBLIC AND THE ITEMS MARKED PART II WILL BE CONSIDERED IN PRIVATE (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that all items of business were in Part I and would be considered in public.</p>
57.	<p>PAVEMENT OUTSIDE 8 CLIVE PARADE, GREEN LANE - 76740/APP/2022/1701 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>

Installation of a multi-functional Communication Hub including advertisement display (Application for Planning Permission)

Officers introduced the application and outlined the information in the addendum. It was noted that items 6 and 10 related to the same site and would be considered together. Members heard that the proposed Hub would be located within the Green Lane Northwood Town Centre and the Northwood Town Centre, Green Lane Conservation Area. The site was also within the setting of the Grade II listed Northwood War Memorial. The location was used for community events including the annual Remembrance Day wreath laying. The application was recommended for refusal as the proposal was considered harmful to the street scene and the Conservation Area and it was felt it would compromise use of the public realm.

A petitioner, representing Northwood Residents' Association, addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Key points highlighted included:

- The proposed Hub would have a damaging impact in a high-profile position within Northwood Conservation Area and was considered disrespectful given its proximity to the War Memorial;
- The Hub would impede flow on a narrow pavement;
- The advertisement display was designed to be eye-catching which would be dangerous on such a busy corner.

Members supported the concept of Communication Hubs and acknowledged that they were beneficial. However, it was felt that this was the wrong location for such a proposal. The Committee enquired whether the highways impact could be included as an additional reason for refusal. It was confirmed that this was not possible since the proposal complied with all guidance. If the application had been recommended for approval, conditions would have been added in relation to the use of the sign to ensure it was not distracting to drivers.

Given the benefits of Community Hubs, Members enquired whether alternative sites were being earmarked for these. The Committee was informed that a number of other Hubs had been agreed under officers' delegated powers.

Members agreed that the benefits of the proposed Hub did not outweigh the disadvantages in this instance. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

58. **139 BELMONT ROAD, UXBRIDGE - 17175/APP/2022/1989** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Redevelopment of existing two storey dwelling and the erection of 3 no. dwellings with associated private amenity space, car parking, bike and refuse storage.

Officers introduced the application. It was noted that the area was characterised by detached two-storey properties. No flats or terraced properties were currently located in the vicinity of the application site. Officers felt the proposal would fail to integrate with the established character and appearance of the area due to its size and scale and would be unduly prominent. It was recommended that the application be refused.

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

- The proposed development would be excessively large dwarfing existing houses;
- There were no other terraced houses in the road at present;
- Such a development could set a precedent for the future;
- The proposal would increase pressure on local GP surgeries, schools and other amenities;
- An application proposing 7 flats at the site had been rejected 14 years previously;
- One parking space per house would be insufficient as parking was already at a premium in the area. The development would increase pressure on parking, particularly given the proximity of a roundabout and bus stop;
- Concerns had been raised by neighbours in relation to noise, lack of privacy and loss of light.

The agent for the application was in attendance and addressed the Committee informing Members that the site was extremely large (1000 square metres - 22 metres wide and 44 metres deep). It was centrally located with excellent transport links. The existing building varied from the norm as it was the only bungalow on the street - the proposal was to replace it with an alternative unusual structure and any other future development on the site was likely to take a similar form. Three large, good quality, comfortable, sustainable family homes were proposed (333 square metres each). It was confirmed that the design closely resembled other buildings along the street in terms of its roof pitch, materials, window proportions, eaves etc. The original form of the current building would be retained with the addition of one extra floor. It was claimed that concerns regarding overlooking were unfounded.

In response to questions from the Committee, the agent confirmed that there were existing flats on Belmont Road and other individual properties which varied from the norm. The scheme respected the existing in terms of its proposed form and appearance. It would be a sustainable development on a town centre site.

Committee Members observed that the proposal would fail to integrate with the area and would be harmful to the visual amenity of the area. Concerns were raised in relation to parking although it was recognised that the number of spaces proposed was compliant with the requirements of the London Plan.

Councillors acknowledged the need for additional family homes in the Borough but supported the officer's recommendation and agreed that the development was excessive for the site.

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

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

59. **12 CHERRY ORCHARD, WEST DRAYTON - 28519/APP/2022/1668** (*Agenda Item 8*)

This application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the meeting.

Erection of a two-storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension. Roof light located on rear roof slope with the demolition of outbuildings.

