

## Minutes



**CENTRAL & South Planning Committee**

**1 November 2016**

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

	<p><b>Committee Members Present:</b> Councillors Ian Edwards (Chairman), David Yarrow (Vice-Chairman), Shehryar Ahmad-Wallana, Roy Chamdal, Jazz Dhillon (Labour Lead), Janet Duncan, Beulah East, Raymond Graham and Brian Stead</p> <p><b>LBH Officers Present:</b> Nicole Cameron (Legal Advisor), Alex Chrusciak (Planning Service Manager), Meghji Hirani (Planning Contracts &amp; Planning Information), Roisin Hogan (Planning Lawyer), Manmohan Ranger (Transport Consultant) and Luke Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)</p>
1.	<p><b>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</b> (<i>Agenda Item 1</i>)</p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alan Chapman and Manjit Khatra, with Councillors Raymond Graham and Beulah East substituting.</p>
2.	<p><b>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN MATTERS COMING BEFORE THIS MEETING</b> (<i>Agenda Item 2</i>)</p> <p>Councillor Ahmad-Wallace declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8, as a relative of the applicant came to his surgery, however, he refused to discuss the issue and remained in the room during the discussion of this item. Councillor Ahmad-Wallana also declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 11 as Ward Councillor for the applicant and left the room during consideration of this item.</p> <p>Councillor Edwards declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 11 as the Ward Councillor for the applicant, but did not discuss the application prior to the meeting and passed on all information and correspondence to the Planning Department. Councillor Edwards remained in the room during discussion of this item.</p> <p>Councillor Beulah East declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 8 as Ward Councillor for the item, but did not discuss the application prior to the meeting, and remained in the room during the discussion of the item.</p>
3.	<p><b>TO SIGN AND RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2016 AND 20 SEPTEMBER 2016</b> (<i>Agenda Item 3</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- That the minutes of the meetings held on 7 September 2016 and 20 September 2016 were agreed.</li></ul>
4.	<p><b>MATTERS THAT HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED IN ADVANCE OR URGENT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 4</i>)</p>

	None.
5.	<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 confirmed that items marked Part I would be considered in public, and items marked Part II would be considered in private.</p>
6.	<p><b>14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2016/1283</b> (<i>Agenda Item 6</i>)</p> <p><b>Conversion of existing dwelling into 2 x 2-bed self-contained dwellings with associated amenity space.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report to Members and noted the addendum. The Committee also heard that there was a petition in opposition to the application.</p> <p>Councillor Richard Mills, a Ward Councillor, provided a written submission which was read out to the Committee, during which he expressed concerns over the impact the proposed dwelling would have on drainage on the site, exacerbating the risk of flooding, while the application would also be an overdevelopment of the site and have a detrimental effect on the parking scene in Moorfield Road. Cllr Mills' confirmed that supported the refusal of the application.</p> <p>The Committee expressed concerns regarding the over-intensification of the site and moved the officers' recommendation. This was seconded, put to a vote and unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the application was refused.</b></li> </ul>
7.	<p><b>14 MOORFIELD ROAD, COWLEY - 69313/APP/2016/2731</b> (<i>Agenda Item 7</i>)</p> <p><b>First floor rear extension and single storey rear extension.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the application for the site, confirming this was on the same site as Item 6, but remained a separate application.</p> <p>A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, and informed Councillors that the extension currently being sought had previously fallen through, and was then resubmitted in two different applications. Furthermore, the floor risk the application would cause cannot be compensated, and the current application constitutes an overdevelopment of the site, with further applications to be expected.</p> <p>Councillor Richard Mills, Ward Councillor for Brunel, submitted written comments regarding the application, and these were read to the Committee at the meeting. Cllr Mills informed Members that the site had been subject to a number of previous applications, and extending the property further would have an impact on the groundworks and foundations. The Committee also heard that increasing the footprint of the property would take away existing drainage facilities, and as the properties lies in a floodplain, this would increase the impact of flooding to both the property and neighbouring households. Finally, the expansion would intrude onto neighbours living at numbers 12 and 16 Moorfield Road, which highlights the overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The Committee commented that the application was overbearing and an overdevelopment of the site, which could have worrying repercussions if approved due</p>

to the application being sited on a floodplain. It was suggested that the Committee should be safeguarding the current and future residents of the area, and that this application would not help with that task. Furthermore, Members questioned the need for a flood alarm, and commented that if this was necessary, perhaps further development on the property is not a sensible course of action.

Responding to questioning from Councillors, the Planning Services Manager confirmed that the proposed flood alarm was another form of defence against flooding that informed the homeowner when to put the flood prevention plan into practice and that the applicant was providing plans to deal with the threat of flooding, which was welcome.

Members confirmed their view that, with family dwellings in the area, further development would lead to an increased flood risk to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, another extension on a site which had already seen multiple extensions would result in too much development and a loss of privacy for 12 Moorfield Road, particularly impacting their use of the patio.

