

Minutes

CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

14 October 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) Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana Roy Chamdal Alan Chapman Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead) Janet Duncan John Morse Brian Stead</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts and Planning Information), Syed Shah (Principal Highways Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Charles Francis (Democratic Services Officer).</p>	
102.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Manjit Khatra, with Cllr John Morse substituting.</p>	
103.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Cllr Brian Stead declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 7. He left the room and did not participate in the item.</p>	
104.	<p>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 22 SEPTEMBER 2015 (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Were agreed as an accurate record.</p>	
105.	<p>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>The Chairman advised that Item number 18 in Agenda B was an additional enforcement item. This was considered in private following the conclusion of the public agenda items.</p>	
106.	<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>	

All items were considered in Public, with the exception of items 15 to 18 which were considered in Private.

107.

**HILLINGDON PENTECOSTAL CHURCH, KINGSTON LANE,
HILLINGDON 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 and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners supporting the proposal addressed the meeting.

The petitioner supporting the proposal made the following points:

- The original application had been considered at 20 May 2015 meeting where it had been deferred for a site visit. A site visit had taken place on 29 May 2015 and the applicant had been working in partnership with the Council since then to address any grounds for objections.
- The applicant had provided a revised site layout, which included an Arboricultural Assessment and Protection Method Statement and tree protection plan.
- A revised parking layout design had been provided by the applicant which addressed the Council's concerns about the retention of the hedge in conjunction with the tree report.
- The applicant was pleased to note that the parking and trees reasons for refusal had been removed in the officer report.
- The applicant had tried to address the main reasons for refusal which focused on the size and scale of the development.
- The petitioner noted that the revised scheme saw the removal of all the old out-buildings which meant that the proposal now had a smaller footprint.
- It was noted that the condition of the existing building was not good but, should it be approved, this would be addressed in the course of the development
- The scheme did not increase the capacity of the car park.
- The Church was currently too small to support the needs of its congregation.
- The Church provided a number of activities for the wider community but its premises were now too small to meet this need.

Officers explained the application sought a single storey rear extension with associated car parking involving the demolition of the existing outbuildings and part of the existing rear extension. The reason the application had come to Committee was its refusal on the grounds of size and scale and its impact on the Green Belt.

Discussing the application, the Committee asked officers about the size of the car park and to confirm its likely impact on the Green Belt.

Officers explained the application sought to reduce car parking from 35 spaces down to 20 and so on this basis, the Committee were surprised the application was deemed to spoil the character and appearance of the Green Belt. The initial views of some of the Committee was that the Officer recommendation for refusal should be overturned and the application be approved.

The Legal Officer advised that if the Committee were minded to overturn the recommendation for refusal, special circumstances would need to be provided. The Committee discussed the design and scale of the proposal and noted that the increase in roof height was minimal.

The high attendance in the public gallery showed it was a vibrant Church which benefitted the local community. On balance, the Committee agreed that the size and scale of the development was minimal and the demolition of the existing out buildings would reduce its overall foot print in the Green Belt. As the Church was a valuable local resource which provided a range of community services this demonstrated that special circumstances existed for the overturn of the officer recommendation.

The Committee considered the conditions included in the officer report and were advised that the standard ones relating to (i) Time limit; (ii) Plan numbers; (iii) Materials to match; (iv) Landscaping; (v) Travel Plan (without any requirement for a bond); (vi) the removal of all outbuildings; and (vii) Tree protection be incorporated into the decision notice, with the final wording of these conditions, and any other deemed necessary, to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead.

It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed unanimously that the officer recommendation for refusal be overturned and the application approved.

Resolved -

That the application be overturned and approved subject to the conditions above and for the exact wording to be agreed by the Chairman and the Labour Lead.

108. **24 ABINGDON CLOSE, HILLINGDON 18613/APP/2015/1670**
(Agenda Item 7)

Enlargement of front dormer for additional habitable space, porch to front, installation of roof terrace to front, new door and 2 rooflights to existing side extension and additional vehicular crossover to the side exiting onto Court Drive.

Officers introduced the report. In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposal made the following points:

- The proposal had resulted in strong feelings locally and a number of objections had been received from within the street.

