

Minutes**CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE****20 May 2015****Meeting held at Committee Room 5 - Civic Centre,
High Street, Uxbridge UB8 1UW**

HILLINGDON
LONDON

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Manjit Khatra, Brian Stead, Shehryar Wallana and John Morse (In place of Janet Duncan)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger, Head of Planning, Meghji Hirani - Planning Team Manager, Syed Shah - Highways Engineer, Nicole Cameron - Legal Services, Gill Oswell - Democratic Services</p>
1.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillor Janet Duncan with Councillor John Morse substituting.</p>
2.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Ian Edwards declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 8 - The Nags Head PH as he had dealt with a complaint in relation to the site and left the room whilst the item was discussed.</p> <p>Councillor Shehryar Wallana declared a non pecuniary interest in Item 8 - The Nags Head PH as he had dealt with issues of anti social behaviour relating to the site and left the room whilst the application was discussed.</p>
3.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 2 AND 21 APRIL 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held on the 2 and 21 April 2015 were agreed as a correct record.</p>
4.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>There was one item that had been notified as urgent.</p>
5.	<p>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 (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was confirmed that items marked Part 1 would be heard in public and those marked Part 2 would be heard in private.</p>
6.	<p>HILLINGDON PENTECOSTAL CHURCH, KINGSTON LANE, HILLINGDON</p>

66034/APP/2014/1124 (*Agenda Item 6*)

Single storey rear extension with associated parking involving demolition of existing outbuildings and part of existing rear extension.

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

In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners in support of the application addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- A plan and photo had been circulated to members prior to the start of the meeting.
- The Church was unable to be used as the congregation had out grown the building and a meeting hall was being hired elsewhere.
- The Church was extensively used for other activities including parent and granddads toddler groups, which was the only one in the Borough.
- There was a waiting list for the toddler groups.
- The Church valued the gardens and open space as numerous events were held in them.
- The extension had been designed to be sympathetic with the Green Belt and was felt to enhance the site.
- The building was in need of repair and removal of the outbuildings would improve the overall look of the site.
- Accepted that there was a need to keep to the 50% guideline but the footprint of the building was only a tiny fraction over that guideline.
- It was not felt that the extension was excessive against those buildings in the area.
- There had been no objections received from neighbours.
- The highways officer had suggested a travel plan, which would be supported
- It was felt that the loss of the trees on the site could be safeguarded.

The Committee had concerns about the recommendation of refusal and it was suggested that a site visit would be helpful to look at the officers concerns on site. The height of the buildings in the area were above that of the proposed extension and compared with existing buildings was not felt to be too large.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred for a site visit. On being put to the vote deferral was agreed.

Resolved - That the application be Deferred to enable the Committee members to make a site visit.

7. **225 PARK ROAD, UXBRIDGE** **42057/APP/2015/551** (*Agenda Item 7*)

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a two storey detached building to provide 3 x 1-bed and 3 x 2-bed self contained flats with associated parking and amenity space and alterations to existing crossover

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

In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners and the agent addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- The area consisted of bungalows and houses, there were no flats.
- The reason that there were not many residents in attendance was that there was a misapprehension that the application had already been turned down.
- Felt that the officer's recommendation for refusal was correct.

The applicant made the following points:-

- The applicant advised that she was not a professional developer and had been born in the house.
- The family had occupied the house since 1935 and it was now in need of substantial repair.
- There had been a change to the Area of Special Character as there had been development in Water Tower Close and Park Road had been made a dual carriageway.
- There was a residential nursing home and bed and breakfast in the area.
- It was no longer viable for her father to live in the property due to the amount of disrepair so was not viable as a family home.
- The property was not attractive to the market but was a potential development plot.
- Other options had been considered but were not economically viable.
- The two adjoining properties to the site were chalet bungalows.
- The site was a double width plot and was capable of accommodating the proposed development.

The Committee felt that the proposed development was too large and cramped for the site and agreed with the officer's recommendation for refusal.

It was moved and seconded that the application be refused and on being put to the vote was agreed.

Resolved - That the application be Refused for the reason set out in the officer's report.

