



## Minutes

### CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

6 January 2016

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b>          Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman)          Roy Chamdal          Alan Chapman          Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead)          Janet Duncan          Manjit Khatra          Brian Stead          Peter Davis (substituting for Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana)          Edward Lavery (substituting for Alan Chapman)          Raymond Graham (substituting for David Yarrow)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b>          Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Meg Hirani (Planning Team Leader), Syed Shah (Principal Highway Engineer), Sarah White (Principal Lawyer ) and Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies had been received from Councillors Ahmad-Wallana, Chapman and Yarrow, with Councillors Davis, Lavery and Graham substituting.</p>
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>
3.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD ON 14 OCTOBER 2015, 3 NOVEMBER 2015 AND 26 NOVEMBER 2015</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>Minutes to the Central &amp; South Planning Committee Meetings taking place on 14 October 2015, 3 November 2015 and 26 November 2015 were agreed.</p>
4.	<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>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>
5.	<p><b>14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2015/3137</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application.</p>

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following point:

- The application featured a single-story outbuilding that was not included in the original plan which had previously been approved.

In response, officers explained that the outbuilding was determined not to require planning permission, and instead received a certificate for lawful development.

A Ward Councillor for Brunel spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points:

- The applicant had submitted a large number of applications, making it difficult for residents to know what had been proposed and what had been approved. Residents had found the continuing process very unsettling.
- The developers continued to add more to the building without an apparent plan.
- The design was of poor quality for the street scene.
- The development was being undertaken on a flood plain.
- No site visit had been undertaken by officers.
- The building was only 80cm from the neighbouring property.

In clarification, officers responded that a site visit had in fact been undertaken by officers, reflected in the photos in the presentation. Though the ground floor of the property was 0.8m from the neighbouring property, this had already been approved and was not a part of the current decision. The first floor, which was a part of the application under consideration, was set back 1.6m from the neighbouring property.

A Member commented that the development was listed as a single unit, and asked how this would be monitored. Officers responded that this would be conditioned as a term of approval, and monitoring took the form of a site visit following a report.

Officers clarified that in the report it mentioned that a ground floor extension had been removed, but this had only been removed from the application following consultation with planning officers, and had not been physically built and demolished. For this reason, there could be no consideration of flood risk as the ground floor had already been deemed acceptable and approved.

Members questioned whether the proposed development was in-keeping with the street scene or whether it represented over-development. Officers responded that the urban grain, the proportion of land in the area built upon, indicated an area of high development. This application would actually cover comparatively little of the overall plot compared to neighbouring properties, and not be out of keeping with the area.

The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was agreed by 7 Members with 1 abstention.

**Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.**

6.	<p><b>203 WEST END LANE, HARLINGTON - 34605/APP/2015/3019</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>Though a petition had been received, the petitioner did not attend the meeting.</p> <p>The agent for the applicant attended, circulated images of houses in the surrounding area with the agreement of the Chairman, and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sole reason for refusal given was the roof form. However, a front dormer exists at 124 West End Lane.</li> <li>• Though the front dormer of this application is prominent, it was an attempt to make the design architecturally interesting.</li> <li>• The application is an attempt to expand the house in a large plot.</li> </ul> <p>Members stated their belief that the dormer proposed for 203 West End Lane was too prominent, and that the example given of 124 West End Lane did not look like an extension, but that the dormer was part of the original construction. In the case of 203 West End Lane, members were not encouraged to think the dormer was in-keeping or subservient to the original property.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</b></p>
7.	<p><b>27A AND 27B DALEHAM DRIVE, HILLINGDON - 67783/APP/2015/4003</b> (<i>Agenda Item 8</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development had a larger footprint than the previously approved applications, and was oversized and unsightly.</li> <li>• The privacy of neighbours was compromised by the deviations from the original plans. Lights to the rear of the development caused a disruption to the amenity of neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The 2 front entrances to the development are positioned in the middle of the building, and not in the middle of each unit as situated in the original application.</li> <li>• The front of the plot has been fully concreted, with no landscaping.</li> <li>• The development is 3 stories, and not 2 as set out in the original application.</li> <li>• The development is 4 bedrooms, and not 2 as set out in the original application.</li> <li>• The roof was oversized and included an end gable containing the Master bedroom and a skylight in contrast to the original plans.</li> <li>• The development had been constructed with the wrong colour of bricks.</li> <li>• The original application had been limited to 2 bedrooms per unit due</li> </ul>

to safety concerns, which the new construction compromised.

- The petitioner requested that the property be demolished, as the bricks themselves were unacceptable and could not be changed.
- Further, the petitioner questioned why the property had not been inspected early in the building process to notice problems and deviations from the approved application.

