

Minutes

CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

19 July 2011

Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors John Hensley (Chair) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) Janet Duncan Wayne Bridges Paul Buttivant Dominic Gilham Robin Sansarpuri Brian Stead</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger - Head of Planning, Trading Standards & Environmental Protection Matt Duigan – Team Manager – Central & South Team Sarah Hickey – Legal Advisor, Syed Shah – Highways Engineer and Nadia Williams – Democratic Services</p>																	
46.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>There were no apologies for absence.</p>																	
47.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a personal interest in the items listed below by virtue of the applications being in her Ward:</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Item No.</th><th>Address</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>8</td><td>Car Park R/O 1 –16 Sydney Court, Perth Avenue, Hayes</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>47 Swanage Way, Hayes</td></tr><tr><td>15</td><td>67 Berrydale Road, Hayes</td></tr><tr><td>16</td><td>18 Stipularis Drive, Hayes</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>She remained in the room during consideration of the items and took part in the decision of them.</p> <p>Councillor Neil Fyfe declared a personal interest in the Items listed below by virtue of the applications being in his Ward:</p> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Item No.</th><th>Address</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>10</td><td>298 Kingshill Avenue, Hayes</td></tr><tr><td>20</td><td>Enforcement report</td></tr></tbody></table> <p>He remained in the room during consideration of the items and took</p>	Item No.	Address	8	Car Park R/O 1 –16 Sydney Court, Perth Avenue, Hayes	9	47 Swanage Way, Hayes	15	67 Berrydale Road, Hayes	16	18 Stipularis Drive, Hayes	Item No.	Address	10	298 Kingshill Avenue, Hayes	20	Enforcement report	
Item No.	Address																	
8	Car Park R/O 1 –16 Sydney Court, Perth Avenue, Hayes																	
9	47 Swanage Way, Hayes																	
15	67 Berrydale Road, Hayes																	
16	18 Stipularis Drive, Hayes																	
Item No.	Address																	
10	298 Kingshill Avenue, Hayes																	
20	Enforcement report																	

	<p>part in the decision of them.</p> <p>Councillor Robin Sansarpuri declared a prejudicial interest in Item 6 (Airlink House, 18 -22 Pump Lane, Hayes), as he had been involved with the application as a Ward Councillor. He withdrew from the room and did not take part in the decision of the item.</p> <p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a personal interest in Item 19 (Enforcement report), as the application was in his Ward and remained in the room during consideration of the item.</p>	
48.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (TO FOLLOW) (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2011 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.</p>	
49.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There had been no items notified in advance as urgent.</p>	
50.	<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 agreed that items marked as Part 1 would be considered in Public and matters marked as Part 2 would be considered in Private.</p>	
51.	<p>AIRLINK HOUSE, 18 - 22 PUMP LANE, HAYES 5505/APP/2010/2455 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Single storey rear extension and change of use of building from offices to a restaurant / banquet hall at ground floor level with 23 hotel rooms above.</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>In response to a query as to controlling possible noise from tannoy system, officers advised that Condition 9 could be amended to include this.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the level of car parking and staff parking provision. Officers advised that the two car parks proposed were public car parks with 24hours opening times. The ratio of 1:1 parking did not apply to guest houses and small hotels of less than 30 rooms, and in this case, there were 23 rooms in the proposed development, sited in a central location.</p> <p>The Committee added an additional condition to prevent 'off airport parking.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

The recommendation set out in the officers' report with the amendments in the Addendum sheet and additional condition for 'off airport' parking was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

1. That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection to grant planning permission, subject to the following:

- a) **That the Council enters into an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and/or Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (as amended) and/ or other appropriate legislation to secure:**
 - i) **The provision of a 10 Year Travel Plan and an undertaking to implement the Initiatives therein.**
 - ii) **A financial contribution of £12,500 towards air quality monitoring.**
 - iii) **A contribution towards the monitoring and management of the legal agreement of 5% of the s106 value.**
- b) **That in respect of the application for planning permission, the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in preparation of the Section 106 Agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.**
- c) **That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.**
- d) **That if any of the heads of terms set out above have not been agreed and the S106 legal agreement has not been finalised within 6 months of the date of this committee resolution, then the application will be referred back to the Committee for determination.**
- e) **That if the application is approved, the conditions set out in the officer's report be imposed.**

Amended Condition

Condition 9 was amended to read as follows:

The development shall not begin until a scheme for the control of noise (amplified or otherwise, including music or any noise from a tannoy system) emanating from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include such combination of physical, administrative and other measures as may be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be fully implemented before the development is use commences and thereafter shall be retained and maintained in good working order for so long as the building remains in use.