Officers introduced the application noting that the site plan / ground floor plan included in the agenda pack was a previous version which had referenced the wrong house number for an outbuilding – an updated plan had been included in the officer’s presentation; this had had no impact on the officer’s recommendation. The proposal was for a large extension and was recommended for approval. A previous application for planning permission to build a 3-bedroom detached house at the site had been refused in May 2022.

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

- Plans for a 3-bed house at the site had previously been rejected;
- Concerns were raised regarding potential use as an HMO given that the development would incorporate 5 bedrooms and 4 bathrooms;
- A large extension at the other end of the terrace group (no.15) had been built 39 years ago hence should not be considered relevant to this application. Moreover, the extension at no.15 had been intended for family use and had only one bathroom and one toilet;
- Residents were concerned the extension could be converted into a 7-bedroom HMO at a future stage;
- Parking stress would be exacerbated if the planned development were to go ahead;
- House numbers 10 and 12 shared a water supply. Water pressure was already at the legal limit hence the impact of the development was a matter of concern;
- The view from residents’ gardens would be compromised if the application were agreed;
- The new property would look like a ‘bolt on’ and would not be in keeping with the current building line.

A written statement on behalf of the applicant was read out to the Committee. Members heard that the planning application had been made in good faith to increase the size of a family home. The existing house was situated on a large plot of land providing a substantial total of 366 square metres of garden and parking amenities. The development would only utilise a small part of this otherwise unused space (50 square metres). The extension had been carefully planned in line with planning policy and was respectful of the neighbour’s amenities. The works would bring the house in line with current building regulations and make it more sustainable.

Ward Councillor Roy Chamdal addressed the Committee in objection to the application. He noted that the application conflicted with current policy as it exceeded half the size of the original property. Councillor Chamdal felt it was not a good development and was not required. He commented that the reference to a previous application on the site was not relevant to this case. Moreover, planning permission for the large extension at the other end of the terrace had been granted many years previously and did not make the current application acceptable.

Members expressed concern that the proposal did not align with current policy and requested further clarification regarding the size of the development and the potential for HMO use. It was confirmed that the proposed width was 4.3m – to comply with

	<p>policy this would need to be reduced by 1.3m. With regard to the potential use as an HMO, the Committee was advised that the area was subject to an Article 4 restriction hence planning permission would be required for any change of use. At this stage it was important that Members focussed only on the application before them.</p> <p>Members were informed that the existence of a large extension at the other end of the terrace was a material consideration, which would also carry considerable weight if a decision were to be appealed. An inspector would be required to consider whether the addition of something symmetrical would be harmful. It was noted that officers had proposed a number of conditions to protect the amenity of neighbours; if the matter were to go to appeal, it was possible that the inspector would not allow these.</p> <p>In response to further questions from the Committee, it was confirmed that the previous application at the site had proposed a materially different scheme for a new house, which had been refused. Parking provision was now considered acceptable because this scheme was for an extension, not a new dwelling. Concerns regarding water pressure could not be taken into account as this was not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>A site visit was proposed and unanimously agreed. It was confirmed that, following the visit, the application would come back to the Borough Planning Committee for further consideration. Should petitioners wish to speak again, a new petition would be required.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be deferred pending a site visit.</p>
61.	<p>PAVEMENT OUTSIDE 8 CLIVE PARADE, GREEN LANE - 76740/ADV/2022/48 <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p>Installation of 1 no. internally illuminated free standing multi-functional Communication Hub, including advertisement display (Application for Advertisement Consent).</p> <p>This application was considered in conjunction with agenda item 6.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be refused.</p>
62.	<p>HAYDON HOUSE, EASTCOTE - 51321/APP/2022/1861 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Change of use from Class E (Office) to Class C3 (6 no. self-contained flats – (2 x Studio, 2 x 1 Bed 2 People, 2 x 2 Bed 3 People) (Application for Prior Approval under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class MA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended))).</p> <p>Officers introduced the application It was noted that the application was for Prior Approval. It had been concluded that the proposal would not have any unacceptable transport or noise impacts, contamination risks or flooding risks in relation to the application building. Adequate natural light would be provided in all habitable rooms. The application was recommended for approval.</p> <p>Members welcomed the fact that environmental factors had been taken into account</p>

	<p>and that the proposal would bring a disused building back into use. In response to their requests for clarification, the Committee was informed that a condition had been included in relation to parking allocation. No further concerns were raised.</p> <p>The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and, when put to a vote, unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.35 pm.</p>

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