- If the proposal were granted, it would break a previous condition for the Close.
- The proposal would destroy the aesthetic quality of the road.
- If the proposal were approved, it would result in a precedent being set in the area.
- The proposal would result in access which would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety and might result in the formation of a rat run.
- The proposed crossover would open up the cul-de-sac of Abingdon Close and views from Court Drive would create security concerns.
- The proposal would result in the loss of privacy to residents from the resulting roof terrace.
- The Close was an area of special local character which needed to be protected.

A representative of the applicant / agent was invited to address the meeting, but there was nobody in attendance.

A Ward Councillor spoke and raised the following points:

- He supported the concerns raised by the petitioners and objected to the vehicular access route which would be created.
- The proposal was prejudicial to the existing street scene.
- Court Drive was an area of local special character which needed to be preserved.
- The proposal would create a danger to pedestrian safety.
- The proposal, if approved would set a precedent in the local area.
- Residents should be put first and the proposal should be refused.

Discussing the application, the Committee asked Officers to comment on the safety and special local character issues which had been raised by the petitioner and Ward Councillor. Officers confirmed that access and egress to the road would not pose a danger, as the fence had been designed to ensure there was sufficient visibility of the roadside. With regards to the character and appearance of the area, Officers confirmed this was subjective and as a stand alone reason, would not be sufficient as a grounds to overturn the officer recommendation (of approval) at appeal. The Committee discussed the merits of conducting a site visit , but on balance, agreed that the information before the Committee was sufficient on which to base its decision.

It was moved, second and on being put to the vote agreed with 3 votes in favour and 3 abstentions, that the Officer recommendation be agreed and the application be approved.

Resolved -

That the application be approved as set out in the agenda with 3 votes in favour and 3 votes in abstention.

109. **28 COWLEY ROAD, UXBRIDGE 20290/APP/2015/2525** (*Agenda Item 8*)

Change of Use from Use Class A1 (Shops) To A1/Sui Generis for use as a shop and minicab office

Officers introduced the report and highlighted the changes set out in the addendum.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, a representative of the petitioners objecting to the proposal addressed the meeting.

The petitioner objecting to the proposal made the following points:

- The parking stress in Hinton Road would be exacerbated should the application be approved.
- At present, it was unclear if the business would operate from the Close.
- Should the application be approved, there would be increased noise and disturbance to local residents.
- The application would be hazardous to the free flow and movement of traffic.
- It was impossible to park in front of the premises as there was a bus stop as well as yellow lines there at present.
- There already were several taxi firms in the vicinity. However, none of these were situated in residential streets and all of these had off street parking.
- The application would be detrimental to the living conditions of local residents.

A representative of the applicant raised the following points:

- It was envisaged that most bookings would be made either on-line or from phone calls and so there would be little need for the taxis to operate in and around Cowley Road.
- Most pick up's would not occur in the vicinity of the booking office.
- The taxi firm had a trafficking system in operation and so there would not be parking in nearby streets.

A Ward Councillor raised the following points:

- The Ward Councillor supported the concerns which had been raised by the petitioners in objection to the scheme.
- The application should be refused.

In response to a number of questions of clarification, the Committee heard that the business would operate on a 24 hour basis, have 10 drivers and there would be limited pick up from base. Discussing the merits of the scheme, the Committee agreed that it would be detrimental to the amenity of local residents.

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

	<p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officer report.</p>	
110.	<p>LAND REAR OF 54 & 56 STAR ROAD, HILLINGDON 70020/APP/2015/3066 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Two x one-bed semi detached bungalows with associated parking and amenity space involving demolition of existing garages.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The Committee were informed the proposal was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, as well as having an unacceptable impact upon highway safety. It was also deemed to result in a poor level of residential amenity to the occupant of the bungalow.</p> <p>The Committee noted that minor amendments had been made to the application which was previously refused, but these had not addressed the previous reasons for refusal.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be refused.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be refused as set out in the officers report.</p>	
111.	<p>1 PARKFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON 9431/APP/2015/1230 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Conversion of a single dwelling into 2 x 1-bed and 1 x 2-bed self contained flats</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The Committee heard the application sought retrospective planning permission for the conversion of a singled welling into 2 x 1-bed and 1 x 2-bed self contained flats. Officers explained the proposal did not detract from the character and appearance of the site or have an adverse impact on the amenity of residents in nearby properties.</p> <p>Officers explained that revised site plans had been submitted to show that three on site parking spaces could be provided using a cardok stacker and as such, the proposal would provide adequate on site car parking and acceptable pedestrian visibility splays.</p> <p>While the Committee welcomed the provision of adequate parking, it raised concerns about the maintenance regime of the stacker and agreed that a condition should be in place to ensure this was adequately funded in the future.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be approved subject to the additional</p>	