No loud music or other noise, whether amplified or otherwise, shall be played in the premises or externally between 22:00 hours and 08:00

	<p>hours Mondays to Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Additional Condition</p> <p><i>The car parking facilities provided at the hotel shall be used by hotel guests only and strictly for the duration of their stay in the hotel. Prior to occupation of the development a car parking management strategy shall be submitted to demonstrate how this will be managed and to ensure the efficient operation of the car park, especially at peak demand periods. The approved strategy shall be implemented as soon as the hotel is brought into use and the strategy shall remain in place thereafter. Any changes to the strategy shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p>Reason</p> <p><i>The use of the site for long-stay parking for Heathrow Airport passengers is directly related to the operation of Heathrow Airport but is located outside the airport boundary, contrary to Policy A4 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007. Furthermore, this would provide airport related car parking in addition to the 42,000 car parking spaces that have been 'capped' at Heathrow Airport as a condition of the Terminal 5 approval and is contrary to Policies AM2 and AM7 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies September 2007, Policies £C.1 and £C.23 of the London Plan and to advice in PPG13 to restrain the use of private cars and encourage travel by alternative modes.</i></p>	
52.	<p>19 - 22 CHIPPENDALE WAYE & CAR PARK AREA TO REAR OF 23 - 28 CHIPPENDALE WAYE, UXBRIDGE 67544/APP/2011/736 (Agenda Item 7)</p> <p>Erection of a two storey building comprising 12, one-bedroom supported housing units, along with ancillary office space and associated landscaping for new building, alterations to car parking and access arrangements (both vehicular and pedestrian) (involving demolition of dwellings known as 19, 20, 21 and 22 Chippendale Way).</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>The Chairman asked whether part of the proposed development was dedicated for nursery use. Officers advised that a survey was carried out to work out the level of occupancy and found 11 spaces; and in terms of staff usage, with the present staff proportion, there would always be spaces after the development for staff.</p> <p>A Member commented that the drawings showed that the kitchen windows opened into a corridor with limited natural lighting and suggested that the Code 3 level (for Sustainable Homes) should be</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

replaced with Code 4 to counter act this. Officers advised that Code 3 was generally used unless there was a material reason, and in this instance, it could be modified by the Committee.

With regard to the provision of car parking spaces for supported housing, a Member commented that if parking spaces were allocated, the current parking spaces for Nos. 22 – 28 Chippendale Way would no longer be available. Officers responded that the applicant had advised that as it was their land, they were not required to provide parking spaces for those occupiers. Occupiers of Nos. 22 – 28 Chippendale Way could park along the access road; the current view was that there were 23 spaces available at the rear access road.

It was explained that of the 23 spaces, 11 would be allocated for nursery use and the remainder would be uncontrolled parking during the day for the residents. The applicant had been asked to mark the spaces for nursery use (which would be no more than 2 staff) during nursery hours.

In answer to a query about the loss of amenity space in the fenced off area in the car park, officers advised that the area was a derelict playground, which had not been covered in the report. The Committee was informed that as the area had been abandoned for so long, it would not be feasible to use as a play area without having to re-create it.

A Member pointed out that in purchasing the properties in Chippendale Way, residents also purchased the right of access and that it was worth noting there was controlled parking the whole area.

The Committee raised concerns about the need for the disabled parking bay to be near as possible to the entrance and requested officers to confirm whether the Wall along Chippendale Alley was a listed building.

The Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Services indicated that there were concerns about the proposed level of parking and in view of the issues raised, advised that it would be appropriate for him to withdraw the application.

The application was therefore withdrawn by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Services for the clarification and amendments as set out below; and reported back to a Committee meeting:

- **Ascertain whether nearby residents have legal ownership over the proportions of the site for car parking**
- **Establish how long the playground had been abandoned and the Council's policy to its removal**
- **Investigate the adequacy of proposed amenity space**
- **Confirm whether the wall along Chippendale Way was a listed**
- **Look into the disabled parking spaces being positioned close to Chippendale Alley**
- **Amend Condition 24 to require Code 4**

