

Minutes**CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**

15 December 2015



HILLINGDON
LONDON

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

	<p>Committee Members Present: Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra, Brian Stead, Duncan Flynn (substituting in place of Alan Chapman), Edward Lavery (substituting in place of David Yarrow)</p> <p>LBH Officers Present: James Rodger (Head of Planning and Enforcement), Meg Hirani (Planning Team Manager), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer).</p>
149.	<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>) Apologies had been received from Councillors Alan Chapman and David Yarrow with Councillors Duncan Flynn and Edward Lavery substituting.</p>
150.	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>) Councillor Dhillon declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 6 (Branden, The Greenway) and left the room.</p>
151.	<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>) It was confirmed that all business marked Part 1 would be considered in public and all items marked Part 2 would be considered in private.</p>
152.	<p>BRANDEN THE GREENWAY UXBRIDGE - 15243/APP/2015/3392 (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>) Councillor Dhillon declared a non-pecuniary interest and left the room. Officers introduced the report and provided the committee with an overview of the application. The petitioner made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As they wished to increase the living space, the petitioner believed they would be doing so in a way that mirrored the adjoining house. • The house to the rear was some distance away with little visibility of the proposed extension, meaning that it had a very low impact on their amenity. • The proposed extension would have only been visible to the direct neighbours on either side. It would be the same as the adjoining

house and not as deep as that of the neighbour on the other side.

- The proposed extension would not be detrimental to the character of the house, of the street or the area.
- Responding to a point raised within the report, that the house had a steeper roof pitch, the petitioner responded that it would be similar to the adjoining house.
- The petition submitted reflected the fact that neighbours were in agreement that it would not be detrimental to the street, and as the petition had been signed by the neighbours on either side they too were not concerned by the impact on their amenity.

The agent made the following points:

- The application in general terms complied with policy and guidance of the council.
- There was a question of what was actually being protected within the conservation area. The front of the house is an attractive 1930s build, but the street has no specific character itself.
- There was no pattern on the street in how extensions had been built, and it was therefore difficult to ascertain a specific character that the house should retain.
- The proposed extension was not visible from the front, and from the rear houses on the street have no specific character.
- The conservation officer had cited the profile of the pitch of the roof as an issue, but this would not be visible from the front. The officer had described this as an awkward detail, which the agent disagreed that it would be, and instead argued it would meet neatly with the existing building.
- In conclusion, the application complied with size and scale guidelines, and at the rear there was nothing to preserve in terms of conservation.

A member of the committee clarified that they believed from the plans that the roof would be of a steeper pitch than that of the adjoining house. The agent confirmed that it would be, but very minor and not visible from the street. A member of the committee then asked how the roof would be drained. In response, the agent answered that the pitched roof was to have an internal drainage system, based on existing drainage.

Councillor Cooper was unable to attend in her capacity as Ward Councillor, but submitted a statement in advance in support of the application:

I am very disappointed that Officers are recommending refusal. The Applicants have done their best to address the issues that had been previously raised by Planning Officers, only to be refused on new and different grounds from the original reasons.

This modest development of a modest semi-detached family home is more in keeping with the adjoining neighbour than the present arrangement. It is very similar to other extensions in the vicinity and it is barely visible from the road. I concede that it is not the most attractive configuration, but the applicants were trying to accommodate the expressed concerns of Planning Officers, so it seems particularly harsh to refuse the application on the grounds given.

If the Committee are not convinced by the supporters here to-night

that this is a very small and contained development which it is perfectly reasonable to approve I suggest they visit the site and see for themselves.

The committee discussed adherence to conservation guidance given that the extension would not be visible from the front and the character of the houses on the street to the rear is not uniform.

Officers confirmed to the committee that the extension would only be visible to the rear, and that the proposed extension would have similar height but greater depth than that of the adjoining property. As the difference in height between the application and the existing extension of the adjoining property was considered to be visible but minor, members concluded that this would have a negligible visual impact if the tiles of the roof matched as proposed in the application.

A motion for approval, subject to the choice of roof tiles being approved by the planning authority in advance, was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED - That, subject to the approval of the choice of roof tiles by planning officers, the application be approved.

153. **6 CHURCHILL AVENUE - 71202/APP/2015/3325** (*Agenda Item 8*)

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

The petitioner made the following points:

- The reason for the application is to accommodate a relative in need of accommodation due to health and financial reasons.
- Other options for accommodation had been considered but had been found to be unaffordable.
- The plans indicated a kitchen, but this was in reality just an area of work surface, cupboards and a kettle.
- The application would require a shower and a toilet due to the proposed occupant's difficulty using those in the house.
- There was no intention to provide separate, rear access to the property, nor the long-term aim of letting the building.
- The applicant stated that they were prepared to work with planning and make changes to the application where necessary.

The Committee enquired as to the extent the petitioners were aware of discussions between the agents and planning officers, to which the petitioner responded that they had only been informed that the application may be approved if it was made smaller.

Officers stated that they had attempted to guide the application, but as currently designed was a standard 'bed in shed' arrangement. However, the committee did have the option of deferral in order to allow amendment of the application, to which a motion for deferral was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred to allow further guidance

	and negotiation on the content of the application.
154.	<p>LANZ FARM 33 HARMONDSWORTH LANE, HARMONDSWORTH - 44185/APP/2015/1729 (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided the committee with an overview of the application. It was noted that though the application was situated in the green belt, it was only a change in access to the site. The committee were asked to note the addendum and the additional requirement to obtain a legal obligation under s106 to secure the appropriate design and construction of the access.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the application be approved subject to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. receipt of a s106 agreement or unilateral undertaking to secure the provision of an associated agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the appropriate design and construction of the new access, including associated works to the public highway and a provision for the costs of all these works.
155.	<p>57 MIDHURST GARDENS - 5455/APP/2015/3399 (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided the committee with an overview of the application. Officers requested delegated powers to the Head of Planning for rights to ensure an outbuilding could not be reinstated at a later date. In addition, officers withdrew a condition for controlled landscaping as this would only affect the rear of the property.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p> <p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. removal of condition 3 2. addition of condition removing Permitted Development rights for extensions, outbuildings etc.
156.	<p>63 COLDHARBOUR LANE, HAYES - 26433/APP/2015/3829 (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Change of use from shop (use class A1) to restaurant/cafe/hot food takeaway (use call A3/A5) and single rear extension.</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided the committee with an overview of the application. Officers requested delegated powers to the Head of Planning to ensure relevant food and hygiene legislation was conditioned.</p> <p>A motion for approval was moved, seconded and, on being put to the vote, was unanimously agreed.</p>

	<p>RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to</p> <p>1. relevant food and hygiene legislation being conditioned.</p>
157.	<p>ENFORCEMENT REPORT (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>RESOLVED - That the enforcement action be deferred.</p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 7.55 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Alex Quayle on 01895 250692. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

This page is intentionally left blank