

Minutes

## CENTRAL &amp; SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

4 November 2014

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors John Hensley (Chairman), Ian Edwards (Vice-Chairman), Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra, Brian Stead, Shehryar Wallana and John Morse</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> James Rodger - Head of Planning, Green Spaces &amp; Culture, Meg Hirani - Planning Team Manager - Manmohan Ranger - Highways Engineer, Tim Brown - Legal Adviser, Gill Oswell - Democratic Services Officer</p>
122.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>No apologies had been received.</p>
123.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>No declarations of interest had been received.</p>
124.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 15 OCTOBER 2014</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2014 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
125.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There had been no matters notified in advance or urgent.</p>
126.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>I was confirmed that all items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and all items marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>
127.	<p><b>14 MILTON CLOSE, HAYES 16558/APP/2013/1731</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b><i>Two storey side extension and part two storey part single storey rear extension, involving the demolition of existing single storey side extension.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report setting out a summary of the application. The Committee was informed that a further petition had been received giving speaking rights.</p>

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting. The applicant/agent was not present at the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- The plans were misleading and had changed a number of times.
- There were a number of errors on the submitted plans.
- The distance to the boundary with No12 was 1.7m; this would mean that access to the second parking space would be difficult as can be seen by the narrow gap indicated on the plans.
- The side entrance to No.12 Milton Close was in constant use and was a shared driveway with No.14.
- If a skip was to be placed in the drive of No. 14 access to No 12 would not be possible.
- The report had no information in relation to light and water.
- The report stated that the side window to No 12 was not a habitable room; this information is incorrect as this is used as a living room.
- Previous history of the site should be looked at carefully.
- No 14 had been previously used as a House in Multiple Occupation.

Ward Councillors raised the following points:-

- The application had caused a lot of distress to residents.
- All the points raised by residents were valid.
- Particular concern to all residents was the problem suffered over the use of the property.
- There had been a number of concerns raised about the plans and their accuracy.
- Residents had been confused about which of the applications had been withdrawn.
- Asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Chairman asked officer to clarify the following points:-

Would the existing garage take a family car?  
Confirmation that the drawings were correct.  
That the side window at No 12 was to a habitable room.

Officers advised the Committee that the garage entrance was sufficient to take a family car as shown on the plans. In relation to the side window of the adjoin property this was to a staircase and bathroom. The extension would be the same distance from the proposed extension and it was the officer's view that the extension would not impact on the adjoining occupier.

Further clarification was sought in relation to the dimensions shown on the drawings.

The legal officer advised the Committee that if the plans were not accurate the extension would be unable to be built, as the proposed extension must accord to the approved plans.

In answer to concerns raised in relation to plans, the officers informed the Committee that when plans were received they would have been assessed to see whether they were accurate and whether the extension to the existing property could be undertaken.

A member suggested that if there were doubts about the accuracy of the plans the application should be deferred to enable this to be checked, given the concerns of local residents.

The Chairman highlighted that as the application had previously been refused due to the parking if there were concerns that two spaces could be provided.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to enable clarification to be given to the whether the side window at No. 12 serviced a habitable room and whether the second parking space was accessible.

**Resolved - That the application be deferred to seek clarification whether the side window at No. 12 was a habitable room and that the second parking space was accessible.**

128. **THE BRUSHWOOD INN, 47 HARLINGTON ROAD, HILLINGDON  
8002/APP/2014/1342 (Agenda Item 7)**

***Change of use from Use Class C4 (Drinking Establishments) to Use Class C3 (Dwelling Houses) and single storey rear extension and first floor side extension to create 2 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing outbuilding to rear.***

Officers introduced the report setting out a summary of the application setting out the 3 main issues i) the principle of the change of use, ii) quality of the accommodation iii) parking. There were no policies that would support the application being refused.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the agent/applicant addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- The Borough was heading for a pub disaster
- If allowed it would remove an important neighbourhood facility.
- The positive effects of the current use needed to be taken into consideration.
- The current use provided social events for the local community
- There had been no anti social behaviour occurring from the use as a public house.
- If approved the application would destroy a lovely public house and reduce jobs for local people.
- The Hillingdon Local Plan and the National Planning Policy in relation to decreasing social engagement and the proposal not supporting the local community.
- Development was rife at the moment and asked the Committee to refuse the application and keep this public house open.

The applicant/agent made the following points:-

- If the use as a public house was viable the use would continue.
- There had been 5 different tenants since 2011 and all had been unable to make the pub work.

- The building was being kept as it currently was with just a couple of minor extensions.
- The application meets all the planning requirements.
- Sympathetic to local residents concerns but there are two other public houses within a half mile radius of the site.