8. **THE NAGS HEAD PH, FALLING LANE, YIEWSLEY 43301/APP/2015/58** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change of use from Use Class A4 (Public House) to Use Class C3 (Dwellings), full height infill extension to rear including changes to roof-form, to create 6 x 2-bed flats with associated parking including widening of existing crossover and cycle store to rear (full application).

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

In accordance with the Council's Constitution a representative of the petitioners in support of the application addressed the meeting.

The petitioner made the following points:-

- The building was old and occupied a prominent corner plot.
- There had been squatters in the property and it was now in a state of disrepair inside and out.
- The garden area was small but the single storey outbuildings would be removed to provide the maximum garden area possible.
- The footprint was smaller and the height was no higher than that existing.
- The proposal would bring the building back into use.
- The area consisted of low value housing and would not provide a high yield.
- This type of accommodation was needed in the area as it was close to Hillingdon Hospital.
- The site had good public transport links as it was close to West Drayton Station.
- Two parking spaces had been provided on site along with a cycle storage and garden area.
- Additional parking was not available in the area for rent for a sustained period.
- The objections raised had been in relation to the development not being used by a Housing Association.
- The public house closed three years ago and would remain empty for the foreseeable future.
- Suggested that special circumstances should be used in this case to allow less parking as occupiers would be encouraged to use alternative forms of transport.

The Committee felt that this was a good development and that housing was required in the area but that parking was already an issue in this area.

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

Resolved - That the application was Refused for the reason set out in the officer's report.

9. **21A ERROL GARDENS, HAYES 56310/APP/2015/432** (*Agenda Item 9*)

Installation of vehicular crossover to rear of property.

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

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

Resolved - That the application was Refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.

10. **LAND FRONTING RENAISSANCE HOTEL, BATH ROAD, HARLINGTON 57699/APP/2015/1257** (*Agenda Item 10*)

Replacement of existing 14.2 metre high telecommunications monopole with a 14.7 metre high telecommunications monopole with associated equipment cabinet (Application under Part 16 of schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)

Officers introduced the report giving a brief summary of the application and highlighted the information contained in the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.

	<p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application was Approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
11.	<p>LAND FRONTING 28 SUTTON COURT ROAD, HILLINGDON 54867/APP/2015/1256 (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p><i>Replacement of existing 13.9 metre high telecommunications monopole with a 14.7 metre high telecommunications monopole with associated equipment cabinet (application under Part 16 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for determination as to whether prior approval is required for siting and appearance)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving the committee a brief summary of the report, referring Members to the addendum sheet.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application was approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
12.	<p>THE BUNGALOW, GRANVILLE ROAD, HILLINGDON 20398/APP/2015/817 (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p><i>Details pursuant to conditions 4 (Materials), 5 (Landscape Scheme), 7 (Sound Proofing Scheme) and 8 (Sustainable Water Management) of planning permission Ref: 20398/APP/2014/2992 dated 13/11/2014 (Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a two storey detached building containing 4 studio flats with associated parking and amenity space)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving the Members a summary of the report.</p> <p>The recommendation for approval was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application was approved, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the officer's report.</p>
13.	<p>62 THE GREENWAY, UXBRIDGE 20576/APP/2015/390 (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><i>Variation of condition 5 of planning permission ref: 20576/APP/2013/ 3566 dated 5/8/2014 (alterations to existing building and change of use to bed and breakfast) (Section 73 application to allow modifications to approved scheme)</i></p> <p>Officers introduced the report giving the Committee a summary of the report. The application had been deferred from the previous meeting for a site visit. At the site visit Members requested further information in relation to the status of the upper floor of 64 The Greenway, the side elevation window facing 64 The Greenway and compliance with the 45° guidance. Members were informed that the information on these issues were set out on the addendum sheet circulated at the meeting.</p>

	<p>A Member asked how much the built form breached the 45° angle.</p> <p>Officers advised Members that the built form breached the 45° angle by 0.85 metres and if members were minded to go against this rule they would need good reasons as to why this application should be treated differently to any other application.</p> <p>The Committee felt that as there was a clear breach the officer's recommendation was correct.</p> <p>The recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote was agreed.</p> <p>Resolved - That the application was refused for the reasons set out in the officer's report.</p>
14.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</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>
15.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</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>
16.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</p> <p>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.</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>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.20 pm.</p>

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