53.	<p>CAR PARK REAR OF 1 - 16 SYDNEY COURT, PERTH AVENUE, HAYES 65936/APP/2009/2629 (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Erection of 12 flats (8 two-bedroom, 4-person flats, 3 two-bedroom 3-person flats and 1 one-bedroom 2-person wheelchair accessible flat), in a single block with 12 associated car parking spaces; demolition of existing garages adjacent to Melbourne House and number 83 Perth Avenue; and provision of 3 open car parking areas.</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers advised that the proposed development was restricted to over 55 years with partners of not under 50 year olds. The issue of education contribution had not been addressed given that there would be very little chance of children living within the scheme, therefore, the legal agreement would be varied to no longer require education contribution.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <p>a) That the Statement of Intent dated 31 March 2010 be varied as follows:</p> <p>i) That the definition for education contribution be amended from; means the education contribution in the sum of forty one thousand and twenty pounds (£41,020) referred to in Schedule Two towards the costs of providing education or educational improvements or facilities in the Authority's Area including (but not limited to): New school facilities, including ancillary facilities; Improvements, adaptations or enhancements to existing school facilities [in order to accommodate extra children]; or Improvements and expansion of playground and external leisure spaces, including equipment and maintenance contributions;</p> <p>ii) Replaced with the following definition means the education contribution in the sum of forty one thousand and twenty pounds (£41,020) referred to in Schedule Two towards the costs of improving traffic calming measures for the direct benefit of Brookside Primary School, Perth Avenue Hayes, Middlesex.</p> <p>b) That the owner and Council meet their respective costs in the preparation of the Deed of Variation to the Statement of Intent and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.</p> <p>c) That if the Deed of Variation to the Statement of Intent is not finalised within a period of 6 months from the date of this by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection, then the application may be referred back to the Committee for determination.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
-----	---	---

	<p>d) That subject to the above, the application be deferred for determination by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection under delegated powers, subject to the satisfactory completion of the Deed of Variation to the Statement of Intent that was entered into by way of Notice under Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 which shall ensure only for the benefit of the land) that the applicant being the local authority being the only legal entity with an interest in the land which is the subject of this application, and hence being unable to enter into a section 106 Agreement with the local planning authority, completes a Statement of Intent (Statement) to make provision for the planning obligation as approved on 31 March 2010 as would a third party developer under a section 106 planning obligation.</p> <p>e) That if the application is approved, it be subject to the conditions and informatives agreed by the Central and South Planning Committee on 9 March 2010 (detailed in the Committee report and minutes) and attached to this report and amendments in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>	
54.	<p>47 SWANAGE WAYE, HAYES 48600/APP/2011/548 (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Erection of a first floor side extension.</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting in support of the application.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the whole area around Swanage Way and Brookside Estate benefited from an anomaly of developments with no conformity • The proposed development would compliment the character of the area • Referring to some photographs circulated at the meeting and suggested that all the developments in the photographs breached building lines • Officers had stated in the report that there were no properties in the east that would be adversely affected by the proposed development • The property at the rear of the proposed development (no. 49) was and 17m away which officers had stated would not harm the occupiers of that property. Suggested that this clearly addressed issues relating to building lines • The petition was signed by occupiers of No. 49 • Building materials would be incorporated to match existing design 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant was reasonable and stepped in to try to rectify each stage based on the recommendation for refusal • With regard to Policy BE15, the proposed development would not be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area as the proposed first floor would be setback even further • Suggested that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the street scene and character of the area • Fifty signatories to the petition in support of the proposal demonstrated that residents had no objection <p>A Member stated that the Committee usually dealt with applications before them and would not necessarily compare other buildings in the same road.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report, and amendments in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>	
55.	<p>298 KINGSHILL AVENUE, HAYES 8195/APP/2011/38 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from A1 (Retail) to A3 (Restaurant) & A5 (Takeaway) and installation of 2 x extract ducts to rear</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>An additional Condition OM16 was added for signage and Condition 5 was revised for the control of hours to include Bank Holidays.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns about the change from A1 use classification to an A5 use in an area where there were 6 fast foods in a row of 6 shops of 12 units and asked how the A1 use was being protected. Officers responded that of the 24 units in the area, 14 units remained in A1 use. The Committee was advised that policy required that a parade retained sufficient shops, but did not set out a specific percentage, as it was not a primary area.</p> <p>A Member asked for an additional informative to be attached requesting the applicant to provide a double door to the toilets which were near the food preparation area to meet building control requirements.</p> <p>It was indicated that the Council would need to look at strengthening policy to include local shopping parades.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval, additional Condition OM16 and amendment to Condition 5 in the Addendum sheet and additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p>Resolved - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report, amendments in and to the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting, and the following additional condition and additional informative:</p> <p>Amended Condition 5</p> <p><i>Deliveries and collections, including waste/refuse/recycling collections (but excluding takeaway food deliveries and collections), shall be restricted to the following hours; 09:00 hrs to 18:00 hrs Monday to Fridays, 08.00 to 13.00 Saturdays and not at all on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.</i></p> <p>Reason</p> <p><i>To safeguard the residential amenity of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby properties in accordance with Policy OE3 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan.</i></p> <p>Additional Condition OM16</p> <p><i>A notice shall be displayed permanently and prominently within the premises requesting that customers dispose of their litter responsibly.</i></p> <p>Reason</p> <p><i>To ensure the satisfactory disposal of litter in the interests of maintaining a satisfactory standard of amenity in the locality, in accordance with Policy OE1 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007).</i></p> <p>Additional Informative</p> <p><i>You are advised that there should be a second door between the toilet and the food preparation area so as to create an airlock between the toilet and working area.</i></p>	
56.	<p>13 BOURNE AVENUE, HAYES 30586/APP/2011/252 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Alterations to single storey rear extension with new flat roof to rear and part demolition of existing single storey outbuilding to rear to provide extra amenity space to front. (Part Retrospective).</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