A motion to reject the proposal with final wording of refusal reasons delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control in consultation with the Committee Chairman and the Labour Lead Member, was put to the Committee on the grounds that the risk of flooding was not adequately mitigated and the development would be overbearing and impact the amenity at 12 Moorfield Road. The motion was seconded and put to a vote, when it was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be refused, with final wording of the refusal reasons to be delegated to the Head of Planning and Building Control, in consultation with the Committee Chairman and the Labour Lead Member:**
  1. **The details of the application fail to adequately demonstrate that that suitable mitigation measures and safeguards could be provided that would prevent the increased footprint of the building from resulting in an increased risk of flooding to both this site and adjoining properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EM6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies OE7 and OE8 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies 5.12 and 5.13 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.**
  2. **The bulk, proximity and depth of projection of the first floor rear extension would have an unacceptably overbearing impact upon the residential amenity of the occupants of the neighbouring property at 12 Moorfield Road. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (November 2012).**

8. **LAND FORMING PART OF 117 FAIRHOLME CRESCENT, HAYES - 56502/APP/2016/3136** (*Agenda Item 8*)

**Two storey, three-bedroom dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.**

Officers introduced the report and provided an overview of the application, noting that there were petitions both in support, and objecting, to the application.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, noting that this was the ninth application on the site since 2002 and all previous applications had been refused. Additionally, the proposed application was an overdevelopment of the site, and would intervene with the light and privacy of 119 Fairholme Crescent.

Members confirmed their support for the officer's recommendation, commenting it would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the street scene. The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be refused.**

9. **12 GROVE WAY, UXBRIDGE - 71844/APP/2016/1589** (*Agenda Item 9*)

**Two storey side/rear extension, single storey rear infill extension and single storey front infill extension.**

Officers introduced the report to Members.

A petitioner spoke in objection to the application, stating that every resident in Grove Way had raised concerns over the application. The Committee heard that local residents were concerned with the bulk, density and size of the proposed dwelling, and that a number of mature trees had been removed from the site. Furthermore, there was concern that the site would be used as a home of multiple occupation (HMO).

The agent for the application then addressed Members and commented that the application was in keeping with the street scene, and the height, width and boundary gap comply with the Council guidelines. The agent confirmed that four sycamore trees were removed, but these trees were not protected with a Tree Preservation Order. It was also confirmed that the applicant would be happy to engage in further dialogue with the Council and local residents regarding the rear extension, with the possibility of it being a single storey extension. Responding to questioning from the Committee, the agent confirmed that the proposed access to bedrooms which was angled off the stairs was by design.

Members expressed concern that this access was unusual and may cause problems for inhabitants, while suggesting that the layout gave weight to the claims that the property would be used as an HMO. Officers confirmed that the site layout was a building regulation matter and there was no proof that a solution could not be found to the concerns. Officers also informed Councillors that planning approval was not required to change from a family dwelling to an HMO, and the application must be determined on its current merits.

The Committee stated that the increased demand for parking on Grove Way would be problematic, and this issue was not addressed in the application. The Council's Transportation Consultant confirmed that there was sufficient space in the front garden area for two parking spaces which would comply with the parking requirements, and Members confirmed that conditions should be applied to ensure car parking is available in the front garden area and on-street parking concerns are not exacerbated.

Members moved the officer's recommendation with the added condition regarding parking. This was seconded, and upon being put to a vote was confirmed by five votes to one, with two abstentions.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be approved, subject to the following revisions to condition 5:**  
**5. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby approved plans demonstrating hard and soft landscaping works to the front of the property shall first be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These plans shall detail the provision of 2 car parking spaces and a minimum of 25% of the front garden area shall be soft**

landscaped (eg.grass or planted beds). The agreed plans shall be implemented in full and retained for so long as the development remains in existence. The approved car parking spaces shall at all times be made available for the parking of cars associated with the property 12 Grove Way, Uxbridge and shall not be used for any other purpose.

10. **57 MONEY LANE, WEST DRAYTON - 62525/APP/2016/333** (*Agenda Item 10*)

**Single storey attached garage to side/rear involving alteration to existing vehicular crossover.**

Officers introduced the report, providing an overview of the application and highlighting that a site visit for Members had recently taken place.

A petitioner, speaking in objection to the application, addressed the Committee and confirmed their opposition was based on flood concerns. The properties at 55 and 57 Money Lane were considered at high risk of flooding, and as recently as June, heavy rain at the property resulted in the garden of No.57 flooding. The petitioner provided photographic evidence of this flooding. Members heard that the proposed garage would limit the drainage area on the property, and the pitched roof would result in more water running off onto the garden, which already suffers from flooding in heavy rain. Upon questioning from the Committee, the petitioner confirmed that flooding occurs from both heavy rain and the rising levels of the River Colne.

Councillor Jan Sweeting, Ward Councillor for West Drayton, also spoke and confirmed her support for the petitioners, commenting that the garden currently provides a much needed soak-away area which would be diminished by the application, and water would run off the roof to heighten the water table further. Councillor Sweeting also stated that the flood alleviation methods currently proposed would only work in light rain, and asked that the application be refused.

Members confirmed they attended the site visit, but commented that the petitioner's statement and photographic evidence of recent flooding suggests that the river is not solely the cause of flooding at the site, and that heavy rain appears to also be a concern. Concerns were raised about where any flood water would be displaced to, should the application be approved.