The Committee sympathised with the petitioners but without there being a strong policy against the loss of this type of facility a refusal could not be supported.

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

**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.**

129. **LAND AT 141, 143 & REAR OF 145 LONG LANE 62467/APP/2014/1958** (*Agenda Item 8*)

***5 two storey, 4-bed, detached dwellings with associated parking and amenity space involving installation of two vehicular crossovers to front and boundary wall to front and demolition of 2 detached dwellings and conversion of garage of No.145 to habitable space involving alterations to front and rear elevations and removal of bay window to rear.***

Officers introduced the report setting out a summary of the application.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting and the agent/applicant addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- 156 local residents who live around the proposed development site who had signed the petition had valid concerns.
- This application was the same as that previously considered and was fundamentally back land development.
- There were 5 main concerns - Street Scene, loss of character and style of the area, Highway and Pedestrian Safety and parking.
- The site backs onto an Area of Special Character
- The development would not enhance or be in context with the existing area.
- The development does not relate to the established layout to the detriment of the street scene.
- A lack of consideration had been given to the style and character of the area.
- There were a number of Tree Preservation Orders on the site.
- The proposal would change the current building line.
- If allowed this would set a precedent for similar developments in Long Lane.
- Pedestrian safety was a principle concerns in relation to the ingress and egress to the site with the crossovers being larger than the three existing, which would present a danger to pedestrians and other road users.
- There were a number of schools in the area along with a Doctors Surgery, Library and shops in Sutton Court Road.
- The manoeuvre of large vehicles turning right out of the site would be unsafe and dangerous.
- Long Lane was a main distributor road and was regularly congested.

The applicant/agent made the following points:-

- The application has met all objections in relation to tree protection and highway safety.
- All of the development lies within residential land and was not garden grabbing.
- The application should be considered on its own merits.
- The local context of the area was a key consideration in the design of the development.
- The application site does not form part of the Area of Special Character as the development faces Long Lane.
- There were already developments to the rear of properties in Long Lane, which were accessed from Long Lane.
- The Urban Design Officer stated that there were post war houses opposite the site that do not contribute to the character of the street scene.
- One of the three existing accesses would be closed thus reducing the number of crossovers onto Long Lane and a new boundary wall would be built.
- The proposed development would not affect neighbouring amenity and trees were to be maintained.

A Ward Councillor addressed the meeting making the following points:-

- The level of objections clearly raised several questions about the development
- The question of balance lied with the Committee when making its decision.
- The application needed to be taken in context with the surrounding area.
- The existing developments at the rear of properties in Long Lane had been built before the new policy came into effect.
- The proposal was back land development due to the recent changes in policy.
- The proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

In answer to an issue raised in relation to how refuse vehicles would access and exit the site officers advised that there was a plan showing that vehicles would be able to leave the site in a forward gear.

A question was asked by the Committee as to whether the quality of the environment and openness of the site had been taken into consideration.

Officers advised the Committee that the overall character of the development meets the requirements in relation to distances for the new and existing properties.

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

**Resolved - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.**

130. **103 PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE 32648/APP/2014/2551** (*Agenda Item 9*)

***Variation of condition 5 of planning permission 32648/APP/2010/1408 to extend the opening hours to allow delivery service between 18.00 and 22.00 Monday to Saturday (Change of use from Class A1 (Shops) to Class A5 (Hot food takeaway) and installation of extraction flue to rear).***

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.

In accordance with the Council's constitution a representative of the petitioners objecting addressed the meeting. The agent/applicant was not present at the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- Residents already suffered noise and disturbance from vehicle traffic on Park Road and would be exacerbated if the application was approved.
- There would be increased noise and disturbance from staff arriving and leaving the premises.
- The fan within the unit can be heard by the occupier of the adjoining property until it had been turned off.
- The parking bays on Park Road were for permit holders only.
- Park Road was a busy dual carriageway with fast flowing traffic, although there were speeding restrictions.
- The site had no parking and the parking bays were being abused.
- There were environmental issues in relation to smells from the unit and rodents.
- The increase in opening hours would have the same implications as the previous application so the same problems remain.
- Why should residents suffer just because the unit was not viable with the current opening hours?
- Only the adjoining occupier had been notified of the application.

A member asked whether an additional reason for refusal could be added in regards to the parking.

Officers advised that the site history was important and there had been no previous refusal on this ground, so this should not be added.

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

**Resolved - That the application be refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.**

131. **THE BUNGALOW, GRANVILLE ROAD, HILLINGDON 20398/APP/2014/2992**  
*(Agenda Item 10)*

***Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a two storey detached building containing 4 studio flats with associated parking and amenity space.***

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application advising the Committee that the previous application had been allowed on appeal. Given the Inspectors conclusions it was not felt that there were strong reasons to refuse the application on size and layout.