The agent for the application attended and raised the following points:

- The property did in fact not have a larger footprint.
- Each unit had 3 bedrooms with a study, and not 4 bedrooms as claimed by the petitioner.
- The officer report stated that the height of the eaves had been raised, but this was incorrect - the gabled roof changed the shape of the roof.
- The agent disputed the statement in the officer's report that the roof was out of keeping, and circulated photos of nearby houses with the permission of the chairman, which indicated varying styles of roofs in the vicinity. Properties in nearby roads had gabled roofs, and in some roads all properties had gabled roofs.
- The entrance doors to each unit are in the wrong place. The builder decided that this would reduce the impact of noise between adjoining walls.
- The brick is a different colour to that approved in the application, but there are a number of red brick properties on Daleham Drive and in surrounding streets.
- The lack of front landscaping could be rectified by a condition.

Prior to discussion, officers clarified that all the changes from the original approved application were listed in the report. A change was not in itself reason for rejection of the application, and that Members should assess the building as it now was.

Members enquired as to whether permitted development rights were conditioned in the original application, and whether other properties in Daleham Drive with hipped roofs could that change this to gabled under permitted development. Officers clarified that permitted development rights were not removed for other properties in the road to change roofs under lawful development certificates, but the question remained as to whether the development was in-keeping with the neighbourhood. Members were within their rights to give weight to the changing characteristic of the road in their decision, or to reject the application if it was decided that the development was not sufficiently in-keeping with the street scene.

Officers indicated the public vantage point from aerial images, and said it was a question of how far from the development in question Members decided to include properties in their decision for whether the roof was in-keeping. The chairman indicated that given the complexity of this point, Members of the Committee may benefit from a site visit to inform their decision.

A motion to defer the application pending a site visit was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

**Resolved - That the application be deferred pending a site visit from members.**

8.	<p><b>35 SHAKESPEARE AVENUE, HAYES - 29765/APP/2015/3825</b> (<i>Agenda Item 9</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum supplied, provided an overview of the application. An addendum had been included as it was deemed unrealistic to ask for completion of the development within a set timescale, and had been amended to state that works must commence within a set time, and alteration to aspects deemed harmful be completed within a set time, unless prior agreement was made with officers of the planning department.</p> <p>Members requested clarification of how the development matched the design of the house constructed opposite the junction. Officers responded that the roof shape was the same, which had been agreed on appeal.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report, subject to the amended conditions, relating to implementation and timescale for the completion of certain elements of the works, as listed in the tabled addendum.</b></p>
9.	<p><b>12 MARLBOROUGH PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, HILLINGDON - 6674/APP/2015/3389</b> (<i>Agenda Item 10</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum supplied, provided an overview of the application. Due to set back from the road, officers proposed the condition that prior to construction commencing, officers of the planning department could approve the arrangement for cars crossing highway land to access the property. The Legal Advisor had agreed that in this instance a Grampian condition was the best way to proceed.</p> <p>Members enquired about whether there was an expectation that current informal parking would be displaced elsewhere. Officers clarified that the area was not a controlled parking zone, and that the current footway parking would be displaced to nearby roads. The ground floor of the development would remain class A2. Parking was not officially in use by the bank on the ground floor of the development, but many retail units on Uxbridge Road do not have parking and are instead served by buses.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report, subject to:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. the removal of condition 3 as set out in the published agenda report</b></li> <li><b>2. the addition of the following new condition (listed in the tabled addendum)</b></li> </ol> <p><b><i>No development shall take place until a dropped kerb has been</i></b></p>

	<p><i>installed and markings have been provided in the ground to secure a route from the carriageway of the adjacent public highway to the parking spaces shown on the approved plan reference 887/RDP/PA01 Rev C. The dropped kerb and surface markings shall be installed in full accordance with details that have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be retained in perpetuity.</i></p>
10.	<p><b>LAND AT JUNCTION ADJACENT WITH FALLING LANE AND ROYAL LANE - 70600/APP/2015/4266</b> (<i>Agenda Item 11</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and provided an overview of the application. The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be approved as per the officers' report.</b></p>
11.	<p><b>PLOT 5, 91 PARK VIEW ROAD - 20207/APP/2015/2987</b> (<i>Agenda Item 12</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum supplied, provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</b></p>
12.	<p><b>PLOT 3, 91 PARK VIEW ROAD - 20207/APP/2015/2988</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum supplied, provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</b></p>
13.	<p><b>PLOT 4, 91 PARK VIEW ROAD - 20207/APP/2015/2989</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report, and, noting the addendum supplied, provided an overview of the application.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for refusal was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the application be refused as per the officers' report.</b></p>
14.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p><b>Resolved - That the decision on enforcement action be deferred.</b></p>
	<p>The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 PM, closed at 8.36 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