57.	<p>165 NORTH HYDE ROAD, HAYES 17357/APP/2011/18 (Agenda Item 12)</p> <p>Change of ground floor from Class A1 (Retail) to Class A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) for use as fast food restaurant with new extract duct to rear.</p> <p>In introducing the report, officers explained that there was limited space outside of the 'redline'. Previously the development was a retail shop which sold sound equipments and above the shop was residential use with stairs to the residential unit and windows at the top of the stairs. The issue highlighted with the proposal was the changes to facilitate cooking and the proposal to relocate the stairs. Whilst officers were comfortable with the appearance of the extract flue; there were concerns about the noise and type of flue. There were also concerns about the tight constrained space between the two storey building and neighbouring building and wonder where refuse storage would be located.</p> <p>In response to a question, officers advised that the rear access was very constrained and was also used by businesses to the rear of the proposal. There did not appear to be type of storage area that would be required for a fast food business. The key concern therefore in respect of the proposed development was that no storage space had been proposed and there was no room around the 'redline' site. The 'redline' area was so constrained that there did not appear to be any area to locate the type of refuse that would be required for this type of takeaway shop.</p> <p>A Member asked whether the applicant had a right of access at the 'redline' and whether this could be closed off? Officers responded that the applicant only had access at the 'redline' to the shop but was not certain about access to the unit upstairs or whether the units had been subdivided – this would need to be confirmed.</p> <p>A Member asked how other fast food restaurant along the parade disposed of their waste. Officers advised that there was no space outside for refuse bins.</p> <p>The Committee queried there being no customer/disabled toilets and the proposed WC sited around the food preparation area with only one door. Officers advised that the provision of toilets varied and depended on the number of seats and that this was a building control issue. It was noted however that the applicant could be reminded by way of an informative.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal and additional informative was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report, and the following additional informative:</p> <p>You are advised that the proposed toilet would not meet disabled access requirements and this issue should be addressed in the</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
-----	---	---