	<p>condition:</p> <p>- Additional condition to secure appropriate ongoing maintenance and availability of the of the car stacker system. An informative should be included to advise the applicant of the desire expressed by the committee that the maintenance scheme include a mechanism for pooling contributions as a financial reserve to be available quickly should there be a failure or mechanical problem with the equipment.</p> <p>This additional condition to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman and Labour Lead</p>	
<p>112.</p>	<p>78 RYEFIELD AVENUE, HILLINGDON 8865/APP/2015/2794 <i>(Agenda Item 11)</i></p> <p>Two storey, 3-bed, semi detached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space, installation of crossover to front and alteration to existing crossover involving demolition of existing single storey side element of No.78 Ryefield Avenue</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the officer report.</p>	
<p>113.</p>	<p>HEATHROW NORTH SIDE SERVICE STATION, SHEPISTON LANE, HAYES 17981/ADV/2015/16 <i>(Agenda Item 12)</i></p> <p>Installation of various illuminated and non illuminated signage</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>It was moved, seconded and on being put to the vote agreed that the application be approved.</p> <p>Resolved -</p> <p>That the application be approved as per the officer report.</p>	
<p>114.</p>	<p>FORMER CAPE BOARDS SITE, IVER LANE, COWLEY 751/APP/2015/2797 <i>(Agenda Item 13)</i></p> <p>Variation of condition 5 (Opening Hours) of planning permission ref:751/APP/2014/1650 (Variation of condition 5 (Opening Hours) of planning permission ref: 751/APP/2011/272 dated 02/11/2014 to</p>	

change operating hours (Erection of two detached single storey buildings for the use of light industrial and offices with associated parking (Retrospective application)

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application.

The Committee noted that the primary considerations with the application related to the noise and extended use associated with the site. Officers explained that the alteration was for an extra two hours in the evening. With regards to consideration of the site location and previous planning decisions, whilst there is no objection to on site operations occurring until 2000, officers are concerned with the associated vehicle movements that would occur beyond 1800.

The applicant has agreed to accept a condition that the on site operations only extend to 2000 hrs, however HGV vehicular movements to and from the site be restricted to 1800hrs. Therefore subject to suitably worded planning conditions to ensure such, the recommendation is that the application is approved

Resolved -

That the application be approved.

Officers in presenting the application made a verbal amendment to the recommendation to alter conditions 1 and 2. The amended conditions agreed by the committee are:

1. Operation of the site shall be restricted to 0700 hrs to 2000 hrs Monday to Fridays, 0800 to 1800 hrs Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays.

REASON

To ensure that the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining or nearby properties is not adversely affected in accordance with the NPPF, Policy 7.15 of the London Plan, Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic policies (November 2012) and Policy OE3 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Saved UDP Policies (November 2012).

2. No vehicles exceeding 3500kg (gross weight) shall enter or leave the site before 0700 hours or after 1800 hours Monday to Fridays, 0800 to 1800hrs on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays. The access gates to the site shall be closed outside of 0700 hours or after 1800 hours Monday to Fridays, 0800 to 1800hrs on Saturdays and on Sundays and Bank/Public Holidays other than for vehicles below 3500kg (gross weight).

REASON

To ensure that the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining or nearby properties is not adversely affected in accordance with the NPPF, Policy 7.15 of the London Plan, Policy EM8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic policies (November 2012) Policy OE3 of the

115.	S106 QUARTERLY MONITORING REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>) Officers introduced a report which provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the Central and South Committee area up to 30 June 2015 where the Council has received and holds funds. Resolved - That the report be noted	
116.	ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>) 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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. <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>	
117.	ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>) 1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed. 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. <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>	

118.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 17</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>	
119.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 18</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 7:00pm closed at 9:15pm.</p>		

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Charles Francis on 01895 556454. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.