

Minutes

## CENTRAL &amp; SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

5 January 2012



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) Judith Cooper (Vice-Chairman) Wayne Bridges Janet Duncan Neil Fyfe Dominic Gilham Robin Sansarpuri Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Meghi Hirani – Team Leader, North, Matt Duigan – Team Leader Central  &amp; South, Manmohan Ranger – Highways Engineer, Sarah White – Legal Adviser, Gill Brice – Democratic Services.</p> <p><b>Also Present:</b> Councillor George Cooper</p>	
202.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
	<p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a personal interest in Item 18 – Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Uxbridge Item 22 – Enforcement Report &amp; Item 23 – Enforcement Report as the applications were in his ward. He remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p> <p>Councillor Neil Fyfe declared a personal &amp; prejudicial interest in Item 19 – Minet Junior School, Avondale Drive, Hayes, as he was a Governor at the school. He left the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Wayne Bridges declared a personal &amp; prejudicial interest in Item 10 – 132 Ryefield Avenue, Hillingdon as he had been speaking to the petitioners objecting to the application. He left the meeting whilst the item was discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Dominic Gilham declared a personal interest in Item 9 – Former Honeywell Site, Trout Road, Yiewsley, as the application site was in his ward. He remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p> <p>Councillor Janet Duncan declared a personal interest in Item 20 – West London Shooting School, West End Road, Northolt, as the site abutted her Ward. Item 8 as her partner's daughter attended the college. She remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p>	<p><i>Gill Brice</i></p>

	<p>Councillor Sansarpuri declared a personal interest in Item 19 – Minet Junior School, Avondale Drive, Hayes as the application was in his ward. He remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p> <p>Councillor Hensley declared a personal an prejudicial interest in Item 18 Brunel University, Kingston Lane, Uxbridge as an ex Don and academic adviser. He left the meeting whilst the application was discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Judith Cooper declared a personal interest in Item 16 – Land at Blackmore Way, Uxbridge as the application was in her husband’s ward. She remained in the meeting to discuss and vote on the application.</p>	
203.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>Item 23 – 2 Turnpike Lane, Uxbridge was taken as urgent by the Chairman as enforcement action to restrain the unauthorised use of the outbuilding was being held in abeyance pending the outcome of the planning application. An enforcement notice had already been served and not complied with, and officers were keen to commence a prosecution.</p>	
204.	<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 marked Part 1 would be heard in public and items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>	
205.	<p><b>FORMER HAYES &amp; HARLINGTON GOODS YARD, STATION ROAD, HAYES</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p>	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>Variation of condition 10 of planning permission ref. 10057/APP/2007/3674 (granted on appeal 11 November 2008, for revisions to planning permissions ref. 10057/APP/2005/1620 and 10057/APP/2007/1993 and 10057/APP/2007/1994, for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Hayes and Harlington Station Goods Yard site), to enable parking for private residential, hotel and apart-hotel to be self-parked (rather than valet parked) until 318 dwellings have been occupied.</b></p> <p>Officers advised the committee that the application sought to vary condition 10 to enable parking for private residential, hotel and apart-hotel to be self-parked (rather than valet parked) until 318 dwellings have been occupied.</p> <p>The committee asked that condition 10 be amended to delete ‘unless otherwise agreed in writing.’</p> <p>A member asked whether the parking standards had changed since the original.</p>	<p><i>Meg Hirani</i> <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<p>Officers advised the committee that as there was a high level of transport links in the area, there was no change in the parking required since the original permission was granted.</p> <p>A member asked how the parking would be allocated.</p> <p>Officers advised that apart from disabled parking there would be no allocation of parking spaces. The application would provide for an interim arrangement prior to the development being fully occupied. Once 319 dwellings had been occupied the valet parking would need to be provided. The interim parking spaces would provide for .75 of a space per unit, which had been agreed when original planning application was granted permission.</p> <p>The recommendation with condition 10 amended was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote there were 6 in favour and 2 against. The recommendation was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report, addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and condition 10 being amended as follows:-</b></p> <p><b>The roads/turning/loading facilities/sight lines and parking areas (including the marking out of parking spaces) shown on the approved drawings T9-1-(20) P00 Rev P9F and T9- 1-(20) P0M Rev P9D and as described in the Traffic and Parking Management Plan (September 2011) shall be retained.</b></p>	
206.	<p><b>1 AND 1A BATH ROAD, HARLINGTON 35805/APP/2009/2433 (Agenda Item 7)</b></p> <p><b>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a five storey, 192-bedroom hotel, basement and surface level car parking, bar/restaurant, meeting rooms and other associated works.</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That if the S106 is not completed within 3 months of the date of this committee resolution, or any other period deemed appropriate by the Head of Planning, Trading Standards and Environmental Protection then the application may be referred back to the committee for determination.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>
207.	<p><b>106 OXFORD, UXBRIDGE 26198/APP/2011/2085 (Agenda Item 8)</b></p> <p><b>Application under S73 of the Town and Country Planning Act to vary condition 3 of the existing permission 26198/APP/2008/2339 (Change of use from Class B1 (Offices) to Class D1 (Education) to enable a wider range of subjects to be taught and faculties to teach in the premises.</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting</b>	
208.	<b>FORMER HONEYWELL SITE, TROUT ROAD, YIEWSLEY 335/APP/2010/1615 (Agenda Item 9)</b>	<b>Action by</b>
	<p><b>Conversion of 7 existing live/work units into 7 one- bedroom and 7 two-bedroom apartments, with associated landscaping and car parking.</b></p> <p>A member raised concerns in relation to the parking as the parking spaces had been numbered and the report made no mention of a Parking Management Scheme. There was already an issue in regard to existing parking and this proposal would be exacerbate that situation if this application was to be approved.</p> <p>Officers advised the committee that there was no Parking Management Scheme on the original planning application. The spaces were unallocated with there being 21 spaces for the 14 units. The live/work units had not worked as expected and the current proposal met the required guidelines.</p> <p>A member asked whether the additional units being provided met the requirements of the London Plan.</p> <p>Officers advised the committee that this application was considered by the Committee at its meeting on 8 March 2011 when it was resolved to approve the application subject to the completion of a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The applicant had subsequently submitted a revised site location plan amending the position of the red line site boundary. This plan excluded 3 car parking spaces which had already been conveyed to other properties within the wider development. Neighbouring occupiers had been re-notified of the amended plan and a further 6 replies had been received, reiterating previous objections, which had been referred to in the officer’s report. The overall number of car parking spaces and their allocation over the wider development remain as previously considered by the Committee, which was found to be acceptable. All other aspects of the scheme remained as previously considered.</p> <p>Officers further advised the committee that the overlooking and internal floor space met HDAS standards. The proposal met the standards of the London Plan in regard to the one bed units but the 2 bed units would depend on whether it was occupied by 3 or 4 people.</p> <p>It was suggested that condition 4 be amended, this was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote there were 7 in favour and 1 against. The recommendation was agreed.</p>	<p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>