The Committee asked officers to write to the Inspectorate to raise their concerns about the decision as it was felt that the Inspector had failed to understand Hillingdon's policies.

The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote

	<p>and agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report</b></p>
132.	<p><b>WEST LONDON INDUSTRIAL PARK, IVER LANE, COWLEY 751/APP/2014/586</b> <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p><b><i>4 x single storey detached outbuildings for use as storage offices and toilet facilities with associated parking ancillary to Use Class B8 (Storage and Distribution).</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officers report</b></p>
133.	<p><b>GREATER BARN, HUBBARDS FARM, HUBBARDS CLOSE, UXBRIDGE</b> <b>5971/APP/2013/2831</b> <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p><b><i>Dismantling and rebuilding of existing barn and extension to provide 7 self contained flats with associated external works and landscaping.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application, this was an important Listed Building and needed to be re-constructed in line with previous approvals.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces to grant planning permission, subject to any amendments agreed by the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces and the following:-</b></p> <p><b>A. That the Council enters into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the 1990 Town &amp; Country Planning Act (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>1. The Greater Barn the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn shall be returned to the site and reinstated as part of the works within a specified time frame.</b></p> <p><b>B. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</b></p> <p><b>C. If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, under the discretion of the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, the application is refused under delegated powers on the basis that the applicant has failed to return and reinstate The Greater barn, the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn.</b></p> <p><b>D. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out</b></p>

	<p>in the officer's report be attached.</p>
134.	<p><b>GREATER BARN, HUBBARDS FARM, HUBBARDS CLOSE, UXBRIDGE 5971/APP/2014/1168 (Agenda Item 13)</b></p> <p><b><i>Listed Building Consent for the dismantling and rebuilding of existing barn and extension to provide 7 self contained flats.</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces to grant planning permission, subject to any amendments agreed by the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces and the following:-</b></p> <p><b>A. That the Council enters into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the 1990 Town &amp; Country Planning Act (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>1. The Greater Barn the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn shall be returned to the site and reinstated as part of the works within a specified time frame.</b></p> <p><b>B. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</b></p> <p><b>C. If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, under the discretion of the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, the application is refused under delegated powers on the basis that the applicant has failed to return and reinstate The Greater barn, the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn.</b></p> <p><b>D. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report be attached.</b></p>
135.	<p><b>LESSER BARN, HUBBARDS FARM, HUBBARDS CLOSE, UXBRIDGE 5971/APP/2013/1839 (Agenda Item 14)</b></p> <p><b><i>Dismantling of existing farm outbuilding and reconstruction to accord with planning permission ref: 5971/APP/2011/2438, dated 18-04-12 (Conversion of Lesser Barn to two three-bedroom dwellings involving internal and external alterations to existing barn with associated parking and landscaping) (Application for Listed Building Consent).</i></b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application.</p> <p>The recommendation was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote and agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That delegated powers be given to the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces to grant planning permission, subject to any amendments agreed by the Head of Planning, Sport and Green Spaces and the following:-</b></p>



	<p><b>A. That the Council enters into a legal agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the 1990 Town &amp; Country Planning Act (as amended) or other appropriate legislation to secure:</b></p> <p><b>1. The Greater Barn the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn shall be returned to the site and reinstated as part of the works within a specified time frame.</b></p> <p><b>B. That officers be authorised to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of the proposed agreement.</b></p> <p><b>C. If the Legal Agreement/s have not been finalised within 3 months, under the discretion of the Head of Planning, Green Spaces and Culture, the application is refused under delegated powers on the basis that the applicant has failed to return and reinstate The Greater barn, the Lesser Barn, the original granary and the removed wing to the Greater Barn.</b></p> <p><b>D. That if the application is approved, the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report be attached.</b></p>
136.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
137.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in</i></p>

	<p><i>withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
138.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 17)</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
139.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 18)</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i></p>
140.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 19)</p> <p><b>Resolved -</b></p> <p><b>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer’s report was agreed.</b></p> <p><b>2. That the Committee resolved 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></p> <p><i>This item is included in Part II as it contains information which a) is likely to reveal the</i></p>

	<i>identity of an individual and b) contains information which reveals that the authority proposes to give, under an enactment, a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person. The authority believes that the public interest in withholding the Information outweighs the public interest in disclosing it (exempt information under paragraphs 2 and 6(a) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985 as amended).</i>
	The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.50 pm.

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

This page is intentionally left blank