The Chairman commented that he attended the site visit, and clarified to the Committee that the property was situated higher than the garden, with a slope down from the front garden to prevent flooding.

Councillors expressed concerns that the building would impact on the soak-away area, and also commented on the impact of the front garden, which was to be created with pea shingle and could further impact on the water levels to the rear.

Members commented that it would be helpful to be able to question the Council's Flood and Water Management Officer, who was not present at the meeting. Therefore it was proposed that the item be deferred to a future meeting that would be attended by the Flood and Water Management Officer to provide clarification to questions regarding the flooding concerns.

Members seconded the proposal, and upon being put to a vote, six Members voted in favour with two abstentions.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be deferred.**

11. **85 FALLING LANE, YIEWSLEY - 56688/APP/2016/3270** (*Agenda Item 11*)

**Conversion of existing detached outbuilding to granny annex.**

The Planning Officer introduced the report, and noted the addendum which highlighted further written submissions from the applicant.

The applicant had submitted a petition in support of his application, and addressed the Committee. The applicant confirmed that the application was for himself and his wife, an elderly couple, who wished to use it for family reasons and had the support of the neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the applicant commented that there was no reference to the National Planning Policy Framework or Initiative on Elderly People in the report, and questioned the reasons for refusal put forward.

Councillor Peter Davis, Ward Councillor for Yiewsley, confirmed that 31 local residents had signed the petition in support of the application, and commented that the applicant wishes to use the outbuilding when his children visit as both residents do not use the upstairs of their home due to disabilities. Councillor Davis stated that the proposed granny annex would use the same bricks as the back extension and as the building was already situated there, it could not constitute an over-development of the site or affect the neighbours in the area.

The Planning Officer commented that while it was important for the Committee to understand the applicant's desire to use the building, the wider impact of use of the outbuilding should not be discounted. Officers confirmed that the reference to overdevelopment should be removed from the reasons for refusal, but the application still constituted an over-intensification of the site, and responding to questioning from Members, also confirmed that the application was set out on the application form as a granny annex, and it was not specified on the form who would be using it.

Members sympathised with the applicant's wish to use the annex for family, but stated that the ability to access the proposed granny annex separately from the rest of the property was a concern due to the "beds in sheds" issue, and the impact the proposal would have on any future usage of the site could not be ignored.

The Committee commented that a number of similar applications had been turned down at recent meetings, as the application was contrary to a number of policies within the Hillingdon Local Plan, and there were no reasons to overturn the officer's recommendation in this instance either.

The officer's recommendation was moved, subject to an amendment removing the word "over-development" from the reasons for refusal. This motion was then seconded, and upon being put to a vote, was unanimously agreed.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be refused, subject to the removal of the reference to over-development from reason for refusal 1.**

12. **6 BROWNGRAVES ROAD, HARLINGTON - 36832/APP/2016/2590** (*Agenda Item 12*)

**Ground floor rear conservatory.**

Officers introduced the report, and the Committee commented that there were similar extensions on both sides of the road and there would be a very limited impact on the street scene.

The officer's recommendation was moved, seconded and unanimously agreed when put to a vote.

**RESOLVED:**

- **That the application be approved.**

13.	<p><b>TAMARA LOUNGE, BYRON PARADE, UXBRIDGE ROAD, HILLINGDON - 61362/APP/2016/3466</b> (<i>Agenda Item 13</i>)</p> <p><b>Proposed side timber canopy.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report to the Committee, and, when questioned by Councillors, confirmed that the area affected was covered by the property's existing hours of use and a condition was proposed to prevent the canopy area from being used by customers or as a smoking area.</p> <p>Members moved, seconded and unanimously agreed the officer's recommendation.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the application be approved.</b></li> </ul>
14.	<p><b>7 HUGHES ROAD, HAYES - 56119/APP/2016/2558</b> (<i>Agenda Item 14</i>)</p> <p><b>Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as an annex, involving demolition of existing outbuilding.</b></p> <p>Officers introduced the report to the Committee, and highlighted that the proposed outbuilding was considered capable of independent occupation from the main dwelling.</p> <p>Members moved and seconded the officer's recommendation, and upon being put to a vote, it was unanimously agreed.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the application be refused.</b></li> </ul>
15.	<p><b>S106/278 QUARTERLY FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 15</i>)</p> <p>Members noted the report, which provided financial information on s106 and s278 agreements in the Central and South Planning Committee area up to 30 June 2016 where the Council has received and holds funds.</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>That the report be noted.</b></li> </ul>
16.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 16</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the enforcement action as recommended in the officer's report was agreed.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <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>

17.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 17</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></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>
18.	<p><b>ENFORCEMENT REPORT</b> (<i>Agenda Item 18</i>)</p> <p><b>RESOLVED:</b></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 9.57 pm.</p>

These are the minutes of the above meeting. For more information on any of the resolutions please contact Luke Taylor on 01895 250693. Circulation of these minutes is to Councillors, Officers, the Press and Members of the Public.

**The public part of this meeting was filmed live on the Council's YouTube Channel to increase transparency in decision-making, however these minutes remain the official and definitive record of proceedings.**