**Resolved - That the application be determined by the Head of Planning, Consumer Protection, Sport and Green Spaces under delegated powers, subject to the Council entering into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to secure the following:**

- (i) The provision of the proposed 7 one bedroom flats as shared ownership affordable housing units.**
- (ii) A financial contribution of £22,954 towards education facilities.**
- (iii) A financial contribution of £5,202 towards primary health care facilities.**
- (iv) A financial contribution of £522 towards library provision.**
- (v) A financial contribution equivalent of 5% of the total cash contributions for project management and monitoring.**

**b. That the applicant meets the Council's reasonable costs in the preparation of the Section 106 agreement and any abortive work as a result of the agreement not being completed.**

**c. That the officers be authorised to negotiate and agree detailed terms of the proposed agreement.**

**d. That the application is reported back to the Planning Committee, if the Section 106 agreement is not completed within a period of 6 months from the date of Committee consideration.**

**e. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting be attached and condition 4 as amended.**

#### **Amended Condition 4**

**The parking areas including the marking out of the 21 parking spaces (and for the avoidance of doubt, the spaces shall be marked out in a way which clearly and permanently identifies the dwelling to which the parking space is allocated), including any garages and car ports shown on the approved plans, shall be constructed, designated and allocated for the sole use of the occupants of the development hereby approved prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained and used for no other purpose. Spaces shall be allocated as follows:**

- \* 1 space minimum per dwelling (total 14 spaces).**
- \* 4 spaces marked out and dedicated for the use of the 2 bedroom dwellings**
- \* Not less than 3 unallocated spaces**

**For the avoidance of doubt, spaces 12, 13, and 14 which are not included in the red line site plan do not make up the 21 spaces to be allocated.**

