

## Minutes

### CENTRAL & SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE

31 March 2016

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



HILLINGDON  
LONDON

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Alan Chapman, Janet Duncan, Manjit Khatra, Brian Stead and John Oswell (as substitute)</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Richard Phillips (Principal Planning Officer), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant), Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Alex Quayle (Democratic Services Officer)</p>	
56.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Dhillon, who was substituted by Cllr Oswell.</p>	
57.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
58.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD 28 JANUARY 2016 AND 16 FEBRUARY 2016</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings held 28 January 2016 and 16 February 2016 were agreed.</p>	
59.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p> <p>None.</p>	
60.	<p><b>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</b> (<i>Agenda Item 5</i>)</p> <p>It was noted that items in Part I would be considered in public, and items in Part II would be considered in private.</p>	
61.	<p><b>11A WOODSTOCK GARDENS, HAYES - 6670/APP/2015/1036</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and noted the addendum.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and raised the following points:</p>	<p><b>Action by</b></p>

- Refuse would be located by the petitioner's own outside wall, and the petitioner reported that they were already clearing rubbish from this area on a weekly basis.
- The resident located to the north of the application site (number 26) would lose natural light.
- The access road would be difficult for emergency services to navigate, as well as the heavy lorries required to service the building site, and neighbours were concerned about preserving access to garages
- Council policy was that a 3-bed property should have 2 parking spaces.
- The petitioner indicated that the photos displayed to Members did not accurately represent the parking situation as experienced by residents, and due to congestion the turn into the access road would be very narrow when cars were parked.
- It was unclear how the amenity space would be divided between private and shared space.

In response to points raised by the petitioner, officers responded:

- That the amenity space was a combination of shared and private space.
- That the property to the north would potentially be overshadowed by the development, but with limited loss of light due to existing trees. The application complied with Council policy of preserving a 45 degree angle for light, and there were no grounds for refusal on this issue.
- That the access to the garage would be preserved, and the width of the road at 3 metres complied with standards.
- Though officers had considered the parking arrangements, they had concluded that the development would not lead to a loss of parking or greater competition for existing spaces.
- That the refuse storage area marked was just for collection day, and not the regular location. This would be formally managed by a waste management process which should prevent rubbish dumping.

Members raised concerns about the detail of the plans they were scrutinising, including the plan of the amenity space, parking and turning points, as well as distance to neighbouring properties. A further question was raised regarding the impact of light on neighbouring properties, resulting in the Chairman recommending deferral to allow officers to supply more information and clarify concerns.

A motion for deferral was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.

**Resolved:**

- That the item was deferred.

62.	<p><b>1 HOWS ROAD UXBRIDGE - 70108/APP/2016/95</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p>This item was withdrawn.</p>	<b>Action by</b>
-----	---	------------------

63.	<p><b>CRIMSON COURT, 1390 UXBRIDGE ROAD - 11982/APP/2015/4013</b> (Agenda Item 8)</p> <p>Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the retrospective application.</p> <p>Members concerns centred on two lights which had been installed but not yet activated, and the potential impact of light pollution on neighbours. It was requested that a condition be included to mitigate impact on residents. Officers suggested that the condition specify that lights were directed away from residential accommodation on De Salis Road.</p> <p>Officers reminded members that regardless of granting planning permission, residents still had recourse to complain to the Environmental Protection Unit and that the Council has powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 to overcome a nuisance caused by light and that planning permission did not affect this.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application be approved, subject to the additional condition that lights are directed away from housing on De Salis Road.</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>
64.	<p><b>LAND REAR OF CRESCENT PARADE UXBRIDGE ROAD - 70895/APP/2015/4349</b> (Agenda Item 9)</p> <p>Officers provided an overview of the application and noted the addendum. Officers commented that the 1 bedroom units were 0.5 square metres under the stipulated 50 square metres floor space as well as 1.5 square metres for storage space, the additional patio and balcony area meant this was not a consideration.</p> <p>Members commented that they anticipated local residents would be pleased with the replacement of the current building yard. A Member requested clarification of the distance between the south of the proposed development and the residential accommodation above Crescent Parade, to which officers responded that at 15.4 metres it was in excess of minimum standard distances.</p> <p>The officer recommendation for approval was moved, seconded, and upon being put to a vote was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>Resolved:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That the application be approved, subject to the addendum.</li> </ul>	<b>Action by</b>
65.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (Agenda Item 10)</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</b></p>	<b>Action by</b>

**for the purposes of issuing the formal breach of condition notice to the individual concerned.**

*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).*

The meeting, which commenced at 7.00 pm, closed at 8.17 pm.

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.