

## Minutes

### CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

9 October 2012

Meeting held at Committee Room 6 - Civic Centre,  
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman) David Allam Janet Duncan Neil Fyfe John Morgan Carol Melvin Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger Rory Stracey Matthew Duigan Sirous Ordoubadi</p>	
133.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Judith Cooper, Wayne Bridges, Dominic Gilham and Mo Khursheed. Councillors Carol Melvin, John Morgan and David Allam were in attendance as substitutes.</p>	Action by
134.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Brian Stead declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 5 as it was in his ward and remained in the room to discuss and vote on the item.</p>	Action by
135.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that this urgent meeting had been called because an appeal against non-determination had been lodged with the Planning Inspectorate. It was therefore essential that the Committee considered the proposals and advised the Planning Inspectorate of its views on the application within the specified appeal timetable.</p>	Action by
136.	<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 4</i>)</p>	Action by
137.	<p><b>LAND AT REAR OF 21 &amp; 22 ORCHARD WAYE, UXBRIDGE</b></p>	Action by

**68586/APP/2012/1306** (*Agenda Item 5*)

**2 x two storey, 2-bed, detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of vehicular crossover**

Officers provided a report on the application which sought planning permission for the erection of 2 detached dwellings within the rear gardens of 21 and 22 Orchard Way, along with associated parking and landscaping.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners in objection to the application addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:

- That the proposed development would have a negative impact on existing residents' parking in the area
- That the 2 story height of the proposed dwellings would overlook neighbouring properties
- That the development would result in a loss of privacy
- That the problem of overlooking would be exacerbated if the mature tree on the plot was removed

It was noted by Members that the mature tree referred to in the report was not subject to a Tree Preservation Order but that the applicant had failed to safeguard existing trees or to demonstrate protection for long-term protection of trees on the site.

Officers advised that the proposed development would be harmful to the amenities of the residents at 20, 21 and 23 Orchard Way as mentioned in the report but would also be harmful to the residents of 22 Orchard Way.

The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.

**Resolved – That the Local Planning Authority advise the Planning Inspectorate that, had an appeal against non-determination not been lodged, the application would have been refused for the following reasons:**

**1. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal by reason of its siting, design, layout, bulk, massing, overall size and loss of back gardens would result in a cramped form of development, which is visually incongruous and over dominant, therefore failing to harmonise with the established character of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13, BE19 and BE22 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts and Policies 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011).

**2. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal, by reason of its location in close proximity to nearby dwellings, design (including in particular the proposed roof form), extensive coverage with hardstanding and loss of openness provided by the existing back gardens would result in an overdevelopment of the site which would detract from the open character and appearance of the surrounding area and the visual

amenities of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007), 3.5, 7.1 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2011) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Layouts.

**3. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposed development by reason of its height, position and proximity, would result in an overly dominant feature that would result in loss of outlook and residential amenity to the adjacent properties at 20, 21, 22 and 23 Orchard Way, and as such would result in a visually intrusive and an un-neighbourly form of development. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents HDAS Residential Extensions.

**4. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

Whilst two parking spaces are indicated the applicant has failed to demonstrate that access to the site is available as it involves crossing private land. The proposed development therefore fails to provide any off-street parking to service the proposed dwellings. The development would therefore lead to additional on-street parking, in an area where such parking is at a premium, to the detriment of public and highway safety, contrary to Policies AM7 and AM14 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007) and the Council's adopted car parking standards.

**5. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

In the absence of a Tree Survey and Arboricultural Implication Assessment to BS5837: 2005 standards, the application has failed to demonstrate that the development will safeguard existing trees on the site and further fails to demonstrate protection for long term retention of the trees. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE38 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (Saved Policies September 2007).

**6. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The proposal would fail to meet all relevant Lifetime Home Standards, contrary to Policies (September 2007), policies 3.1, 3.8 and 7.2 of the London Plan (2011) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Accessible Hillingdon.

**7. NON2 Non Standard reason for refusal**

The applicant has failed to provide a contribution towards the improvement of services and facilities as a consequence of demands created by the proposed development (in respect of education facilities). The scheme therefore conflicts with Policy R17 of the Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (September 2007) and adopted Supplementary Planning Document for Planning Obligations.

The meeting, which commenced at 6.30 pm, closed at 6.42 pm.

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