	<p><b>REASON</b>  <b>To ensure that an appropriate level of car parking provision is provided on site in accordance with Policy AM14 of the adopted Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and Chapter 6 of the London Plan (July 2011).</b></p>	
<p>209.</p>	<p><b>132 RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON 1728/APP/2011/1565</b>  <i>(Agenda Item 10)</i></p> <p><b>Conversion of first and second floors to 2, two-bedroom flats and 1, one-bedroom flat, involving installation of external staircase at rear first floor level and demolition of single storey rear extension, rear store and detached garage to provide space for the creation of a private communal garden and 5 car parking spaces.</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in support of the application addressed the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application had been deferred at a previous meeting regarding concerns of car parking at front of premises, rear car parking, security issues for car parking at the rear, access and manouverability.</li> <li>• These concerns had all been met by the amendments provided.</li> <li>• The rear parking would not be used for the shop premises.</li> <li>• Rear access was used constantly as there were garages that are accessed from the same access as will be used for the proposed flats.</li> <li>• The access way was not owned by the properties.</li> <li>• There was a block of 14 garages rented out by the Council to residents in Midhurst Gardens, the arrangements for access to the Council owned garages would be the same as for those proposed for this application.</li> <li>• A majority of local residents want to see this application determined and 132 Ryefield Avenue fully utilised to much needed accommodation.</li> <li>• If approved it would mean that the rear of the site would be tidied, providing safe and secure parking and amenity space for the residential use.</li> <li>• Requested committee to consider the application favourably.</li> </ul> <p>The committee suggested that condition 6 to be amended to add the word 'accessible' after 'allocated'. This was agreed by the committee.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval with condition 6 being amended was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting and condition 6 being amended to add 'accessible' after 'allocated'.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i>  <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>

210.	<p><b>HARVARD HOUSE, SUMMERHOUSE LANE, HARMONDSWORTH 67230/APP/2010/1905</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class B1 (Office) to Class C1 (Hotels and Halls of Residence) for use as hotel with restaurant and installation of 1 rear and side dormers and new door to ground floor side.</b></p> <p>In answer to a question raised officers advised the committee that there had been no noise assessment undertaken on the rear parking area and the noise and disturbance that this make cause adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>The committee felt that they had insufficient information regarding noise and disturbance from parking, delivery and refuse bins and it was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a noise assessment to be provided. Information from the Environmental Protection Unit in relation to external noise was also requested. The committee also agreed to undertake a site visit to be arranged once the noise assessment had been provided.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred to a noise assessment to be provided and a site visit.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>
211.	<p><b>HARVARD HOUSE, SUMMERHOUSE LANE, HARMONDSWORTH 67230/APP/2010/1906</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use from Class B1 (Office) to Class C1 (Hotels and Halls of Residence) for use as hotel with restaurant and installation of 1 rear and side dormers and new door to ground floor side (Application for Listed Building Consent.)</b></p> <p>It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred and on being put to the vote deferral was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be deferred to enable additional information to be provided on noise an disturbance and a site visit.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>
212.	<p><b>LAND ADJACENT TO 33 AND 34 FAIREY AVENUE, HAYES 66668/APP/2011/1892</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Two storey building comprising 4 x two-bedroom flats with associated amenity space and parking spaces, involving the demolition of 31 existing garages (Outline planning application for access, appearance, layout and scale with other matters reserved) (Resubmission).</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution the applicant addressed the meeting. The petitioners objecting to the proposal were not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The applicant made the following points:-</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The garages were far too small for a modern day car and had been difficult to rent.</li> <li>• A number of the garages were used solely for storage and a number had remained empty for a number of years.</li> <li>• Larger garages on this site would not be financially viable.</li> <li>• This application had reduced the number of flats proposed since the last application was dismissed on appeal.</li> <li>• The Inspector in dismissing the previous application stated that a smaller build would be more acceptable.</li> <li>• An appeal had already been submitted on this application.</li> <li>• The parking and turning space would remain and would not be affected by this application.</li> <li>• Recycling of materials during the demolition of the garages would take place on site as much as possible.</li> <li>• A method statement would ensure that the demolition of the garages would comply with Health &amp; Safety.</li> <li>• Would be happy to agree to a S106 agreement if the committee were minded to approve the application.</li> </ul> <p>In answer to an issue raised in relation to the S106 agreement officers advised that this was a standard reason for refusal on an application that had been appealed. This would ensure that an Inspector considering the appeal was aware that a S106 agreement should be considered.</p> <p>The recommendation that the application would have been refused was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed</p> <p><b>Resolved – That had an appeal against non-determination been received the application would have been refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	
213.	<p><b>LAND FORMING PART OF 9 AND 9 PEMBROKE WAY, HAYES</b>  <b>36158/APP/2011/937</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>
	<p><b>Two storey building comprising 4 x two-bedroom flats with associated amenity space and parking spaces, involving the demolition of 31 existing garages (Outline planning application for access, appearance, layout and scale with other matters reserved) (Resubmission).</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council’s constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal was over development of the site.</li> <li>• Comments from residents had not been included in the officer’s report.</li> <li>• Part of the garden of 11 Pembroke Way would be lost if this development went ahead.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Meg Hirani</i>  <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was inadequate parking being provided with the overspill parking in the road.</li> <li>• The proposal would result in a loss of amenity for residents and increase the number of vehicles in Skipton Drive.</li> <li>• There were concerns about noise and pedestrian safety.</li> <li>• The proposal would reduce light to existing neighbours, existing trees already reduce light.</li> <li>• The site is close to 3 schools and should continue to be used as a family home and not a house in multiple occupation.</li> <li>• If this proposal was allowed it would set a precedent for other developments in Pembroke Way.</li> <li>• The proposal was out of character with the area.</li> </ul> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	
214.	<p><b>LAND REAR OF 25 WINDSOR GARDENS, HAYES 67835/APP/2011/1318 (Agenda Item 15)</b></p> <p><b>Erection of a three-bedroom, two storey end of terrace dwelling and single storey rear extension to existing dwelling involving the demolition of existing element to side/ rear and conservatory to rear.</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal was only providing one parking space.</li> <li>• Parking in Windsor Gardens had already reached saturation point, this proposal would exacerbate this problem.</li> <li>• Refuse vehicles can not always access Windsor Gardens and have to return later.</li> <li>• The report was comprehensively detailed with 5 reasons for refusal.</li> <li>• Asked the committee to refuse the application as recommended by officers.</li> </ul> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reason set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>