	design of any resubmission.	
58.	<p>FORMER B&Q SITE, UXBRIDGE ROAD 51508/APP/2011/963 (Agenda Item 13)</p> <p>Variation of condition 12 (to extend the opening hours of the store) of planning permission ref. 51508/APP/2008/2927 dated 16/04/2010: (Single storey canopy to front entrance, refurbishment and variation of condition of planning permission ref. 51508/96/1907 dated 16/04/1997 to allow use as an Asian supermarket, comprising 1,606sq.m main retail area, 69sq.m cafe area, 690sq.m bulk goods warehouse, 1,141sq.m goods storage area, and the utilisation of the former Garden Centre trading area as a 425sq.m covered trading area for fruit and vegetables. The proposal includes changes to the external appearance of the existing building, existing parking layout, boundary treatments, external lighting and associated bin storage/compactors).</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and advised the application was for the variation of Condition 12 only, to extend the opening hours of the store. There had been a trial of opening hours from 8am to 9pm Monday to Saturday and Sundays/Bank holidays from 10am to 6pm which had generated no complaint. The applicant had therefore submitted an application for permission to operate these hours on a permanent basis following the end of the trial and the Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) was comfortable for the condition to be varied.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that Sunday trading was prescriptive and clarified that the applicant wished to increase the currently operated hours from 10am to 5pm by an extra 2 hours, and asked officers how it would be ensured that these hours were adhered to. Officers responded that any planning approval would not override the Sunday Trading Law and an additional informative had been included in the Addendum sheet to bring the applicant's attention to this issue.</p> <p>A Member queried why the Committee could not approve the Sunday trading times it was minded to allow. Officers advised that the Sunday Trading Act restricted the amount of trading times and that the applicant was seeking the flexibility to choose. However, if the Sunday Trading Law did not allow them to do so, then it was not a planning matter.</p> <p>The Legal Advisor added that the Committee was required to consider the planning merits of the time, rather than the Sunday Trading hours.</p> <p>A Member raised concerns about the issue of a tannoy system raised under External Consultation in the report and stated that this would be unacceptable and would require further investigation.</p> <p>The Chairman asked officers to provide some clarification over this issue. Officers responded that no complaints had been lodged with Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) during, or after the 6 months trial when local residents were written to. Furthermore, it was not clear whether the complaint made about the tannoy system was referring to</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p>this particular store.</p> <p>Officers checked the file and advised that the concern had been raised by someone living in Ealing borough and by a hotel business.</p> <p>A Member commented that in the report, it had been stated that no response had been received from London Borough of Ealing. Officers added that the issue regarding the tannoy system could be further investigated by EPU.</p> <p>The legal Advisor advised that it would be in the best interest of the Committee to defer the application for further information to be provided, if the Committee was not happy to make a decision.</p> <p>It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for further information to be provided regarding the issue of noise made by tannoy system, and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application be deferred for further information to establish what tannoy system was being used on the site which was causing noise; and to be reported back to a Committee meeting for a decision.</p>	
59.	<p>GARAGE SITE REAR OF 85 AND 87 MANOR WAYE, UXBRIDGE 67593/APP/2011/329 (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a pair of 2 two-storey, two-bedroom, semi-detached dwellings.</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval and the changes in the Addendum sheet was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
60.	<p>67 BERRYDALE ROAD, HAYES 64145/APP/2011/858 (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Single storey side extension (Part-Retrospective).</p> <p>In introducing the report officers explained that the application was deferred at the meeting held on 28 June 2011. A letter had been received from the applicant explaining that when he purchased the property, it had a rear extension in the form of a conservatory which benefited from a planning permission for more than 4 years. He also outlined his personal circumstances for submitting this application, which were not planning material consideration.</p> <p>Officers advised that planning permission was lost when the applicant demolished the conservatory. The amenity space for this application was 40sqm in its entirety.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

A Member stated that this development came to the attention via enforcement proceedings; it was so small that it would be very difficult to approval such a development.

Officers added that the dimension as revised was within Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) standards. However, if Members felt that the size of the neighbour's garden already being so small that, that part of the applicant's garden may affect adjoining neighbours, the Committee could consider the lack of usable external amenity space.

A Member added that as the areas was so small, they did not think that it greatly detracted from policy and as the Committee considered each application in its own merit, did not consider that accepting this application would be going against guidance, particularly as it would provide more useful space for the applicant.

An additional informative was attached to raise the applicants attention to contaminated land issues.

It was proposed that the application be refused together with an additional informative in respect of contaminated land and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved – That the application be refused for the following reasons and the additional informative was attached:

The proposed development, fails to maintain an adequate amount of private usable external amenity space for the occupiers of the property, resulting in overdevelopment of the site and poor quality living environment, detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers as well as the character, appearance and visual amenities of the surrounding area. The development is therefore contrary to policy 4B.1 of the London Plan, policies BE19 and BE23 of the Councils adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies, September 2007) and section 3.0 of the Hillingdon Design & Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions.

Additional Informative

You are advised that permitted development rights were removed from the property when consent was initially given for the original house to ensure contamination issues were thoroughly examined before any development of the site occurred.

Standard informatives 152 & 153 (which is included on all applications and covered polices and Human Rights Act issues referenced in the decision making process) were also included.

61.	<p>18 STIPULARIS DRIVE, HAYES 31178/APP/2011/263 (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>Erection of a single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as storage involving part demolition of existing building (Part-retrospective).</p> <p>Officers presented the report to the Committee and drew their attention to the amendments in the Addendum sheet.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval and the changes in the Addendum was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and amendments in the Addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
62.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed. 2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned. <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
63.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer’s report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer’s report be agreed. 2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal 	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">enforcement notice to the individual concerned.</p> <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	
64.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 19)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed. 2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned. <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>
65.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (Agenda Item 20)</p> <p>The recommendation set out in the officer's report was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed. 2. That the Committee resolve to release their decision and the reasons for it outlined in this report into the public domain, solely for the purposes of issuing the formal enforcement notice to the individual concerned. <p><i>The report relating to this decision is not available to the public because it contains information which reveals that the authority proposes (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; and (b) to make an order</i></p>	<p>Action by</p> <p>James Rodger Matt Duigan</p>

	<i>or direction under any enactment and the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i>	
66.	ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 21</i>) This report was withdrawn by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Services for further investigation.	Action by James Rodger Matt Duigan
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 10.32 pm.	

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Nadia Williams on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.