<p>215.</p>	<p><b>LAND AT BLACKMORE WAY, UXBRIDGE</b>  <b>20978/APP/2011/1521</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a two storey building to include 4, one-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing garages.</b></p> <p>In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners addressed the meeting. The agent was not present at the meeting.</p> <p>The petitioner made the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal would have an adverse impact on existing on-street parking arrangements.</li> <li>• The development at 1 Bawtree Road had already exacerbated the current parking situation.</li> <li>• There would be no dedicated parking for the existing 24 flats, contrary to conditions of the planning permission.</li> <li>• The developer had sold flats without garages.</li> <li>• Little effort had been made to make the garages available to local residents.</li> <li>• The proposal would increase on-street parking demands and encourage the paving of front gardens, which would affect the character of the area.</li> <li>• The parking problems would hamper emergency and service vehicles.</li> <li>• There were enough flats in the area and this application should be refused to put Hillingdon residents first.</li> </ul> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i>  <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>
<p>216.</p>	<p><b>LAND REAR OF 11 &amp; 15 MONTAGUE ROAD, UXBRIDGE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>Erection of a two storey detached building to provide 4, one-bedroom flats with associated parking and amenity space and installation of vehicular crossover to side. (Resubmission)</b></p> <p>The petitioner was present at the meeting but declined his right to address the meeting. The agent was unable to attend the meeting but provided a letter to the committee, which was attached to the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p> <p>A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting making the following point:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal does not meet the requirements of the London Plan in relation to backland development not being acceptable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i>  <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be Refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	
217.	<p><b>BRUNEL UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON LANE, HILLINGDON</b>  <b>532/APP/2011/2364</b> (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p><b>New electrical sub-station (Retrospective).</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i> <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>
218.	<p><b>MINET JUNIOR SCHOOL, AVONDALE DRIVE, HAYES</b>  <b>2297/APP/2011/1524</b> (<i>Agenda Item 19</i>)</p> <p><b>Installation of a new vehicular crossover and staff car park, involving relocation and widening of existing gates, proposed path and alterations to fence line (Resubmission).</b></p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i> <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>
219.	<p><b>WEST LONDON SHOOTING SCHOOL, WEST END ROAD, NORTHOLT</b>  <b>39704/APP/2011/2964</b> (<i>Agenda Item 20</i>)</p> <p><b>Raising of height of existing attenuation flat top bund ranging between 3m at its eastern end and 15m at its western end to create a dome shaped bund. (Consultation by the London Borough of Ealing).</b></p> <p>The committee asked officers to inform Ealing Council that the proposal should be carried out in a timely manner.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the London Borough of Ealing be informed that the London Borough of Hillingdon raises NO OBJECTION to the proposed scheme, subject to the conditions set out in the officer’s report and addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani</i> <i>Matt Duigan</i></p>

220.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 21</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><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></li> <li><b>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 breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></li> </ol> <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><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>
221.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 22</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><b>Resolved</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. That the enforcement actions as recommended in the officer's report be agreed.</b></li> <li><b>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 breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.</b></li> </ol> <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><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>
222.	<p><b>2 TURNPIKE LANE, UXBRIDGE 53213/APP/2011/2672.</b> (<i>Agenda Item 23</i>)</p> <p><b>Change of use of outbuilding from garage to 'House in Multiple Occupation' used in association with main dwelling as a 'House in Multiple Occupation'</b></p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p> <p><i>Meg Hirani Matt Duigan</i></p>

	<p>It was suggested that the District Valuer advised that outbuilding was being used as a separate dwelling.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved – That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer’s report.</b></p> <p>This application was taken as urgent by the Chairman as enforcement action to restrain the unauthorised use of the outbuilding was being held in abeyance pending the outcome of this planning application as an enforcement notice had already been served and not complied with, and officers were keen to commence a prosecution.</p>	
<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 9.50 pm.</p>		

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

This page is intentionally left blank